

CULTURE IN CHAOS

AN ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE SOCIAL CONDITION IN WAR

Stephen C. Lubkemann

Culture in Chaos

Culture in Chaos

An Anthropology of the Social Condition in War

STEPHEN C. LUBKEMANN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS CHICAGO AND LONDON

STEPHEN C. LUBKEMANN is assistant professor of anthropology and international affairs at The George Washington University and the associate editor of *Anthropological Quarterly.*

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637
The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London
© 2008 by The University of Chicago
All rights reserved. Published 2008
Printed in the United States of America
17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 1 2 3 4 5

ISBN-13: 978-0-226-49641-2 (cloth)
ISBN-13: 978-0-226-49642-9 (paper)
ISBN-10: 0-226-49641-4 (cloth)
ISBN-10: 0-226-49642-2 (paper)

Lubkemann, Stephen C., 1968–
Culture in choas : an anthropology of the social condition in war / Stephen C. Lubkemann.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-226-49641-2 (cloth : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 0-226-49641-4 (cloth : alk. paper)
ISBN-13: 978-0-226-49642-9 (pbk. : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 0-226-49642-2 (pbk. : alk. paper)
1. War. 2. Social conflict. 3. Political violence. 4. Forced migration. I. Title.
GN497.L83 2008
303.6'6—dc22

2007018948

♾ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48–1992.

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

Notes on the Text xi

INTRODUCTION. The "Ordering of Violent Things": War and Displacement 1

I. Migration and Social Transformation before the War 45

CHAPTER 1. Contending with Colonialism: Migration and Resistance 47

CHAPTER 2. Other Struggles: Migration and the Transformation of Social Relations 66

II. The Social Conditioning of War 103

CHAPTER 3. Imposing the New Mozambique: Sowing the Seeds of Postcolonial Disillusion 111

CHAPTER 4. Society and the State: Mutual Misrecognition at the Gathering of War 137

CHAPTER 5. Prosecuting Life by Other Means: The Social Logic of Violence in a Fragmented War 161

III. The Social Condition in War 187

CHAPTER 6. Terrains of Displacement: War-time Mobility and Immobility 191

CHAPTER 7. *Tambem Aqui Fazemos Amor:* Living in War 216

IV. War as a Socially Transformative Condition 251

CHAPTER 8. Postconflict Displacements:
The Social Problematics of Refugee Return 259

CHAPTER 9. Transnational Contentions:
The Moral Economy of Postconflict Migration 281

CHAPTER 10. Where to Be an Ancestor?
The Struggle for the Postconflict Social Imagination 304

Notes 331

References 361

Index 393

Acknowledgments

Over the last dozen years that this book has been in the making I have accrued a formidable debt of gratitude to a great many people and institutions for their generous support and timely encouragement, which proved indispensable both throughout fieldwork and the long evolution of this book.

I am very grateful for the financial support provided by grants from the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the Thomas J. Watson Institute for International Studies, the Center for the Comparative Study of Development at Brown University, and the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation.

In Mozambique, the Center for African Studies at Eduardo Mondlane University provided me with an academic affiliation and research credentials that allowed me to work in the country. I am deeply indebted to the staff of the Arquivo Histórico in Maputo and in particular to Antonio Sopa and Pedro Bucuane, without whom I would never have been able to locate such rich and relevant archival materials. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) national and Chimoio regional offices provided logistical support and access to documentation during the beginning of my research; I am also very thankful for the timely support of Airserve and the United Nations Development Programme. I owe a great debt to many friends who assisted me in Maputo with places to stay and provided all sorts of invaluable advice. Moises Venancio provided me with a crucial home base in Maputo for almost two years, from which I could conduct archival work and to where I could return on occasion to reflect and recover physically after a number of bouts with malaria. My thanks also to Georgia Kauffman and John Ericson, who directed me to key contacts in Mozambique early on in my research.

Many Mozambican and Mozambicanist colleagues have provided invaluable feedback and support at different stages of this project. Joel das Neves Tembe, Jeanne Penvenne, Jessica Schafer, Iraê Baptista-Lundin, and Scott Kloeck-Jenson provided not only friendship but, as fieldworkers and scholars, also served as sources of inspiration, furnished important critical insight, and provided discussion and stimulation on many topics of common research interest. Scott's untimely death, along with that of his wife and children, was a source of great sadness to all who enjoyed his friendship and benefited from his intellect—and he is still sorely missed.

In Chimoio, I owe a great debt to my transcription team and local research collaborators, who I have not named here at their own request. However, without them the transcription of the life histories I gathered would never have been possible. I am also particularly grateful for the logistics support and friendship provided to me by the folks at Finnish Aid (FINNIDA), particularly Mikko and Katti Köria, Pepe, Pentti Haatanen, and Vera. In Machaze itself the folks at the Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE) provided logistical support. My very special thanks to Viola whose reflection, insight, wisdom, and support I constantly benefited from in so many ways. I also want to express my thanks to the local administrators of Machaze and Mossurize districts who authorized my work in these areas.

In South Africa, I want to thank the Machazian community leaders who made it possible for me to work with Machazians in the township communities. I am also grateful to the Fred and Laetitia Ackerman family for all of their support and friendship and to the Vaal Tecknorama museum.

At Brown University, I would like to thank the faculty and students of the Department of Anthropology who provided me with support, friendship, and mentorship that contributed in many ways to this project over so many years. More specifically, I thank David Kertzer, Lina Fruzzetti, Nicholas Townsend, George Hicks, Bill Beeman, Richard Gould, Larry Minear, Dan Smith, Hillary Crane, Dave Conlin, Isabel Rodrigues, Miguel Moniz, Rebecca Upton, Lacey Andrews Gale, Kathy Grimaldi, and Matilde Andrade. I am deeply grateful to the Watson Institute and to the Populations Studies and Training Center (PSTC) for the postdoctoral fellowship they provided that allowed me to conduct extensive additional fieldwork and begin the process that would eventually lead to this book. In particular I want to thank Tom Weiss and Tom Biersteker at the

Watson Institute and Michael White at the PSTC. At George Washington University, the Department of Anthropology has provided me with a supportive environment in which to complete this work. My very special thanks to Alison Brooks and Richard Grinker for their advice and constant encouragement.

I want to express my appreciation to Oxford University Press, SAGE Publications, the *Journal of Peace Research,* and the *Journal of Refugee Studies* for their permission to use substantially altered portions of previously published chapters or articles. Specifically: a portion of chapter 4 was originally published in 2005 as an article in the *Journal of Peace Research* 42, no. 4: 493–508; some of the material in chapter 8 originally appeared in *Categories and Contexts: Anthropological and Historical Studies in Critical Demography,* edited by Simon Sretzer, Hania Sholkamy, and A. Dharmalingam (Oxford University Press, 2004); and portions of chapters 9 and 10 originally appeared in a 2002 article of the *Journal of Refugee Studies* 15, no. 2: 189–212.

David Brent believed in this project from the outset and patiently allowed it to come to fruition. I am thankful to him and to his editorial team, including Elizabeth Branch Dyson, Mary Gehl, and Robert Hunt, at the University of Chicago Press, as well as to freelance copyeditors John Raymond and Katy Meigs. I also want to acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers who offered incisive comments that stimulated my thinking and led to important revisions that greatly improved my original text.

A special thanks to my good friend Malangatana for allowing me to use his artwork on the cover and to Filomena Andrade and the Fundação Mario Soares for providing the digital image.

This work would have been impossible without the generosity of the many Machazians who spoke with me throughout the course of my research. So many people in Machaze, Chimoio, and South Africa were willing to give their time and share from the courage, humor, wisdom, pain, and uncertainty of their lives to help me understand what they had gone through. I am grateful to each of them. In particular, to my research associates Jereboamo, Django, Domingos, Felipe, Abiah, Felizardo, Jossia, Soares, and Fransisco: without you I would never have been able to do this work, and much of what I have come to understand is a result of your patience, persistence, friendship, and hard work. My special thanks to Jossia who patiently enabled, guided, and mentored my work in Machaze, Chimoio, and South Africa.

Finally my greatest thanks go to my family (my mom, Cheri; my dad,

Chris; my brother and sister, Dave and Sharon; and my in-laws, Peg and Rich) who have provided with me with the love and support that has carried me through this whole endeavor. Most important of all, my wife April has been my closest friend, staunchest supporter, a source of endless encouragement, and—along with our daughter Ava—my inspiration. April and Ava—you have tolerated the most insane moments of all and made them worth it all simply by being there.

Whereas this work would never have been possible without the assistance, support, and insight of all of those mentioned here, all responsibility for the arguments and material presented here must, of course, remain my sole responsibility.

Notes on the Text

On Translation

All quotations from both oral interviews (originally in ChiNdau and Portuguese) and historical documents (originally in Portuguese) have been translated by me into English. All translations from ChiNdau were initially made during the transcription process by my assistants in Chimoio, after which we jointly reviewed them. In some cases I have paraphrased some quotes in order to render them more accessible to a general readership.

On Anonymity

In Mozambique most of my interviews were conducted during a period in which many Machazians remained uncertain about whether the peace would hold, while in South Africa Machazians were often apprehensive about their illegal or quasi-legal status in a context of growing xenophobia and government action against immigrants. Accordingly, I committed to strict anonymity everyone I interviewed. This commitment is reflected in the way I refer to particular interviewees, who are either quoted in the text without any name whatsoever or with a pseudonym. No real names of individuals are provided in this text. In a few cases I have changed some minor details about individuals who are discussed at great length in order to assure their anonymity. None of those changes are of consequence to the substantive arguments that are made based on their cases.

INTRODUCTION

The "Ordering of Violent Things"

War and Displacement

In this book I attempt to retheorize the social existence of the growing number of people throughout the world who struggle to survive prolonged warfare and displacement. War is one of the tragically ubiquitous signs of our times. Shortly after the turn of the millennium, over forty-five significant armed conflicts were estimated to be taking place across the globe, with 40 percent of these occurring on the continent of Africa alone (Gurr, Marshall, and Khosla 2000). Many recent or still ongoing conflicts have persisted for two,[1] three,[2] or even four[3] decades or more, spanning the entire lifetimes of multiple generations and fundamentally shaping the social realities of many tens of millions of the continent's inhabitants.

In the growing number of places in which armed conflicts and displacement persist for decades there is a need to approach war as something more than a violent form of political struggle. Throughout Africa alone prolonged or chronically resurgent armed conflict has served as the primary backdrop for the social existence of entire generations in over a dozen countries over the last four or five decades.[4] For the inhabitants of such places war has not been an "event" that suspends "normal" social processes, but has instead become *the* normal—in the sense of "expected"—context for the unfolding of social life. Rather than treating war as an "event" that suspends social processes, anthropologists should study the realization and transformation of social relations and cultural practices *throughout* conflict, investigating war as a transformative social condition and not simply as a political struggle conducted through organized violence.

I present this approach to war as a "social condition" through an ethnohistorical study of social survival and change in Mozambique, a

country in which a decade of armed anticolonial struggle (1964–74) was almost immediately followed by one of Africa's longest and most brutal civil wars (1978–92). Although the Mozambican civil war was initially a highly localized movement spawned by hostile neighboring regimes intent on destabilizing the newly independent country, it eventually grew into a devastating nationwide conflagration that raged for a decade and a half, killing one million people and driving nearly five million more from their homes (Hanlon 1996, 16). By the time a lasting peace was negotiated in late 1992 the country's infrastructure lay in ruins, with 60 percent of the country's primary schools and over 40 percent of its health clinics destroyed (Hanlon 1996, 15).

My specific point of ethnographic departure is the remote district of Machaze in Mozambique's south-central province of Manica. Although strategically insignificant to Mozambique's civil war for the most part, Machaze was one of the earliest staging grounds for the Mozambican National Resistance, RENAMO (Resistência Nacional Moçambicana), and for the counterinsurgency campaigns of the Liberation Front of Mozambique, FRELIMO (Frente de Libertação de Moçambique), the party that assumed power after the demise of Portuguese colonial rule. Witnesses to the civil war from its very beginning, the inhabitants of Machaze thus suffered from the conflict for far longer than most of the rest of the country. Over the course of the fifteen-year war, thousands of Machazians perished and, by some estimates, over 70 percent (GTZ 1993, 1996; CARE 1994; Wenzel and Bannerman 1995) of the population fled the district. Control of this vast and relatively remote rural district remained divided between RENAMO and FRELIMO throughout the war. Even when I arrived in early 1995—almost two years after the conflict had officially ended—some places were only tenuously accessible to the government and international NGOs, and groups of armed irregulars were frequently rumored to hold sway in others.

I chose to pursue fieldwork in Machaze because of the district's particularly high incidence of war-time displacement. My plan was to investigate how anthropology could contribute to the demographic analysis of war-time migration and postconflict return. In Mozambique, as in most contemporary war-torn countries, migration was one of the most important and common ways people coped with violence and its effects—and Machaze was among those districts in the country that ranked highest in its incidence of war-time out-migration. In fact, regardless of whether they ever left the district, virtually every inhabitant in Machaze relocated—often



Machaze District in Relation to Manica Province, Mozambique, and surrounding countries

several times—during the war. Those who remained in Machaze either stayed in the heavily fortified and militarized communal villages controlled by the government or sought refuge in the district's vast and remote rural hinterland. Others contributed to Mozambique's war-time urban explosion by moving to the nearest provincial capitals, Chimoio and Beira, or to other satellite urban centers such as Manica and Gondola. Massive numbers of district inhabitants eventually fled across international borders: by the end of the war over thirty thousand were in refugee camps in Zimbabwe, while an untold number settled "informally" (and illegally) in the camps' surrounding rural communities. Thousands more found refuge even further afield, in the periurban townships on the outskirts of Johannesburg, Pretoria, and Vereeniging in South Africa.

I first arrived in Mozambique in 1994, nearly a year and a half after the war had officially ended. I conducted the fieldwork on which this book is based intermittently throughout the decade that followed. During this period millions of Mozambicans returned to their war-ravaged homes and struggled to rebuild their local communities. Although many Machazians were returning when I arrived, I discovered that many others were reluctant to do so, fearful that the peace would not hold and uncertain of what conditions they would encounter in their former homes.

Thus, although my fieldwork began in Machaze District, I decided to let the experience of war-time displacement itself define the boundaries of my "field site," which led me to eventually follow many of the district's displaced residents—often from the same communities and even from the same families—to several of the discontiguous corners of the Machazian "social world" (Marx 1990) that war-time dispersion had created. My thirty or so months of fieldwork were in two areas within the district of Machaze, in the provincial capital of Chimoio, and in the Vaal-area townships of South Africa. More intermittently, I conducted interviews with Machazians in the Chipinge and Mutare areas just across the nearby border in Zimbabwe.

I decided that working at "multiple ends" of the displacement stream would better position me to explore both war-time migration and post-conflict return, responding to historian Terence Ranger's call to "place forced migration back into the flow of social history" (1994, 279) by pursuing work in areas that had also served as labor-migration destinations before the war. The war-time migration of refugees has typically been theorized in terms that starkly differentiate it from, and fail to explore potential connections with, labor and other forms of migration. Most

notably, the extent to which agency shapes war-time movement is theorized as being very different from other forms of migrancy. While labor migration is deemed "voluntary," war-time migration is typically described as "forced" or "involuntary." Whereas studies of labor migration seek to ascertain what factors influence the various aspects of the migration decision-making process (where, when, and with whom to go, for how long, and, most important, whether to go at all), refugee migration is often seen as largely devoid of strategic calculation, indeed as virtually a "nondecision" driven by a reflexive instinct for survival. Consequently, while scholars of labor migration investigate how context-specific social relations, cultural understandings, and economic and political conditions converge to structure opportunities and shape the perceptions that inform the exercise of volition, the agency of refugees is more often simply taken as a given, cast in universally generalizable and highly reductionist terms. War-time conditions are assumed to reduce individuals to acting on the basis of what are often described as "more fundamental" and, by implication, socially and culturally undifferentiated needs. Indeed, in the throes of war people are often presumed to have no motivations other than bare survival.

While many anthropologists have critiqued such reductionist framings of refugee agency by exploring how war-time migrants negotiate the many *effects* of displacement as socially positioned and culturally embedded actors,[5] there have been very few investigations of how refugee agency shapes the social organization and dynamics of the *migration process itself* (cf. Wilson 1994). My original objective was therefore to ascertain the extent to which war-time movement might be influenced by a complex array of culturally scripted life projects and social interests not unlike those that had shaped labor migration before the war and the connections between labor migration and refugee movement.

However, over the course of my fieldwork and in its aftermath, my focus evolved from being simply an "anthropological demography" of war-time migration into an effort to address a much broader set of questions about how anthropologists and other social scientists come to understand and depict the social existence of warscape inhabitants. I gradually came to realize that the dismissal of refugee agency in the analysis of war-time migration was ultimately rooted in even deeper assumptions and understandings about the processes that produce refugees in the first place. My goal in rendering this account of how the residents of Machaze used migration throughout Mozambique's long and difficult conflict and in

its aftermath has therefore been transformed into something broader in scope. My purpose is now to critically interrogate—and retheorize—how we conceptualize and analyze war itself, the behavior of warscape inhabitants, and the effects of war on social and cultural process. While the demographic process of migration remains a key question, as well as being my primary point of ethnohistoric entrée into Machazian social experience, I now focus primarily on war-time mobility as a strategic site for exploring and theorizing the social condition in war.

The Discursive Constitution of Refugees: Beyond the "National Order of Things"

Images and understandings of refugees are constituted with reference to a litany of losses—of culture, identity, place, security, material means, and power. In her powerful critique of humanitarian discourse Liisa Malkki offers a detailed analysis of how refugees are typically portrayed: "stripped of the specificity of culture, place, and history—(and thus) as human in the most basic elementary sense. The refugee as bare humanity stands, we imagine, for all of us at our most naked and basic level" (1995a, 12). Refugees are thus rendered as "exemplary victims"—people to whom things happen and are done, rather than agents who make things happen through their doing. In fact, elsewhere Malkki (1997) notes that the power of this frame is such that when the displaced demonstrate any degree of self-initiative that contradicts their presumed "helplessness" they often find that the authenticity of their "refugeeness" is cast into doubt. In short, the category is more capable of shaping the reality of the categorized than the realities of the categorized are of defining the category.

Malkki argues that such framings are grounded in deeply held assumptions about how place, nation, and culture coincide. This powerful regime of order, which she designates as the "national order of things" (1992, 1995a), equates movement across international borders with the loss of identity, culture, and agency:

> If territorially "uprooted" people are so easily seen as "torn loose from their culture" (Marrus 1985, 8), as I have argued elsewhere (1992), this is only because culture is itself a profoundly territorialized (and even a quasi-ecological) concept in so many settings. . . . Violated, broken roots signal an ailing cultural identity and a damaged nationality. . . . Insofar as "culture can also function

> like a nature" (Balibar 1991, 22) that fixes people in native places and points of origin, uprootedness becomes profoundly unnatural and perhaps the ultimate human tragedy. (1995b, 15–16)

Yet, while Malkki's "national order of things" plays a powerful role in rendering refugees as "most basic people," a more comprehensive reading of humanitarian and policy discourse quickly makes it apparent that it is not only those who cross international borders who are portrayed as paradigmatic victims and "stripped-down humanity" but in fact *all warscape inhabitants.* Thus, for example, the much larger category of internally displaced persons (or IDPs, as they are conventionally designated in professional humanitarian circles) who seek refuge within their own countries of origin are often described in much the same terms as refugees who cross international borders. Over the last decade a series of influential policy research projects have highlighted the plight of IDPs as far more dire—and neglected—than that of refugees (Cohen and Deng 1998a, 1998b; Norwegian Refugee Council 2002). Thus, for example, Hiram Ruiz notes that one of the largest and most imperiled populations of displaced people are Sudan's internally displaced:

> The Sudanese government has bombed camps for the internally displaced, forcibly relocated persons from Khartoum to camps where services were virtually non-existent, and abducted displaced children and placed them in camps where human rights groups report that they were compelled to convert to Islam and undergo military-style training. The government has furthermore tolerated the enslavement of displaced women and children, profiteered, and actively prevented international aid from reaching displaced people with urgent needs. (1998, 141)

However, in rather stark contrast to refugees, it is not the transgression of national borders but rather *containment within them* that is identified as the source of this population's compounded vulnerability and dehumanization:

> The Sudanese government in Khartoum has been able to pursue these policies by insisting that this issue of displacement—because it is internal—is a domestic concern, and has donned the mantle of state sovereignty [a political prerogative of its internationally recognized borders] to keep the international community at bay. (1998, 141)

Interestingly, rather than being informed by notions of national "rootedness" the metaphors that are used to depict the plight and utter helplessness of IDPs tend to be derived from images of captivity and containment. Thus, for example, internally displaced Angolans have been described as "stored" in IDP camps (Messiant 2004). Similarly, in describing the desperate state of Liberia's internally displaced, Jean-Herve Jezequel draws explicit parallels between the state of internal displacement and those who live in states of servitude and slavery:

> Civilians uprooted by fighting but unable to find refuge abroad move around the interior of the country according to the dictates of shifting battles and the injunctions of the armed groups they encounter. Some end up *crammed into* camps for the internally displaced persons (IDPs), the locations of which are decided by the Liberian authorities according to military priorities. . . . [M]any others are *unable to escape* the armed factions for whom they constitute a major source of young recruits and *servile* labor. . . . [T]hese populations are victims of social disintegration: the break-up of families, collapse of community solidarity, *enslavement* of civilians, acceptance of rape as a feature of everyday life. (Jezequel 2004, 172–73; emphasis added).

More generally, Cecile Dubernet (2001) describes IDP camps as "humanitarian spaces without exit" and critiques the growth of the IDP phenomenon as a process of "international containment of persons."

In a world in which "complex emergencies" are more likely to be durable social conditions that span decades and persist for generations rather than short-term events, *all* warscape inhabitants—*whether they move or not*—tend to be discursively constituted in terms that suggest they are at the whim of larger forces and uncontrollable currents of violence. Anthropologist Mats Utas has insightfully noted how even warscape inhabitants themselves have started to note how outside agencies constitute them as "non-agents"—and have begun to strategically appropriate that discourse in their own "presentations-of-self" through what he terms "performances of victimcy":

> During a recent consultancy focusing on Sierra Leonean women in northern Liberia I was initially taken by surprise when every single woman we interviewed immediately and without hesitation declared that she had been raped. . . . [Y]et I soon came to realize that presenting themselves as victims was a means by which women effectively established themselves as "legitimate" recipients of humanitarian aid. (Utas 2005, 409)

I was greeted early on in my fieldwork in Machaze with similar presentations of self, whereby absolute strangers, on meeting me for the first time, would immediately extend one hand, place the other on their stomach, and declare "*tenho fome!*" (I am hungry!). I later discovered that most assumed I was working with one of the aid organizations active in the district during the immediate postwar period.

The fact that *all* warscape inhabitants tend to be discursively constituted as paradigmatic victims—subjects acted upon rather than acting subjects—suggests that the "national order of things" is but one stream of discourse among others that forges our understanding of refugees and their agency. Other powerful and implicit understandings have been at work in the discursive production of refugees as "bare humanity" long before any borders are crossed. I suggest that the category of refugee is framed at a point of confluence between the "national order of things" and other—possibly even deeper—currents of discourse that have already acted to constitute the subjectivities of *all* warscape inhabitants. Throughout this book, I focus in particular on one of these "other streams" by examining—and questioning—how violence is cast as a hegemonic producer of war-time subjectivity, agency, and social processes.

The Discursive Constitution of War: The "Violent Ordering of Things"

Few processes are more singularly, thoroughly, or powerfully constituted with reference to violence than war. Indeed war, as anthropologist Carolyn Nordstrom notes, is inevitably identified with reference to violence: "[W]ar comes into existence when violence is employed. Political aggressions may become flamed, threats may be flung back and forth, military exercises may take place, but it is only when bullets are fired and people are maimed and killed, when bombs destroy strategic targets that war is said to exist" (1997, 114).

Similarly, Clausewitz's famous dictum "War is the pursuit of politics by other means" also identifies violence as the marker that distinguishes war from other modalities of political struggle.

In fact, war arguably falls into that limited class of phenomenon that tends to signify violence reflexively and implicitly. It is thus generally deemed redundant—or merely emphatic—to speak of a "violent war," much as it is to speak of other phenomena similarly ordered as violent, such as murder, rape, or torture. The self-evident way in which war and

violence invoke each other is rendered all the more obvious if we consider how entirely nonsensical it is to speak of a "nonviolent" war.

This may seem unsurprising. After all, what could be more paradigmatically violent than war? Indeed, in his influential and landmark treatise on the anthropology of violence, David Riches identifies warfare as nothing more than "violence that is subject to a certain level of organization" (1986, 24). However, it is precisely the consequences of this seemingly self-evident interreferentiality between violence and war for how we understand the social existence and behavior of warscape inhabitants that is one of the major critical concerns of this book. Processes (such as war) that are so implicitly and interreferentially intertwined with violence tend to be discursively constituted as analytical objects of a particular sort. Violence is not only highlighted as their central feature but the analytical framing itself is more often than not imperceptibly altered so that the object considered seems to coincide *only* with what that part of itself that is violent. Thus, to speak of a strike or a rally in which violence occurs is to consider an altogether different phenomenon than a violent strike or a violent rally. The first framing contains and isolates violence as an exceptional state within the event, and thus implicitly defines the event itself in opposition to it. However, the second framing constitutes the event in its entirety with reference to violence and thus operates in much the opposite manner, containing the event within and defining the totality of the experience to which its refers, first and foremost, in terms of violence.

"Violent things" are discursively constituted through such totalizing effects, as well as through a weighting of the sensational. There is thus an implicit tendency to focus on the most dramatic, acute, and outrageous manifestations of violence. Objects constituted through their "ordering as violent things" are thus constructed in much the same manner as the recent car accident is witnessed by those who leeringly drive past it: not only is no notice taken of the flow of "normal" traffic flying by on the other side of the median, but few will remember the color or make of the vehicles that merely skidded off the road or were just lightly dented. Instead all eyes tend to drift to the most mangled wreckage, and it is this image that ultimately defines their experience of the scene.

These totalizing and sensationalizing effects influence how the analysis of war and war-time behavior is framed. Indeed, analysts who study war-torn societies tend to be immediately drawn to—and are often singularly consumed by—two problems only: how violence is organized and how warscape inhabitants handle it. In capturing and dominating the entire

scope of the analytical gaze, violence is thus treated, either explicitly or by default, as the only concern of consequence to people in war zones. In this manner violence is implicitly ascribed hegemonic status as both the singular determinant of agency and the sole genitor of all warscape social processes (including displacement). Our understandings of what war involves as an experience for subjects and societies thus tends to be organized almost exclusively around our understanding of what coping with violence involves.

These understandings also tend to emphasize only certain capacities of violence, most notably its capacity to unmake and undo—to hyperactively disorder, disorganize, and destabilize—with little if any reference to other possible effects. Most obviously the destructiveness of violence unmakes and takes life, health, security, and property. Similarly, it is the implied violation of the will that leads most analysts to reflexively constitute war-time migration as *forced* and *involuntary* (Kunz 1973, 1981; Richmond 1988; Van Hear 1998; Indra 1999). Many analysts of warscapes (Tambiah 1986; Feldman 1991; Suarez-Orozco 1992; Nordstrom 1997; Uvin 1998; Taylor 1999) emphasize the capacity of violence to produce what Erikson (1995, 8) has termed a form of "massive collective trauma" in which the social tissue of the community is damaged in a manner analogous to that of the body. This massive trauma "ruptures social bonds, undermines communality, destroys previous sources of support, and may even traumatize those members of a community, society, or group who were absent when the catastrophe of persecution took place" (Suarez-Orozco and Robben 2000, 24). Pushing even further, Gampel argues:

> [T]he pain and terror of war and social violence often overwhelm and sometimes destroy our very apparatus for perception and its representations because their terrible spectacles often paralyze our capacity for symbolization. . . . [T]he feeling of uncanniness overwhelms us when we are thrust into a fragmented violent social context, one without any continuity and which transmits extremely paradoxical messages. (2000, 55)

This overwhelming emphasis on violence's capacity to unravel and destroy powerfully shapes how policymakers, journalists, the broader public, and even many social scientists implicitly think about social processes in the parts of the globe in which wars proliferate.[6] This destructive capacity has been given particular emphasis in recent wars in which violence is depicted as both hyperchaotic and incomprehensible. As Paul

Richards notes in his introduction to a recent edited volume, the images that predominate in depictions of these so-called new wars are often "epidemiological," metaphorically equating the spread of mass violence with the mindlessness and tenacity of a viral contagion (Richards 2004, 2–3), spilling back and forth across borders and "infecting" entire subregions. Cast as sites of uncontrollable and pervasive violence, warscapes are viewed as "socially unstable places" in which historically constituted social relations and cultural meanings have been thoroughly "undone" by that violence.

Indeed, for some theorists violence not only has the capacity to render historically constituted social relations and cultural meanings irrelevant to the social navigation of war zones, but it provides an alternative socializing context in its own right. Thus, Nordstrom (1997) argues that experiences with war-time violence serve as the shared referents for forging new "warzone cultures" that overwrite prior cultural differences. She argues that the similarities of experience with violence often outweigh the differences, not only within any one culturally diverse warscape but even across entirely different conflict contexts altogether.

In such interrupted or rebooted societies the myriad social processes and life projects that anthropologists and other social scientists might investigate elsewhere (such as gendered social struggle, intergenerational or class relations, or the negotiation of culturally prescribed life-course transitions) are assumed to have been either rendered irrelevant or suspended. Instead, coping with violence becomes the only social role and task for warscape inhabitants—or at least the only one that their social analysts acknowledge. In the process, analysis tends to lose track of—or simply dismiss—all other potential sources of motive force that usually shape social behavior. People who are simultaneously brothers, workers, neighbors, and elders all of a sudden are recast in singularly reductionist molds: either as "refugees," whose only recognizable role is to flee violence, or as "combatants," whose only analyzed role is to perpetrate violence, or as "victims," whose only role of relevance is to suffer violence.

Unsettling the Hegemony of Violence: An Anthropology of War as Social Condition

Here, I raise several questions about the relationship between violence and war, and specifically about the consequences of war's "ordering as

a violent thing" for how we analyze and understand the social existence and behavior of warscape inhabitants.

My first major question is whether the implicit power of violence in defining "war" precludes investigation of how processes *other* than violence shape war-time social processes and experiences. In other words, how is it that the "ordering of war as a violent thing" preempts the space of forces and processes other than violence in our analysis of how war-time experiences are shaped and what they involve?

Machazian accounts of a decade and a half of experience with war serve as the starting point for this line of inquiry. These accounts reveal how warscape living was shaped not solely, incessantly, or even predominantly with reference to violence. Although violence inevitably played an important role in shaping the experience of many of Machaze's residents, for most of them violence—or the threat of violence—periodically punctuated their lives rather than continuously scripting them. War was thus not a matter of "all terror all the time."

While acknowledging that there is no war without violence, and while I explore its indisputably crucial role in shaping warscape experience, everyday social existence in war-time Machaze was not just a matter of coping with violence, but, as in peacetime, it was centered on the pursuit of a complex and multidimensional agenda of social struggles, interpersonal negotiations, and life projects. Throughout the conflict, gendered, generational, and other micropolitical forms of social struggle continued to inform interests and orient behavior—migratory and otherwise. In short, to those immersed in it for most of their lives, "war" was an experience that was about much more than violence or its avoidance. Thus, if Machazian accounts confirm Nordstrom's observation that "war comes into existence when violence is employed" they also provide grounds for taking issue with her derivative claim that "it is in the act of violence, then, that the definition of war is to be found" (Nordstrom 1997, 114).

One of my primary objectives is to develop an alternative anthropological approach to the study of war that interrogates the role of violence in shaping war-time existence rather than presuming its pervasiveness or privileging it a priori in the explanation of behavior. Rather than framing war as a violent condition, I propose to recapture the full drama of Machazian war-time existence through an ethnographic exploration of war as a "social condition." This approach is distinctive in how it constitutes war as an object of study, in the questions that serve as the point of departure

for the analysis of this object, and in how its situates violence in relation to that object.

Rather than focusing on the violent contest for political power (the "classic" object of analysis in the study of "war"), my primary object of study here is *everyday social life and the process of its realization.* As it was in peacetime, Machazian social life during wartime was shaped by many complex and multidimensional social struggles and concerns, interpersonal negotiations, and culturally scripted life projects, most of which were in no way derived from shared experiences with violence and had little to do with the macropolitical interests usually taken to define "the war." I contend that people in warscapes not only remain oriented to gendered, generational, and other micropolitical forms of social struggle but it is primarily with these other struggles in mind—not the macropolitical terms of the conflict—that individuals imagine, plot out, and enact wartime living.

This approach takes the challenges of realizing both everyday and strategic life projects under dramatically transformed conditions—rather than the "problem of violence"—as its point of departure for interrogating war-time social behavior and agency. Instead of organizing an analysis of war-time social behavior around the question "How do people cope with violence?" I start by asking: "How are culturally scripted life projects realized under trying new circumstances? What new challenges or opportunities do social actors confront in their efforts to realize these life strategies? How are social relations maintained, constituted, or renegotiated in order to fulfill both immediate and long-term goals? I explore how the war-time fragmentation of social networks altered the options for social investment and generated new challenges to key life projects (such as marriage and raising children) in highly gender-differentiated ways. In using this approach questions about violence are subsidiary to questions about the reconfiguration of the social fields within which culturally scripted life projects are enacted.

This approach also insists on empirically interrogating the role of violence in shaping the conditions within which war-time social interaction occurs, without presuming its pervasiveness or assuming its predominance. Much as a movie trailer may misrepresent a drama by stringing together only a feature's most vivid moments, depictions of war that focus solely on acute violence may easily sensationalize and distort the analysis of war-time experience, misconstruing the basis of most warscape agency and behavior. The extent to which acute violence pervasively grips—or merely punctuates—the social existence of warscape inhabitants and the

specific manner in which it influences life projects are subjects for empirical investigation.

These conditions are not only likely to vary widely within the same theater of war, as was the case in Mozambique (Englund 2002, viii), but also from context to context, such that the "social conditions of war" in Mozambique will differ significantly from those in Liberia, Angola, Somalia, and Chad. Moreover, the social condition of war may well vary among warscape inhabitants, differentiated across social formations, in their gendered and generational effects, and even across time for the same people in the same place. As a point of departure, I insist on reserving analytical space within which to consider how factors and forces *other than violence* may also play important—and potentially even leading—roles in shaping warscape social process. This approach demands that violence's role and effects be empirically ascertained through analysis that is socially specific, culturally contextualized, and temporally sensitive—in short, through good ethnography.

The "war" that I examine here is not the violent military contest for political power. Rather, it is the complex reconfiguration of social, economic, cultural, and political conditions that warscape inhabitants confront and contend with in plotting and implementing their everyday social existence—in other words, "war as a social condition."

Violence, Agency, and the "Forced" Migration Paradox

My second major question is whether the emphasis on the destructive and disordering capacities of violence that so implicitly operate in war's "ordering as a violent thing" potentially distorts our understanding of agency and social behavior in warscapes. Does war-time violence merely disable and disorganize the cultural templates that inform everyday interaction under "normal" circumstances? Does it constrain agency and ultimately overdetermine behavior? Or are its effects potentially more complex, at times generating new social possibilities and even extending agency under some circumstances? To what extent does violence reconfigure and recomplicate social opportunity structures in ways that have ambiguous and even contradictory effects on agency, and in different ways, at different times, for different social actors?

The investigation of migration in warscapes provides the primary (though not only) "behavior" through which I investigate the question of warscape agency. The war-time migrant (or refugee) has often been

cast as the paradigmatic nonagent produced by violence. Stripped of any concern for higher-order needs and severed from a meaningful past that violence has supposedly rendered ineffective for informing the present or predicting the future, refugees are reconstituted as universally undifferentiated actors whose culturally differentiated identities or interests no longer inform their action. In this vein Malkki notes that the "refugee subject" is thus often likened in international humanitarian discourse to the still socially unformed newborn: "The image of the infant as *tabula rasa* is only one in an extensive repertory of references to a basic humanity in the contemporary policy-oriented and humanitarian literature on refugees. An infant—a powerless being with no consciousness of history, traditions, culture, or nationality—embodies this elementary humanity" (1995b, 11). Refugee behavior is in turn cast as overdetermined by larger forces entirely external to the refugees themselves, an undifferentiated reflex to the ebb and flow of violence that can presumably be understood without ever actually studying refugees themselves as social and cultural beings. Indeed, it is merely necessary to understand the macrolevel political and economic dynamics that produce war-time violence in the first place to understand or predict the behavior of refugees, as Doreen Indra notes:

> Academics, other researchers, government policymakers, and international agencies . . . appear to so powerfully inform current research with a macrolevel paradigm of forced migration that situational, individual, interpersonal, cultural, historical, and cross-contextual variability are often neglected; many research-generated representations of refugees consequently exhibit a dreary similarity that belies great on-the-ground variability. (Indra 1999, 3)

Over the last two decades anthropologists have critiqued such reductionist and universalizing depictions by demonstrating that refugees experience and react to displacement in socially mediated and culturally creative ways. Numerous case studies have documented the myriad ways in which refugees defy the preferences and pretensions of national governments and international policymakers by resisting resettlement in officially designated and regimented refugee camps (Hansen 1982, 1992; Harrell-Bond 1986; Malkki 1995b, 1997; Koenig 1995; Sommers 2001; Lubkemann 2000a, 2000d). Refugees also evidence agency through their well-documented manipulation of humanitarian aid policies, as they seek to serve their own purposes in ways that often do not dovetail with the priorities, objectives, or understandings of the international community

(Malkki 1995b, 1997; Shahrani 1995; Voutira and Harrell-Bond 1995; Lubkemann 2000d, 2004a; Gale-Andrews 2005; Jacobsen 2005).

Anthropologists have also highlighted the agency of refugees by investigating how forced migrants creatively reconstitute their social identities in relation to displacement (Krufeld 1994, 1997; McSpadden 1999). Thus, for example, Malkki (1995b) has documented how Hutu refugees in Tanzania did not simply lose their culture or social identity but creatively drew on cultural referents to reinterpret their history in ways that incorporated the experience of displacement into their group identity and gave that experience new value and meaning. Similarly, Ken Wilson (1994) has shown how Mozambican Jehovah Witnesses interpreted their displacement as evidence of their spiritual worthiness, while M. Nazif Shahrani (1995) demonstrated how displacement was recast as holy exile and a divine appointment to defend Islam among Afghanis in Pakistan.

Yet, despite mounting evidence that refugees remain socially positioned agents who actively and creatively implement culturally imagined life strategies, there has been little effort to extend the critique of reductionist refugee agency to the analysis of the process of war-time migration. Significantly, most studies of refugees tend to start with the movement as a fait accompli. Thus, for example, among the many excellent works that examine how the experience of movement affects gender relations and identities (Daley 1991; Moussa 1993; Abdulrahim 1993; Benson 1994; Krufeld 1994; Kulig 1994; Kibreab 1995; Omidian 1996; Callamard 1996; McSpadden 1996, 1999; Matsuoka and Sorenson 1999; Indra 1999) there has been relatively little investigation of how gendered roles, relationships, and struggles reciprocally affect the social organization of movement or the dynamics of migration decision making in active war zones (cf. Utas 2005).

In many ways the social analysis of war-time migration decision making still implicitly reflects the assumptions articulated almost four decades ago by Egon Kunz in his now classic "kinetic theory" of refugee migration (Kunz 1973, 1981). Kunz's formal typology of migratory flows, in general, and his theory of refugee migration, in particular, rely heavily on a contrast between what he terms as "kinetic" and "dynamic" models of behavior. In a kinetic model, forces external to the migrants themselves are viewed as the determinants of behavior. By contrast, dynamic models attribute a far more significant role to the consideration and deliberations of migrants themselves in order to explain migration behavior and outcomes. Kunz theorized refugee migration as a "kinetic process," using the following analogy:

> An inner self-propelling force is singularly absent from the movement of refugees. Their progress more often than not resembles the movement of the billiard ball: devoid of inner direction their path is governed by the kinetic factors of inertia, friction, and the vectors of outside forces applied on them. (1973, 131)

In their most reductionist form, kinetic approaches model war-time migration as follows: war or the threat of war occurs in area "A" and acts as a force akin to a billiard cue that drives actors from area "A" of violence to the nearest area "B" without violence. This process may be replicated in a series of stages producing a variety of refugee "vintages" (Kunz 1973, 1981) that reflect the military and political course of the war. Differences between successive vintages are likely to be explained primarily in terms of political affiliation. In Mozambique, for example, Ken Wilson and Jovito Nunes (1994) describe how refugees who were politically aligned with FRELIMO (the government) fled across the Malawian border in the face of a RENAMO (the insurgency) offensive.[7] This initial wave was later followed by refugees from the same area who were politically aligned with RENAMO, when FRELIMO succeeded in recapturing the area it had lost.

Ultimately, kinetic models of war-time migration eliminate the need to investigate actor agency altogether, by reducing the interest of all "forced migrants" to a singular and universally generalizable "survival-utility" (Lubkemann 2004a)—a formulation implicitly premised on the assumption that in the face of sheer terror, violence somehow renders all "normal" concerns for engagement in ongoing, culturally defined social life strategies virtually insignificant in shaping behavior. To extend Kunz's own analogy, there is very little investigation of whether the "properties" of different balls might effect varying reactions to the cue's force. Indeed, virtually all aspects of migration processes—directionality, sociodemographic composition, and timing—are to be explained by variation in forces conceptualized as external to, and unaffected by, the agency of migrants. The emphasis in kinetic theory remains centered on the "cue" rather than the "ball," that is, on how different types of "cues" (larger forces) are "forcing" the "balls" (migrants) to behave in particular ways.

Thus the process of war-time migration is still typically designated as "involuntary" or "forced," and thus categorically distinguished from "voluntary" migration, precisely in terms of the agency that migrants exercise. As Indra notes, "A key dimension of forced migration—whether

politically, economically, environmentally or developmentally driven—is just that: it is *forced*" (1999, 18). This categorical dichotomy not only constitutes war-time migration as a distinct object of study but defines an increasingly institutionalized subfield, most commonly referred to as either refugee studies or forced-migration studies.[8] Yet, by and large, this field has simply failed to recognize the somewhat ironic logical contradiction of arguing for the investigation of agency among people who have been categorically defined a priori precisely by their lack of agency.

In line with my original objective, I extend the critique of reductionist framings of refugee agency to *all* aspects of refugee experience, *including movement.* The agency of refugees is not only evident in the reactions of the displaced to the *impact* of relocation but also in their *organization* of movement. However, by critically exploring how more complex and robust forms of social agency continues to inform war-time migration, which is often assumed to be most directly and thoroughly informed by violence—indeed, viewed as virtually its "reflex"—I also seek a strategic point of entrée for a broader interrogation of how violence affects warscape agency and social behavior.

Perhaps the most useful point of departure for reconsidering whether and how social agency shapes war-time migration is to establish that movement is *not* the only choice that so-called forced migrants can make when confronted by war-time violence or by other forms of socioeconomic, environmental, or political calamity. As Anthony Richmond (1988) and Art Hansen (1982, 1992) have noted, other options may include those of staying and actively fighting, of passively resisting, or of accommodating to new regimes. Significantly, kinetic models have difficulty accounting for why some people move and others do not—after all, if the migration is "compelled" by larger external forces, how can some people *not* move?

All too often forced migration is investigated and theorized based only on studying the experience of those who move. This sampling bias imperceptibly endows the decision of migrants with a guise of self-evident compulsion, which begins to evaporate as soon as we also consider those who do not relocate. Recasting analysis within a broader frame that includes those who decided not to migrate begins to render the exercise of volition more apparent in ways that undermine the analytical integrity of any notion that war-time migration is distinctively forced or involuntary.

In a landmark and often cited study of paradigmatic "forced migration," Elizabeth Colson examined how the Gwembe Tonga reacted to a compulsory resettlement scheme orchestrated by the Zambian gov-

ernment in order to clear the way for dam-based development (Colson 1971). The measures taken by the state presented the local population with a dismal array of choices, the consequences of which were certainly neither desirable from their perspective nor of their own choosing: they could comply with government directives to relocate, and thus face social and economic disruption, or they could resist relocation and face drastic forms of state repression. The dramatic difference in power between these agents and the state, and the dire consequences of defying that power, made the choice seem self-evident and "involuntary." Yet, in reviewing the case a quarter century later, Colson notes that there were those among the Gwembe Tonga who did choose to resist resettlement and that some of them consequently perished in the Zambian state's subsequent crackdown (Colson 1999).

Similarly, anthropologist Jon Bennett describes how the inhabitants of the small peasant village of San Jose de Apartado in the war-torn region of Uraba, Colombia, defiantly refused to flee in the face of seemingly overwhelming danger:

> In March 1997, 300 or so residents declared themselves a "community of peace." They collectively decided not to carry arms and not to support or associate themselves with any armed group. Their stand for peace was particularly courageous in a region notorious for widespread intimidation, drug dealing, arms trafficking, and illegal land appropriation. . . . Declaring neutrality was not without major risks: within three months, thirty-seven members were killed. (Bennett 1998, 10)

Cases such as those described by Colson and Bennett demonstrate that even under the most dire circumstances the relationship between a choice and its consequences—foreseen or actual—does not predetermine how decisions are made, or why they are made as they are. As Fischer, Martin, and Staubhaar (1997) note, "We perceive what one may call 'involuntary' migration as extreme situations where the decision to go is 'self-evident'" (50). However, the theoretical point is precisely that such decisions are *not* so "self-evident" but must rather be problematized in light of the multidimensional concerns of socially and culturally situated actors. In fact, warscapes and other crisis contexts are full of individuals who decide to stay, to resist, and to risk the worst consequences, making choices that to outside analysts seem "self-evidently" the worst ones to make. Yet far from demonstrating poor judgment, such choices usually demonstrate that the terms in which warscape inhabitants evaluate and

interpret their life circumstances differ in substantial ways from those of the analysts who theorize their behavior.

In short, the choice to migrate in the midst of even the most dire situation is never a foregone conclusion; moreover, such decisions may well be informed by concerns other than those that can be traced to the crisis itself. Complex patterns of war-time demographic distribution in Machaze cannot be explained with reference to the politico-military dynamics of the Mozambican civil war, nor can they be explained solely in terms of people's concern with avoiding violence.[9] Rather, war-time movement reflected the complex ways in which warscape inhabitants sought to realize culturally imagined life projects and negotiate the meaning and configuration of social relations as socially positioned and differentiated actors.

Most particularly, I investigate how the process of *engenderation* (Lubkemann 2000a) influenced the social organization of war-time migration and postconflict patterns of return. I use the term *engenderation* to refer to the ongoing struggle over how relationships between and among men and women should be defined and how gendered power should be configured. War-time migration in Machaze was shaped by social struggles other than those operating at a macropolitical level and by social dynamics rooted and informed by processes that *preceded* and were *distinct* from the violence of war. And, if agency can be demonstrated to remain relevant and informed by other struggles in the organization of war-time migration, analysts are not excused from problematizing it—rather than merely assuming it in a minimal and undifferentiated form—in the investigation of *all* warscape behavior.

Problematizing the Social Effects of Violence

More often than not actors in war zones are treated dichotomously, as either those whose weapons provide them with the agency to "do things" (not least of all to victimize others) or as those whose position at the other end of the gun strips them of virtually all agency and to whom things are done, that is, "victims." However, many Machazians, including those who in some instances suffered from or fled the threat of violence, proved adept at diverting and using war-time violence to pursue social agendas that were unrelated to the political raison d'être of the war. In such cases, violence was a force that did not merely strip individuals of agency but was also a mechanism by which many exercised and even amplified their agency.

Ultimately, the effects of violence were often contradictory, imposing new constraints while providing means for extending agency. In his insightful critical exploration of social navigation in the Liberian warscape, anthropologist Mats Utas traces such a conflicted trajectory of one young woman—Bintu—throughout nearly a decade of coping with new risks and seizing new opportunities:

> [W]e see her traversing a variety of high points and low points, moving between different statuses and confronting different levels of risk over time, and at times by her own choice. A linear, developmental narrative, can hardly explain why, after finally reaching a "survivor" position in Guinean exile, Bintu ventured back into the Liberian civil war. Indeed young women in this war transgressed far beyond the position of survivor by sometimes taking up arms and becoming soldiers—and thus in some sense, abusers. . . . Bintu's journey makes sense as a continuation of pre-war patterns of social navigation. She knows the dangerous topography of the Liberian social zone, and she makes good use of it in her manipulations of her social surroundings—whether in the form of using ties with boyfriends, "mates," commanders, civilians, or peacekeepers, in "girlfriending," or even in taking up arms herself. War can even be socio-economically empowering for young marginalized people such as Bintu, and active participation war can be preferable to passive life in refugee camps. Yet this navigation can also be dangerous. Life itself is often at stake. (Utas 2005, 426–27)

Machazian accounts similarly reveal warscape social navigation as a complex process rife with emergent hazards and novel possibilities alike, although often the reconfigured opportunity-and-risk structures that emerged were highly socially differentiated. While many Machazian women lost social and economic power and were compelled to confront daunting new challenges to their life-course strategies because of war-time relocation and prolonged displacement, Machazian men often suffered far less disruption and distress. Somewhat paradoxically, and most certainly inadvertently, the war generated new social and economic opportunities that enabled many men to enhance their social power and life chances in crucial ways.

Inasmuch as war-time violence inadvertently opens such new and empowering opportunities it becomes necessary to also recognize and explore the generative, as well as the merely destructive, social effects of violence. Yet, more often than not, the analysis of violence stops halfway,

casting "undoing" as the full drama rather than the first act in a larger staging of social remaking. The socially reductive capacities of violence are thus framed as the full sum of its effects: less order, less agency, less meaning, less reason, less stability.

The framing of warscapes as particularly "socially unstable" places (Greenhouse 2002) may presume a wholeness, stability, and lack of conflict and violence in social formations in periods of "nonwar" that may not really have been there to begin with (Blok 2000). Just as the "ordering of violent things" can overemphasize the distinction between war and nonwar by casting all war-time behavior as driven by violence, the conceptual inertia of older (and theoretically discredited) anthropological thinking can easily oversharpen the same distinction in reverse, by implicitly casting "normal" social process as conflict and violence free. We should thus not permit analysis in warscapes to neglect what we have learned elsewhere: that hegemony is always contested, that operative social practices are the contingent outcomes of ongoing processes of social struggle, and that conflict and violence—in variously socially recognized and unrecognized forms—are continuously implicated in the negotiation of social reproduction.

A recognition that social process in nonwar is itself inherently unstable, its very dynamic defined by conflict, social struggle, structured inequities, and renegotiation, suggests a recasting of the questions that should be posed about the effects of war-time violence on social agency and process. The questions that make most sense thus become those about how heightened violence may amplify and multiply already existent forms of social struggle, reconfigure the terms of their conduct, and even come to be appropriated and deployed within them, rather than how and if violence "disrupts" social process or "destabilizes" social relations. The reconfigurations that violence leaves in its wake are more than merely disorganization, the somehow lessened fragments of previous wholes; rather, they are reorganizations of the social field in which previous social contests take on new forms. Inasmuch as war is not only about violence nor is peacetime free of it, the very lines between the social conditions of war and nonwar may be less than clear to those who continue to engage in everyday social negotiation and struggle throughout both.

An anthropology that approaches war as a social condition seeks to empirically ascertain the social effects of violence by investigating how it contributes to the reconfiguration of the social fields in which agents exercise their agency. It examines how violence contributes in complex

ways to the reconfiguration of social opportunity structures and to the restructuring of social decision making, recognizing that more often than not violence in any given context will generate both new challenges *and* possibilities, new forms of empowerment *and* disempowerment, and affirmations *and* underminings of identity—in different ways for different actors.[10] Ultimately it insists on analyzing the effects of violence as more than a half process of disordering by also examining the social reorderings that violence produces.

In recasting warscapes as sites of generative social reproduction rather than merely social interruption, an anthropology of war as a social condition is also distinctive in tracing the dynamic development of social relations *throughout* conflict. Challenging the conceptualization of war as a desocializing process that suspends strategic social projects, Machazian social relations continued to evolve and develop as people sought to pursue culturally scripted life strategies under changing circumstances. In particular, it had a dramatic impact on the emergence of transnational polygyny and the reconfiguration of gendered domestic power, intergenerational relations, migratory practice, and community identity. By examining how war-time adaptations altered key life projects, social scripts, and social relations I not only explore the conduct of life under extraordinary circumstances but also trace the resulting transformation of the life conducted.

Anthropologists who work in the growing number of societies in which armed conflicts span entire lifetimes need to trace the unfolding of social relations and cultural expression through the social condition of war, rather than treating it as a period in which social process is suspended. Increasingly, contemporary armed conflicts defy characterizations of war as short-term, temporally discrete event-like occurrences. In places as diverse as Mozambique, Palestine, Kashmir, Angola, Rwanda, Somalia, Colombia, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, Chechnya, Liberia, and Sudan war has spanned decades and socialized entire generations.

As sites of both continued social reproduction and prolific social production (Hoffman and Lubkemann 2005), warscapes may provide privileged sites within which to theorize processes of social change and innovation. Admittedly, warscape survival often requires an even more creative and adaptive reweaving of the fabric of everyday life than is to be found under other circumstances. However, the possibilities of warscapes as "strategic research sites" (Merton 1987) ultimately lies not in any form of categorical difference between "unstable places" (Greenhouse

2002) and presumably more stable ones, but in the starkness with which certain central characteristics of all social process—such as conflict and creativity—insist on being noticed. As anthropologist Carol Greenhouse notes, "Under normal circumstances, the 'timeless order of society' is no less an object of myth than in times of crisis, but in normal times its challengers can more easily be denied" (2002, 27). Venturing beyond my initial goal of an "anthropology of displacement," I also explore the possibilities of "anthropological displacement," reflecting on how the study of the chaotic worlds in which displacement occurs is theoretically unsettling for the discipline itself.

Methods and Dilemmas in the Ethnography of Warscape Pasts and Presents: Dispersion, History, and Violence

Locality: Dispersion as a Field Site

War-time displacement not only links the processes, people, and concepts examined in this book but it also defines my methodological approach. Fieldwork in societies where prolonged war and diasporization have fragmented social networks presents its own distinct ethnographic challenges, not least among which is the problem of how exactly to define one's "field site." Although I chose to work in Machaze because I knew its inhabitants had suffered significant rates of displacement, I was initially unaware that war-time migration had dispersed its residents across so many different destinations. Once my interviews with recent returnees to the district established the cardinal points of Machazian war-time dispersion—and that many remained in these areas uncertain of when or even whether they would return—I redefined my field site to include many of these important points of reference in the Machazian social topography.

I was able to follow up an initial year of fieldwork in Machaze with another year divided among Machazians living in Chimoio, the capital of Manica Province, and those in South Africa; this was followed by three more months in Machaze. During my time in Chimoio and in Machaze I also made numerous shorter trips across the nearby border to interview Machazians living in the Zimbabwean towns of Chipinge and Mutare. Between 1998 and 2002 I revisited Machaze and Chimoio twice and the community located in the Vaal region of South Africa at least once every year. Over time I have continued to return, and will do so for the

foreseeable future, as much because of a number of deep friendships as out of a desire to pursue follow-up fieldwork.

The importance of including South Africa in my "Machazian field site" grew more and more apparent as the long history of circular male labor migrancy between the district and "Joni" (as South Africa was typically referred to) emerged from the many oral life histories I collected in Machaze. The opportunity to spend ten weeks in the Mozambican Historical Archives in Maputo allowed me to review the rich—if at times daunting in their extensiveness—colonial reports on the area. The earliest of the some twenty-five thousand pages of annual, monthly, and special reports that I reviewed dated from the last decade of the nineteenth century and continued through the demise of colonial rule in 1974. This archival work not only made convalescence from a bout with malaria much more tolerable but reaffirmed the centrality of South African migration in shaping local social, economic, and political processes. Because Machaze is north of the areas in which international labor recruitment had been legal throughout the colonial era, Machazian participation in these labor migration streams has generally remained outside of the scope of the excellent treatment that historians such as First (1983), Isaacman (1996), Couvane (2001), and Chilundo (2001) have hitherto given to Mozambican labor migration (cf. Neves 1998). In the first and second chapters of this book I intertwine the oral accounts that I collected with this extensive colonial documentation in order to trace the dynamic development of this labor migration stream throughout the twentieth century and its particular role in mediating socioeconomic change and state-society relations in a rural hinterland on the margins of colonial rule.

If my aim in this book is ultimately to critically speak to how anthropologists more broadly conceptualize and analyze displacement, violence, war, and processes of warscape social change, I work explicitly from within the specific ethnographic and ethnohistorical confines of my engagement with Machazian social experience. My rationale for multisited fieldwork was thus fuller immersion in the social, historical, and cultural specificities that historically came to define a particular sense and social experience—what Appadurai (1996) refers to as "locality." Its larger theoretical goals aside, this book remains in final analysis an ethnohistory of Machazian displacement, of Machazian experiences of war as a social condition, of Machazian war-time social change, and of Machazian post-conflict returns and social dilemmas.

I emphasize this point because refugees are not the only phenomenon

constituted at the convergence of those two powerful streams of discourse that I have discussed earlier: the "national order of things" and the "ordering of violent things." The language and categories with which wars are constituted as objects for analysis tend to be forged at that very same intersection—and in ways that consequentially shape analysis from the very outset by providing the terms of the questions posed. More often than not we thus unthinkingly speak of wars in a national register, as the Mozambican civil war, the Liberian civil war, the Angolan civil war, and so forth. In doing so, we allow the violent contest for state power to constitute the frames we use for analyzing all warscape processes and experiences. However, in implicitly appropriating, rather than critically interrogating, the "hegemony of the state" in defining wars as objects for analysis, we risk mistaking the national stage across which political and military struggle is waged for the sociocultural stages upon which other struggles—gendered, generational, and otherwise—are constituted and conducted. To the extent that such other struggles and the cultural terms of their expression shape social agency, they also shape how war-time violence is interpreted, experienced, and even deployed. We must thus question the degree to which war as a political contest and war as a social condition actually coincide.

Cultural specificity is most fundamental in informing both the social condition in war and how violence is experienced as part of that condition, much as surfaces of varied porosity, chemical composition, and relief give unique shape, hue, and texture to paint that is splashed across them. My rationale for field-site design is diametrically opposed to other studies of warscape social experience in Mozambique (Finnegan 1992, Nordstrom 1997)—or elsewhere—that justify multisited research by theorizing the violent contest for national political power as a contextual frame in its own right. Emblematic of such approaches, anthropologist Carolyn Nordstrom explicitly claims to have verified through her self-described "airstrip ethnography" that the violence perpetrated by FRELIMO and RENAMO proved capable of not only transcending Mozambique's tremendous social and cultural variation but ultimately of overwriting those differences:

> I introduce an "ethnography of a warzone." This is an experimental methodology based on studying a process (political violence and creative resistance) rather than a study based in a circumscribed locale (the war as it occurred in the town of Quelimane or in the province of Zambezia). To study "war" and

> "peacebuilding" is not the same thing as studying war and peacebuilding in a particular place among a set community. Thus this study is grounded in a topic and a process rather than a place. War is about flux, and this approach works to report on that flux as realistically as possible. Whether in Mozambique or in the world, soldiers enter new battlefields, refugees flee. . . . And through all this each person talks with the next and together they forge a means of thinking about and acting within a warzone. These conversations cross borders of gender, age, language, social, cultural, and politico-military associations. Some people agree with others, some disagree, but a vast interrelated compendium of information is gathered, shared, and learned. *This shared information on war and surviving war linking people war-wide constitutes shared culture(s). . . .* It is this shared culture across all the many differences defining life and living that interests me. (1997, 10–11)

Nordstrom thus theorizes violence as a socializing frame in its own right, casting it as a force capable of carrying the entirety of its own meaning within itself—a meaning that is somehow both culturally and socially uninformed in its own constitution and capable of imposing itself in common ways on all those who experience it regardless of their prior social and cultural differences. When cast as a socially homogenizing, rather than socially informed, force, violence is inevitably operationalized at the largest scale of its occurrence—typically the nation—and thus implicitly and uncritically the *Mozambican* war becomes the object of her investigation from the outset.

The methods she used to investigate this object precluded from the very outset any serious investigation of the influence on violence of other struggles rooted in social and cultural histories and understandings that fragment the nation rather than realizing it. Notably the people and social groups in Nordstrom's study have no histories; instead, they seem to simply start with the war. "Runway anthropology" (Nordstrom 1997, 41) that is, stints of self-admitted brevity at sites of recent violence all across a country marked by profound internal variation in cultural practice, ethnic affiliation, social organization, and history must provide little if any possibility for even the most gifted ethnographer to become sufficiently immersed in any specific social or cultural milieu to recognize—much less delve into—how historically constituted social or cultural difference informs behaviors or reactions that on the surface might seem to be shared and in common.

Reading my own findings in Machaze against those of other ethnog-

raphers of the Mozambican civil war, I critically question whether the "shared warzone culture" that Nordstrom claims to have identified really exists as a product of a violence that has the power to carry its own meaning with itself in ways that overwrite prior difference. It seems far more likely that these findings are merely an artifact of method and theory mutually constituted at the point where the "ordering of violent things" and the "national order of things" powerfully coincide. I question whether violence among the Sena in Zambezia was understood and experienced in the same way as it was among the Ndau in Machaze, or the Erati in Nampula, or the urban residents of Maputo—all "social worlds" (Marx 1990) that were the products of dramatically different histories of state-society relations, each characterized by their own unique form of social and economic organization, religious belief, and cultural practice.

In chapter 5 I demonstrate how war-time violence in Machaze was profoundly influenced by local social struggles, with their own historical specificity and cast in culturally specific terms that had little to do with the contest for state power. To the extent that such local struggles infiltrated and affected its deployment, war-time violence became implicated in, and reshaped by, highly localized terms. Such infusions of violence into everyday social interaction shaped the very perception of crisis and reconfigured social opportunity structures in highly localized ways. Casting the Machazian case against ethnographic evidence from other studies conducted throughout Mozambique, I argue that far from being a "shared experience with violence," the war—both in the more narrow sense of a political project realized through organized violence and as a social condition—differed dramatically throughout the socially and culturally diverse country of Mozambique. In both of these senses there thus was no singular *Mozambican* war.

The "national" frame within which civil wars are most frequently registered by their analysts are rarely likely to be adequate to the task of analyzing war as a social condition, and they may even prove highly deficient for the analysis of war in the more classic sense as a form of political struggle pursued through organized violence. Ultimately, the politics that must serve as the point of departure for an anthropology of war as a social condition should be defined in relation to the social and cultural worlds that are most meaningful to the everyday practice of warscape inhabitants themselves. Thus, they are often likely to be "micro" and "local" rather than "macro" and "national" in scale.

Accounting for the Past as Anthropological Object: History and Narrative

In recognizing that the identities, subjectivity, and behavior of warscape inhabitants are not only shaped by acute violence but also by the conduct of other struggles, an anthropology of war as a social condition also insists that the analysis of war-time behavior cannot start with violence, or even with war itself. The social goals to which Machazians continued to aspire throughout the conflict were not invented ex nihilo during the war. They were generated through the historical processes that constituted subjects in culturally and socially specific ways before the conflict. It is imperative to trace the prewar dynamics of the other struggles, their specific social logic and cultural terms of expression, to understand their conduct and development throughout the conflict. The analysis of war as a social condition must thus be rooted in a history of the social processes that precede war.

Such histories are not simple and straightforward, readily and unproblematically available. Rather, they too must be constituted. In the wake of the discipline's "historical turn" from synchronic to diachronic perspectives and from structure to process, anthropologists have had to wrestle with how we access and represent the past. Although a handful of anthropologists such as Elizabeth Colson have exceptionally pursued a "live" ethnographic engagement with history in the making through decades of continuous fieldwork with one group of people, most of us in the discipline must constitute "process" as an object for analysis through some form of retrospective reconstruction based on secondhand accounts, rather than relying on the assuring intimacy of ethnographic participation. Indeed, anthropology today is as much an exercise in ethnohistory as it is in ethnography.

Such reconstructions of process are always and inevitably partial, incomplete, and highly subjective, metanarratives that are usually assembled from our collection of narratives from subjects or texts, all of which are "organizations of experience after the fact rather than the raw experiences of which they speak (and in which) the narrator judges what whole the fragments should produce, what reality flows through the ruptures" (Nordstrom 1997, 22).

Both our accounts of history and the narratives from which we build them are thus far from being politically innocent, "objective," or uncomplicated. This awareness has dominated anthropology's most recent engagements with history. Whereas earlier anthropologies first

ignored history (structural-functionalism), then successively appropriated it (processualism), and increasingly sought to inform it (anthropological history), contemporary anthropology is most likely to treat "the past" as an ethnographic artifact that is (politically) active in the present (historical anthropology). In this latter vein, important studies such as Jennifer Cole's *Forget Colonialism?* (2001) have drawn attention to the ways in which memories of the colonial experience are continuously being rewoven within postcolonial societies through selective recollection, repression, and emphasis. As she points out, these are processes of literal "re-membering" in the sense that they involve a continuous reconstitution of the past as an artifact made in and for the present, constructed for and through *current* struggles for power at multiple levels, ranging from the micropolitics of gender relations within households to macropolitical contests for state power and even contests in the larger arena of global geopolitics.

However, if anthropology was originally driven to focus on the past's status as a "present political artifact" because of its concern with how to reinform the production of its own object of study, that project has arguably fallen by the wayside. This is problematic, at least for an anthropology concerned with process rather than timeless social structure, for if these two analytical exercises (historical anthropology and anthropological history) are certainly not mutually exclusive—and could and should inform each other—they are also not in any way substitutes for each other. There is simply no way around actually "doing history" in the classical sense of attempting to reconstruct a past to be treated, at least for purposes of any given analysis, as "settled" and (relatively) authoritative.

This necessity is evidenced even in those studies that most explicitly problematize the authoritativeness of any renditions of the past. Thus, Cole's own masterful theoretical problematization of memory and historicity ironically relies on a "naïve" and implicitly unquestioned "history," the production of which is quietly proclaimed in one brief two-sentence paragraph: "To understand how Betsimisaraka remember the colonial period we must begin with the historical record. In this chapter I outline a history of the region using a combination of published works and archival sources" (Cole 2002, 35; emphasis added).

The fact that this book is not only an analysis, but also a constitution, of the "historical record" of Machazian labor, war-time, and postconflict social process, provokes enough historiographic angst that it prevents me from cutting through such a Gordian knot with two sentences.

Anthropologies of war and displacement have generally suffered minimally, if at all, from such historiographic angst. Yet, this may very well be only because the theorization of these processes as "violent events" purports (mistakenly) to locate the full scope of their explanatory reference within war's violence. However, in insisting on investigating the influence of other struggles, whose genesis and dynamics precede conflict, I am loath to dodge engagement with the problematics of anthropology's constitution of its medium for analysis: "process."

I have organized my interpretations of both the "distant history" of prewar migration and social change under colonialism (up to 1974) and the "near history" of Machazian war-time and postconflict experiences (the quarter century since decolonization) largely around the construction of 127 oral life accounts. In chapters 1 and 2 these life histories are also cast against an extensive reading of nearly eight decades of district-level (and to a lesser extent provincial-level) colonial reports.[11] I purposely describe the oral life accounts as "constructed" (rather than "collected") to emphasize the inevitably dialogic and social process of their production, between myself and subjects in the social settings in which these interviews occurred.

My intention, at the very least, is to render as transparent as possible the theoretical sensibilities that I deployed in both constituting these interviews and weaving them with the written record into a "construction of process." My thinking in this respect draws heavily on the oral historiography of Elizabeth Tonkin, who points out that, other questions aside, "the [historian's] business is to try to reconstruct the passage of the past, and for that it is crucial to test for what in an account is true, or can be shown to be false" (1992, 113). In constituting a process to subject to anthropological analysis it is imperative to include in our toolkit questions (and methods for evaluating them) such as: "Did this happen?"; "Did it happen as it was portrayed?"; "What in this 'representation of pastness' (Tonkin 1992, 3) has been omitted or reconfigured in ways that may provide either false comfort or dismay to my analysis of social dynamics?"

Although these are certainly not the only or even perhaps the most interesting questions that anthropology can or should pose to narratives, they are still requisite ones that any reconstruction of the past must consider. Tonkin also points out that this is no easy task, for "even the professional historians may have been experientially convinced by a narrator's account, and then dashed to find that it is inaccurate, despite their also knowing, as part of their expertise, that sincere people need not be tell-

ing the truth and that all accounts must be tested" (1992, 113). I have thus oriented myself to the task of historical reconstruction as a process of turning representations of memories of pastness into history. Each of these dimensions—representation, memory, and history—inevitably poses its own veracity verification dilemmas.

All accounts, whether oral or written, are "presented through social relationships" (Tonkin 1992, 114). In this sense narratives of the past can usefully be cast not only as literary genres but also as genres of social action (Tonkin 1992, 3). The life history interview process of the life histories in my research was both "alien" and "argumentative." Machazians were often struggling to find a meaningful local category of social interaction in which to place our interview encounters, particularly after initial notions that I might be an aid worker did not play out. Other than a Polaroid picture, I offered each interviewee little else of obvious social interest to strategize about in these social encounters.

I found that "inquisitive argumentation" proved to be a particularly productive posture in interviews for constituting life history accounts that inspired "veracity confidence," much as it has for other anthropologists (Hutchinson 1996, West 2005). Most Machazians were not reluctant to express their views or delve into what I presumed to be difficult or controversial subjects (such as *uloi* [witchcraft], war-time violence, and even political matters). My voiced skepticism, doubt, or miscomprehension proved often to be the most effective tools for provoking elaborated response. Argumentation as a strategy also had particularly revealing effects that often depended on who was present in an interview.

Throughout my fieldwork I conducted most, if not all, interviews in the company of several research collaborators, including a former FRELIMO official, a former RENAMO combatant, a pastor, and a teacher. Posing similar questions and reviewing aspects of the same accounts at different points, and with the assistance of different Machazian research associates, provided opportunities to establish whether and how interviewees accounted for the varying relationships potentially at stake in these encounters. My discussions with my research associates about the interviews we had just collected also provided their own valuable insights in their assessments of account plausibility and of how interviewee interests may have impinged on their self-presentation. I learned a great deal from both their arguments over different readings and their points of consensus during these postmortems.

The life histories gathered in this way also benefited from being

collected over an extended period of time. In a few cases life histories were collected in as few as three sessions, but the vast majority were recorded over five or more organized sessions (in one extreme case, nineteen). These sessions were interspersed over weeks, months, and in some cases years. Not only did this allow for the consolidation of my own relationships with informants through other social interactions during the interludes between formal (that is, recorded) interviews but it also provided an opportunity to go over the same questions and events multiple times, and to thus verify inconsistencies and explore their meaning and potential implications.

Time itself is critical to building an ethnographer's cumulative understanding of local terms of social interaction; I found that this staggered-interview strategy allowed me to frequently revisit issues and events discussed earlier at a later date with a greater capacity for meaningful contextualization and knowledge of the local cultural frameworks for periodizing events and registering memory (Bloch 1995; Cole 2001). The ethnographer's capacity to recognize and exploit outsider status, to ask and have answered questions that are simply too "ignorant," "obvious," or "outrageous" to be tolerated from anyone but a child, is also a function of time and, ironically, cumulative understanding of "insider" terms and how to manage them (Berreman 1962). It is this ultimately enhanced knowledge of "how to ask" (Briggs 1986) that accrues through this process that I take to be the hallmark strength of anthropological history.

Finally, the life-course orientation with which I framed these interviews played a crucial role in shaping their production. As I presume is the case for many other warscape ethnographers, my primary interests from the outset revolved around social experience in war, and thus I intuitively gravitated toward the war as a point of departure for inquiry. I only reconsidered this when one of my Machazian research associates (the teacher) posited early on that I would be more likely to get people to discuss their experiences in the war if these were addressed in the course of a broader discussion of their life histories as a whole, with initial interviews starting with the less controversial experiences of their lives before the war. His insight proved effective in building a rapport, which made interviewees more willing to share and elaborate on difficult war-time experiences, and it inadvertently established their own lives, rather than the war itself, as the register for constructing these accounts. It is in this register that the full array of complex social struggles that shaped their war-time behavior is rendered most evident.

Ultimately, these life history accounts cannot be viewed as "natural narratives" in the sense of representing a genre that would exist in the Machazian setting apart from my role in its production. It is unlikely that my own "weightings of veracity confidence" would be the same ones embraced by those Machazians I interviewed, nor those of the Portuguese administrators whose voluminous reporting I read against a broader historiography of Mozambique's conflicted colonial interests, and in dialogue with my Machazian oral accounts. This history must be acknowledged as "my fiction" (Piot 1999), invoked to critique a particular way of theorizing and depicting behavior and social change in warscapes.

Navigating the Study of Violence

Anthropological analysis of sites, processes, and people intimately associated with violence not only offers up formidable methodological problems of fragmented perspective and access, but requires navigation of conceptual terrain that is heavily laden with moral presupposition, bursting with emotional investment, and rife with politically contested representations. To some theorists the very act of describing and theorizing violence runs the risk of in some sense re-perpetrating violence by giving it an order or "reason" that inevitably does not do justice to the suffering of those who have experienced it and fails to adequately convey those "aspects of human existence that are not so easily captured by the text" (Nordstrom 1997, 24).

However, to reserve such safeguards for some aspects of social existence neglects the fact that conflict and violence inform all social fields in various ways—some institutionalized and invisibilized and others socially marked—and that it is equally problematic to uncritically take the socially marked forms as the "correct" thresholds at which to raise such cautionary flags. I take as more pertinent Kay Warren's admonition that anthropologists must be particularly wary lest any theoretical treatment of violence as "meaningful" be mistaken to mean that violence is morally justifiable (Warren 2000). Although I agree with a growing number of anthropologists that "violent actions, no less than any other kind of behavioral expression, are deeply infused with cultural meaning and represent a moment for individual agency within historically embedded patterns of behavior" (Whitehead 2004, 9), my effort to identify how local social struggles and cultural terms informed war-time violence in Machaze does not in any way imply that culture justifies violence. After all,

those who suffered from violence and contested its legitimacy were no less "cultural" than those who perpetrated it. Similarly, in arguing for the need to identify the "productive" or "generative" effects of violence I am not assigning it some positive value. Rather, I am attempting to situate violence as a form of action deployed in its own social and cultural context in order to delineate the full complexity of its contradictory effects on social fields—in a manner that grants it no more theoretical privilege than any other action.

In challenging the overbearing grip of violence on war I possibly run an even greater risk of being accused of trivializing violence, of somehow implying that the moments of suffering of Machaze's population during the war in some ways "did not matter that much" or "did not matter enough." My arguing that violence should not be treated a priori as the sole or sometimes even primary force that shapes war-time living should not be mistaken as minimizing the difficulties that warscape inhabitants confront. Much to the contrary, I argue that an anthropology of war that centers on everyday social interaction ultimately insists on a far more nuanced and fine-grained analysis of the more mundane, yet ultimately no less deadly, dimensions of warscape social and physical existence that are often missed or dismissed by analyses who remain entranced with agentive violence.

Studies of war-time experience most often emphasize the most dramatic acts of victimization—the sudden ruptures in experience that involve the gun, the rape, the beating, the burning, the explosion. Although such forms of acute violence periodically intruded on the lives of many Mozambicans during the conflict, most warscape inhabitants were more consistently affected by the far more mundane, yet ultimately far more deadly, war-time reconfigurations of their social and economic landscape. The vast majority of war-time fatalities in Machaze District did not result from direct military violence but from social and economic changes that hindered the pursuit of long-established strategies of subsistence. The militarization of the district restricted mobility between rural and urban areas and across international borders, making it difficult and dangerous for residents to receive remittances, pursue trade, or relocate across ecological zones. Machazians were consequently deprived of their most important and time-proven strategies for coping with the area's chronic droughts, droughts that ultimately drove more residents from the district than any military actions. These movements had cascading effects, tearing apart social support networks when they were most needed and leading

more people to resort to migrancy as a last desperate measure. More than overt acts of violence, these structural changes transformed everyday subsistence into a difficult and often desperate struggle for survival.

An anthropology of war as a social condition aims to understand the challenges to everyday social navigation and subsistence that result from the deterioration of "total lived environments" (Lubkemann 2000b), a process that can be described as the deepening of structural violence. Despite differences in emphasis and over the precise meaning of structural violence (a debate I engage theoretically in chapter 4), a variety of analysts (Galtung 1969; Uvin 1998; Farmer 1997; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004) have usefully deployed this term to draw attention to the ways in which transformations in broader social and economic conditions can significantly increase vulnerability and reduce life chances by introducing and institutionalizing extreme forms of social disparity and marginalization.

In contrast to the dramatic rupture in experience of acute violence such forms of "everyday violence" (Scheper-Hughes 1993) appear as seamless and unremarkable, precisely because they are viewed as part and parcel of everyday existence. However, it is precisely such forms of mundane, unremarkable, and routinized structural violence that are the most significant factors in constituting the social condition of war, particularly in prolonged conflicts that span and socialize entire generations. Famine proved a more prolific war-time killer in Machaze than the bullet, and the fragmentation of social support networks was a greater source of gendered vulnerability than the proliferation of land mines. I agree with historian Stephen Ellis's observation: "[I]t seems appropriate to analyze wars not only as military endeavours . . . but also as social phenomena, extreme manifestations of violence that is present in societies in their 'normal condition'—that is when there is no violence that is occurring that seems intolerable by its type or scale or in the degree of its organization" (2002, 122).

Treating war as a social condition thus offers an antidote to the conventional overemphasis on acute violence at the expense of structural violence in the analysis of warscape social life, and at the same time it establishes a basis for investigating how agentive and conditional forms of violence inform each other. In this book I investigate how the growth of structural violence amplified already existing social conflict, generated strong desires for political change, and lowered social barriers against the use of violence as a tactic for resolving those differences and effecting

change. At the same time I also make clear that the most pervasive and perverse effects of acute violence were not necessarily realized in the moment of their performance but through their indirect effects on sociality and subsistence. The fragmentation of social networks, the undermining of trust, and the infusion of uncertainty that "violent dramaturgies" (Richards 1996) provoked became formidable challenges, whose ramifying effects on long-term life strategies and life chances far outweighed those of the moment of violence itself.

The Mozambican Ethnographic Context

Having positioned this book within broader currents of debate about refugees and war-time violence, I also situate several other contributing or derivative subarguments in relation to a variety of broader debates and bodies of knowledge. The chapters in section 1 thus draw on the historiography of colonial labor migration throughout the broader southern African region (Van Onselen 1976; Murray 1981; Bozzoli 1991b; Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991; Harries 1994; Crush and MacDonald 2002). In section 2 I position this book's treatment of popular political engagement and the social conditioning of organized political violence in relation to an emerging body of warscape ethnography (Lan 1985; Geffray 1991; Richards 1996, 2004, 2005; Hutchinson 1996; Uvin 1998; Behrend 1999; Taylor 1999; Ellis 1999; Greenhouse 2002) and to more focused discussions about the concept of structural violence. In section 3 I situate my critique of prevalent conceptualizations of "displacement" within a broader discussion of the concept of "place" (Marx 1990; Entrikin 1991; Appadurai 1996; Malmberg 1997; Turton 2005) and cast my discussion of the role of social relations in war-time migration decision making against prominent theories of warscape social agency and interaction (Kunz 1973, 1981; Scudder and Colson 1982; Nordstrom 1997; Honwana 2000; Utas 2005). In the three final chapters I engage with both more narrow critical deconstructions of repatriation discourse (Rogge 1987; McSpadden 1999; Koser and Black 1999; Hammond 1999, 2004; Janzen 2004; Stefansson 2004; Eastmond 2006) and with much broader lines of theoretical debate about the relationships between agency, power, and social change (Gramsci 1971; Giddens 1976, 1979, 1984; Feierman 1990; Mageo and Knauft 2002).

In a more specific sense, however, this book is a Mozambicanist eth-

nography. Although the chapters in section 1 focus on the highly localized history of labor migration and social transformation in Machaze, they also draw on the rich historiography of labor migration and colonial social transformation in Mozambique[12] and on pioneers in the critical study of refugee agency and its role in war-time and postconflict migration (Wilson 1994; Wilson and Nunes 1994). In addressing the question of popular political engagement in the war I position this book in relation to the vigorous historiographic debate over the causes and dynamics of the Mozambican civil war.[13]

In aiming to more broadly recast anthropological approaches to war itself, in this book I most directly engage with Nordstrom's influential retheorization of war based on her unconventional ethnography of the Mozambican civil conflict (1997). However, Nordstrom's is not the only important ethnographic study of social existence during Mozambique's brutal civil conflict. My approach has greater theoretical affinity with other recent studies that trace different lines of social, cultural, and political transformation throughout the Mozambican civil war, most notably the ethnographies by Harri Englund (1995, 2002), Alcinda Honwana (2002), and Harry West (2005). All three take ethnohistorical approaches that ground warscape social and cultural practices within a genealogy of social dynamics that predates the war. Alcinda Honwana's *Espiritos Vivos, Tradicões Modernas* (Living Spirits, Modern Traditions) (2002) casts an analysis of the role of spirit mediums and ritual practitioners in postconflict social healing and community peace-building among the Tsonga in the southern Mozambican province of Gaza against a broader historical overview of their social role before the war. She discusses how the political dynamics of the conflict and its aftermath have transformed these in significant ways. Her reading in Gaza of the colonial-era interactions between local sociospiritual institutions and the independent African churches that emerged during the colonial era provides important parallels to the Machazian case (as discussed in chapter 2 of this book), while her discussion of how the Tsonga reacted to RENAMO's perceived connections to Ndau sociospiritual worlds provides a counterpoint to my own discussion in chapter 5 of how the war's violent dynamics were shaped by the Ndau's own beliefs about their sociospiritual world.

West's *Kupilikula: Governance and the Invisible Realm in Mozambique* (2005) is an intriguingly crafted ethnohistorical account of how *uwavi* (sorcery) has endured for over a century as the predominant local discourse about power and knowledge among the Makonde residents of

the Muedan plateau in northern Mozambique. *Kupilikula* is particularly distinctive in its historical depth, tracing the continuities and changes in *uwavi* throughout the most significant political-economic shifts in twentieth-century social existence on the Muedan plateau, including missionization, colonialism, the anticolonial struggle, civil war, and post-conflict neoliberal reform. Through careful ethnohistorical reconstruction the author demonstrates that the remarkable resilience of *uwavi* discourse as a "distinctive sensibility about the workings of power in the worlds [Muedans] inhabit" (2005, 6) is related to its capacity to explain dramatic change, its penchant for incorporating new forms of knowledge, and its ability to reinterpret in its own terms even those ideological propositions that have sought to directly supplant it.

Thus, although the Muedans he studies arguably suffered more from the anticolonial struggle than they did from the civil war, his analysis nevertheless exemplifies precisely the type of capacity and power that I argue for cultural forms in problematizing social existence and imagining solutions to the contingencies of contexts variously made chaotic by interpenetrations of structural and acute violence. Moreover, although there are important contrasts between the Machazian and Muedan cases in the extent to which the Portuguese were incorporated into local vernacular expressions and understandings of power (perhaps related to differences in the pervasiveness and the power of the colonial presence), I also note the structural parallels in how Machazians and Muedans understood the task of local social governance as a sociospiritual one, and in how they interpreted the local governance practices of the postcolonial state in these terms.

Finally, in squarely focusing on the transformation of social relations before, during, and in the aftermath of the Mozambican civil war, Englund's study of displacement and social change among Mozambicans in northern Tete and in Malawi (*From War to Peace on the Mozambique-Malawi Borderland,* 2002) is the recent Mozambicanist study with which I have the most affinity. Englund critically retheorizes social relations in contexts subject to translocal forces, which he undertakes through an investigation of "human relatedness in the historical predicament of displacement" (2002, 21–22).

Most notably, some of Englund's observations that I try to develop further include attention to how social relationships continued to inform the behavior of individuals in displacement; the insight that analysis of these relationships in historical perspective provides a standpoint from

which to address the many factors other than war-time violence that shape war-time social process (2002, viii–ix); and the observation that migration can produce very different displacement outcomes (2002, 23). Englund's "moral economy" approach to social relations also provides an important point of departure for aspects of my own theoretical recasting of the relationship between agency and social change in warscapes and more generally (chapter 10), although I move in a direction that diverges from Englund's fundamental theoretical posture.[14] Scholars who read both of our works will notice a certain complementarity between his problematization of war and displacement—in theoretically rethinking sociality—and my own engagement with theories of social agency and social interaction in retheorizing the experiential conditions of displacement and war. Finally, while I have been inspired by all three of these ethnographies (and other aforementioned Mozambicanist works), I differ in my explicit agenda: the theorization of war as a social condition.

Orientations

While chronology provides a general line of progression throughout the chapters in this book, themes also divide the remainder of the book into four sections. The two chapters (1 and 2) in section 1 (Migration and Social Transformation before the War) trace the history of migrancy and its role in both effecting and reacting to political and socioeconomic change in Machaze throughout the seven decades prior to decolonization (1974). Focusing first on the role of migration in resisting colonial forced-labor policies (chapter 1) and then on its role in other forms of local social struggle (chapter 2) this history demonstrates the complex ways in which migration was "situated" as a strategy in a complex array of struggles over gendered and generational power, with central state authority, and for coping with political, economic, and ecological crisis prior to the civil war. These two chapters provide an understanding of important social dynamics that continued to powerfully inform migratory and other war-time behavior in their own right throughout the long civil conflict.

The three chapters (3, 4, and 5) in section 2 (The Social Conditioning of War) cover the period from independence through the beginning of the civil war (1974–79). They focus on explaining how the political project of war manifested itself in Machaze and on how local social dynamics and political culture shaped that project. Chapter 3 traces the rapid

deterioration of local confidence in the new post-colonial government after independence in 1974, arguing that the new government's efforts to re-engineer social and economic relations, restructure political power, and mandate cultural practices rapidly engendered deep resentment that reinforced a historically forged posture of adversarial disengagement with the central state.

Chapter 4 explains how Machaze became one of the very first districts in which the insurgency (RENAMO) was able to capitalize on popular alienation from the post-colonial state. I discuss how the interpenetration of structural and acute violence offered few markers with which to neatly distinguish the experience of "war" from "non-war." Consequently, rather than initially confronting war as an unprecedented problem, Machazians resorted to long-proven strategies for avoiding the central state in order to cope with a situation of rising uncertainty and occasional violence. In this chapter I also posit that a series of "misrecognitions" informed both local political agency and the government's strategies in ways that inadvertently initiated a vicious downward cycle of polarizing violence. Engaging with ongoing debates about the Mozambican civil war, I argue more broadly that local political agency in wars is often unrecognized, or misunderstood, because analysts only recognize the "authenticity" of political discourse that is primarily about the state. However, in places such as Machaze that have a long history of disengagement with central authority the most locally legitimate "political visions" may be ones that deny or minimize the state's presence in everyday life.

Most ethnographies of war focus primarily on the ideological underpinnings, political strategies, and culturally-scripted dramaturgy of the militarized factions who wield the technical means for perpetrating violence. However, in chapter 5 I explore how war-time violence in Machaze was neither solely motivated by the political struggle between RENAMO and FRELIMO, nor exclusively organized by these factions. Rather, war-time violence in Machaze was also significantly shaped by local-level social tensions and struggles within communities and families. Many district residents managed to divert the military means of violence in service to local social struggles that were largely unrelated to the contest for state power. The war in Machaze quickly became about much more than the "pursuit of politics through other means" (Clausewitz 1832) but also about "the prosecution of everyday life through more violent means." By comparing the local dynamics of war-time violence in Machaze with ethnographic evidence of war-time violence elsewhere throughout the

country, I conclude that Mozambique's civil conflict was a "fragmented war" (Lubkemann 1998, 2005a) in which violence was problematized by the social and cultural formations across which it was staged.

Throughout the two chapters (6 and 7) in section 3 (The Social Condition in War) I more fully develop my approach to "war as a social condition." I argue that the experience of war is not primarily about coping with acute violence but rather about re-negotiating key life projects and social relations in an environment of dramatically deepening structural violence. In both chapters migration serves as my primary point of entry for examining the social condition in war. In chapter 6 I critically examine the relationship that is often presumed between war-time mobility and the social condition of displacement. I argue that displacement has less to do with movement per se and more to do with how the transformation of relationships between people and their lived environments produces structural violence.

In chapter 7 I examine how migration decision making was affected by social relations and the complex process of their renegotiation in a context of reconfigured opportunity structures. I explore how the war-time migration decision making of all Machazians was responsive to concerns over the preservation and renegotiation of social relations and the pursuit of key life projects such as marriage and raising children. War-time migration was thus constituted as much by these "other struggles" as it was by the violent political and military dynamics of the war itself.

An indispensable analytical task for any anthropology conducted among people who have suffered organized political violence and displacement for decades is to trace the development of social process throughout and beyond the course of conflict rather than treating war as a temporary interruption in the flow of "normal social process." The three chapters (8, 9, and 10) in the fourth and final section of this book (War as a Socially Transformative Condition) explore how novel strategies for the conduct of everyday life emerge and take hold in warscapes and theorize how social process is transformed as a result.

In chapter 8 I demonstrate how the transformation of Machazian social relations during the war informed postconflict return, focusing in particular on how the war-time development of transnational polygyny transformed the life strategies of Machazians in ways that placed them at odds with the international community's understanding of what repatriation should entail.

The two concluding chapters (9 and 10) focus specifically on the course

of postconflict struggle and debate among Machazians over how domestic social relations should be configured and what postconflict migrancy should mean. In chapter 9 I explore migrancy as a new transnational life strategy and as a form of public performance implicated in the negotiation of this new social strategy's legitimacy.

In the concluding chapter (10) of the book I focus on how and why the innovative practices and propositions of some agents gain social traction while those of others remain marginalized. Through an engagement with broader debates about structure, agency, and authority in this chapter I attempt to develop an explicit theoretical framework for explaining the specific direction of transformation in Machazian social relations and demonstrate how the anthropology of the social condition in war can contribute to questions of theoretical importance to the discipline as a whole.

SECTION I

Migration and Social Transformation before the War

Forced migration is often treated as categorically distinct from labor and other forms of migration. Whereas the movement of those fleeing conflict is seen as "involuntary" (a nonchoice with no alternatives), labor migration is regarded as "voluntary" (a matter of strategic calculation). Regardless of whether analysts focus on the macrostructural determinants of political economy or on the microlevel dynamics of household and individual decision making, labor migration tends to be studied as a deeply historical process that develops and changes over time. Scholars thus explain current patterns of labor migration by examining the linkages generated by histories of colonialism and postcolonialism, the creation and reproduction of social networks and migration chains, and the development of regional or even global economic relationships and patterns of labor distribution.[1]

In stark contrast, the movement of refugees in wartime is almost invariably described in ahistorical terms. Even though war-time displacement often occurs in settings with a long history of labor migration or in which life strategies have long been based on other forms of mobility, few analysts consider whether or how social processes or patterns of migrancy that *predate* conflict might bear on war-time behavior and movement. In part this is because war is seen as rupturing history in a way that renders all "normal" engagement in ongoing, culturally defined social life strategies insignificant in shaping actors' decisions. Migration, like most other war-time behavior, tends to be seen as motivated by a reactive panic that is devoid of strategic calculation and driven by an immediate imperative of sheer survival. If the pressing conditions of armed conflict are believed to suspend most "normal" social projects and supply

all the factors necessary for understanding the motivation, organization, and dynamics of war-time behavior, it is unsurprising that war-time migration is treated as a process unrelated to the labor migration patterns that preceded conflict.

The following two chapters set the stage for a challenge to dehistoricized approaches to war-time migration and social behavior by tracing the history of social, economic, and political change in Machaze throughout the first three quarters of the twentieth century, which preceded the Mozambican civil war. Migration was a strategy that played a significant role in coping with a variety of challenges and social and political struggles well before the Mozambican civil war erupted. Later chapters show how historical experiences of migration and forms of social struggle shaped the migratory strategies that Machazians used to cope with the predicament of war.

In chapter 1 I explore how migration developed as a highly effective strategy for resisting the colonial state's efforts to institute policies (such as forced labor) at odds with the interests of the local population. It also describes the importance of migrancy as a strategy for dealing with the deadly famines that chronically swept through the district. Both of these historical experiences significantly shaped how the population of Machaze understood and reacted to armed conflict when it eventually arrived in the district, just a few short years after Mozambique achieved its independence from Portugal.

In chapter 2 I document how migrancy reshaped local social relations and the struggles over gendered, generational, and community power within Machazian society. While migration provides a strategic grid within which to organize a Machazian social history, these two chapters provide more than a historical backdrop for the remainder of the book's analysis of warscape social process and displacement. They trace the complex genealogy of social struggles that provided Machazians with the specific and culturally articulated social problematics with which they constituted their day-to-day lives at the time that war arrived. These two chapters highlight the fact that many of the social struggles and concerns that will later be demonstrated to have continued to shape behavior during war were generated prior to and thus entirely apart from the conflict itself. Inasmuch as Machazian war-time behavior remained responsive to the social logics described in these two chapters as generated *prior* to the conflict, the logic of Machazian war-time social conduct cannot be explained solely through reference to the violent conditions brought on by the conflict.

CHAPTER 1

Contending with Colonialism

Migration and Resistance

On my first trip to Machaze I flew north from the national capital of Maputo to Chimoio, the capital of Manica Province, where I cajoled a ride from the UN refugee agency, UNHCR, one of the few international agencies with a regular presence in that district during the immediate postwar period. In early 1996 the most direct road between Chimoio and Machaze, which is some two hundred kilometers to the south, was rarely traveled. Months earlier four workers from the Catholic convent in Espungabera (the capital of the district next to Machaze)[1] had died when their Toyota Landcruiser hit a land mine. The alternate interior route through the neighboring province of Sofala was difficult because long sections of the country's single north-south highway remained scarred by the trenches that insurgents had dug across the road to slow down traffic to facilitate armed ambushes. Moreover, although the dirt road from the national highway to Machaze had been cleared of mines, the rainy season rendered it virtually impassable and brought the possibility of land-mine movement.

We drove west from Chimoio across the Zimbabwean border, then south through Zimbabwe before we reentered Mozambique in Espungabera, one hundred kilometers west of Machaze. From here the mud-choked road to Machaze wound precipitously down from the Zimbabwean highlands. Within a dozen or so kilometers the decline became more gradual, and shortly after we crossed two small rivers the rolling hills and cooler climate fell behind and the terrain became the flat dense bush that I came to associate with Machaze. Abruptly, as if crossing a line drawn from horizon to horizon across the earth, the soil changed from

a brilliant red, which stood in such dramatic contrast to the lush green vegetation in the highlands, to a dusty sand color. During the few hours it took us to make our way over the next rugged one hundred kilometers we saw only an occasional scattering of small huts, some alone, others in groups of twos or threes, at some distance from the road. Many were half collapsed and in obvious disrepair.

My first trip to the district often came back to mind during later interviews when district residents recounted what they knew about the origin of their communities. These accounts almost inevitably began with a story of ancestral migration that traced roughly the same route I traversed on that first visit to Machaze and that brought two different groups into contact with each other. Many recalled that their forefathers had arrived from the highlands to the west in search of land to settle and of elephants to hunt for ivory. Indeed, although their numbers had been dramatically diminished by war-time trafficking, by the time I began my fieldwork in 1994, elephants still appeared occasionally in the district, particularly during the dry season when they reportedly chased women who were carrying water and damaged small private water reservoirs that residents of Machaze built on their lands.

According to these local oral accounts the newcomers from the highlands encountered others who were already established in the area, whom they designated as "Tonga" (a word that means lack of character or smallness, as well as subjugation). Currently, it is used as an "ethnic" designation in southern Mozambique, where it is spelled Tsonga. In Machaze it is used as a "clan" or "family" name. Reportedly occurring not only "before the Portuguese" but even "before the times of Gungunhana" (a reference to the powerful African ruler defeated by the Portuguese in 1895), in all likelihood this encounter took place before the Mfecane, that great political and military upheaval that shook southern Africa and generated massive population movements throughout the first half of the nineteenth century (Newitt 1995, 257–66). These events were usually described similarly to the way my local ever-patient Ndau language teacher told it:

> When the Nhamunda family [representative of all Ndau from the west] arrived here they found the men of the Tonga family living here and there and there, each in his own house, and asked them who was the ruler. But the Tonga men pointed to their yards and drew like this [a circle around them] and said, "This only is mine, and the rest I do not know about." So the Nhamunda were more organized and they became the *mambos* [chiefs].

Some of the older men of the Tonga family recalled that their ancestors had also been immigrants to the region, arriving from the southeast near to the coast. Their ancestors had also found other people inhabiting the area but had no specific recollection of their fate—only a memory that they were "like wild animals."

While these oral accounts hinted that at one time there may have been a hierarchical relationship between the immigrants from the western highlands and those who had arrived previously from the southeast, this social distinction had lost virtually all of its political significance before the lifetime of even the oldest of my interviewees. The "Tonga" designation was at most cast simply as a clan distinction, suggesting minor differences in the initiation rights of young women, in particular food taboos, and in the versions of dances and drumming performed at community ceremonies. However, intermarriage between families with Tonga and Ndau names occurred frequently without prejudice or even any particular note, and many residents and local land chiefs (usually called *régulos*) could count themselves as related to either, or sometimes both, Tonga and Nhamunda ancestors.[2] Regardless of the point of origin of their ancestors, all the inhabitants of Machaze described themselves as Ndau—a distinction drawn in contrast to the Shangaan speakers whose customs and language prevailed in the areas across the Save River that served as the district's southern border.

The Gaza Empire and Gungunhana

It is likely that the over half a century of common subjugation to other polities played an important role in forging a common identity and rendering any original hierarchical distinctions between these immigrant groups largely insignificant. Although the rusted-out army trucks that I occasionally encountered along the district's roads and the defunct artillery pieces on the Soviet-built airstrip in the district capital (Chitobe) served as reminders of the recent civil conflict, war and displacement were not new experiences for the district's residents. Both loomed large in the oral accounts that chartered local social identities.

One of the by-products of the Mfecane in the early nineteenth century was the creation of the powerful Gaza state that dominated southern and central Mozambique and parts of modern-day Zimbabwe from the mid-1830s until 1895, first under Shoshogane, later under Umzila, and

eventually under Gungunhana (Newitt 1995, 261–64, 348–52). Under these rulers the power of the Gaza state was extended largely by means of force, bringing other local groups and populations first into tributary subjugation and eventually into more integrated social and political relationships through intermarriage and military service (Newitt 1995, 295–97; Liesegang 1983). Some Machazian oral accounts recalled this as a violent conquest that resulted in the death of several local leaders and that their forefathers had decried the harsh treatment that Gungunhana dispensed for witchcraft (uloi)—reputedly driving a stake from the top of the head down through the body of those convicted of this practice.

Eventually, like other local groups in southern and central Mozambique, the population of Machaze was gradually incorporated into the Gaza polity, especially after Gungunhana moved the empire's capital to nearby Espungabera, where it remained until 1889 (Newitt 1995, 348–51). During my fieldwork over a century later, Machazian men still pierced their ears as signs that their forefathers had served in Gungunhana's ranks. Turn-of-the-century accounts by Portuguese colonial officials state that many of the area's residents accompanied Gungunhana when he moved his capital south to Bilene in 1889, during his ultimately unsuccessful final military campaign against the Portuguese.[3]

Despite evidence that residents of the "Madanda" lowlands[4] were increasingly integrated into the Gaza polity, there were also signs that some independent identity was maintained under Gungunhana's rule. Some Machazians recall resistance on the part of ancestors who hid in the dense brush to avoid relocation when Gungunhana forced tens of thousands of his subjects to accompany him on his move south to Bilene (Newitt 1995, 350–51). It is also somewhat telling that ChiNdau (a variant of ChiShona) was never supplanted by ChiShangaan—the language spoken south of the Save River and strongly associated with the Gaza empire and those who trace themselves as its direct ethnic descendants.

As was the case elsewhere in the southern African subregion (Harries 1994; Newitt 1995, 297), Gaza's presence may have played an important role in introducing district residents to labor migration. Virtually from the outset of its administration of the area the local officials of the Companhia de Moçambique (Mozambique Company) commented on the high level of participation in labor migration,[5] as one of the first colonial administrators permanently posted to Espungabera wrote in his 1906 annual report:

> [S]ince the withdrawal of Gungunhana all those belonging to the tribes that emigrated to Inhambane [Bilene] have become accustomed to seeking work

on the Transvaal and even though they have returned to their former lands now in this circumscription they maintain the habit of migrating to the Transvaal in order to obtain the 30 pounds necessary for cafreal marriage (Relatório Annual da Circunscrição de Mossurize, 1906).

Migration as Resistance: The Companhia de Moçambique (1898–1942)

Despite the pretensions of imperial maps that coded large swaths of southern Africa in the colors of different European sovereignties, Portuguese influence in the Machaze lowlands remained negligible even after the demise of the Gaza empire. However, the Berlin Conference of 1884 (the famed staging point for the Scramble for Africa) stipulated that European powers had to effectively occupy the African territories they claimed. Fearful of British designs on southern Mozambique and financially strapped, the Portuguese government sought to meet this challenge through a form of administrative subcontracting, by which it granted broad economic rights over large portions of the Mozambican territory to a series of chartered companies, which on their part assumed duties of governance and administration (Vail 1976). The Companhia de Moçambique was granted a large part of the area of present-day Manica, Sofala, and Gaza provinces where it administered colonial rule from 1893 until 1942. The Companhia's concession included the area of present-day Machaze, which was incorporated into the Circumscription of Mossurize. (Circumscriptions were the administrative units below the provincial level, roughly equivalent to districts.)

The reports of the first officials of the Companhia to visit the area, and of its first local administrators, resounded with grandiose plans for populating the region with yeoman farmers of European stock. However, colonial officials quickly came to the realization that the area's insalubrious climate would be a major barrier to European settlement. Malaria was endemic throughout the district, while the tsetse fly rendered most forms of animal husbandry impossible. A dozen or so settlers established commercial farms on the thin strip of the highlands that ran along the border with Zimbabwe, but the vast interior of the district remained virtually settler free throughout the entire colonial period.[6] Moreover, although the Madanda lowlands had valuable timber in abundance, the district's dirt roads proved impassable during the long rainy season and often remained in disrepair during the rest of the year, rendering profitable

exploitation of this interior resource impossible—at least without major infrastructural investments that were not a priority to a company bent on extracting profits on the cheap.[7]

Pressed to find a source of revenue, local Companhia administrators soon concluded that the only economic resource that could be exploited in Madanda was the labor of its residents. Thus, throughout most of the Companhia's tenure the major objective of its local administrators became the forced conscription of laborers who could serve in agricultural, industrial, mining, and public enterprises elsewhere within its territory. Ultimately, however, the vastness of the Circumscription's territory made it impossible for the handful of underpaid, often demoralized, and overburdened Companhia staff based in Espungabera to realize this mission effectively. The Companhia's authority was in many ways more of a fiction than a matter of any effective day-to-day control over people who lived in a highly dispersed settlement pattern rather than in large concentrations or towns and who were linked by only the most tenuous of road networks.

From their outpost in Espungabera on the district's far western border with Southern Rhodesia (renamed Zimbabwe in 1980), Companhia administrators sought to exert their authority as best they could through a system of indirect rule. They met semiannually with local régulos in the Circumscription's highlands (Mossurize) and lowlands (Madanda) in meetings known as *autos da banja* (official proceedings) where they attempted to urge these leaders to meet labor conscription quotas and assist the administrators in their yearly journey through the district for census taking and hut-tax collection.

However, by the first decade of the Companhia's administration, its officials realized that their attempts to coerce local people into labor gangs were not only prone to fail but also tended to result in the hemorrhaging of the district population across the international border to Southern Rhodesia. The Companhia's first major effort to intensify labor conscription in the Circunscrição in 1907 resulted in a precipitous drop in the number of huts counted in the next year's annual census. Between 1908 and 1912 the district administrator in Espungabera reported to his superiors in Beira that 1,479 "huts" had been lost as a result of population flight into English territory (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório do Administrador, September 14, 1912). Even more intense labor-conscription efforts during the following five years (1912–17) led to a decline in the district's population from 26,677 to 17,535, a loss of over 34 percent (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório do Arrolamento e Recenseamento,

1918). In the wake of the Companhia's decision to increase the duration of compulsory labor contracts from six months to one year in 1922, the population counted in the yearly census dropped to a new low of 16,331 (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1925).

The greatest challenge colonial administrators confronted in rounding up workers was the almost universal participation of men in "illegal" labor migration to South Africa. The concession granted to the Companhia de Moçambique guaranteed its rights to native labor and made it technically illegal for those living within its territory to be recruited for labor across international borders.[8] From the very outset, Companhia officials struggled—largely in vain—to stem the flow of circular labor migration between the area under its authority and South Africa, well aware that significant wage differentials and poor working conditions within the colony made employment in South Africa a far more attractive option.[9]

Although Machaze lay to the north of the 22nd parallel, thus technically rendering its residents legally ineligible for employment in South Africa, young men from the Companhia's territory passed themselves off as residents of areas south of the Save River, where recruitment for the South African mines was legal. Many were assisted by professional labor recruiters who infiltrated the Companhia's territory on behalf of South African enterprises—fully aware that the Companhia administrators could not police the vast circumscription.[10] As early as 1906 the Companhia's administrator lamented in his annual report: "[A]t the end of this year a genuine cloud of recruiters descended on our frontiers in English territory in order to contract our natives to work in the mines of the Transvaal. . . . The main motivation of the native of Mossurize is the high wage there." Indeed, virtually every annual report issued between 1906 and 1926 by the Companhia administrator in Espungabera reiterated the difficulty of meeting labor quotas, the impossibility of stopping male labor migration to South Africa, and the effects of the intensification of efforts to forcibly recruit labor on Machazian population. The ease with which the residents of the Circumscription confounded the Companhia's efforts to capture their labor is evidenced by my review of annual Companhia reports for the Circumscription from 1906 to 1926, which found that its officials never recruited—either through coercion or persuasion—more than 20 percent of those men in the district that were officially deemed "eligible" and legally "required" to work.

So successful were the area's residents in avoiding capture that the Companhia eventually ended this policy. In 1926 the Companhia's native

labor conscription regime was changed to preclude any direct involvement by local administrators in the process.[11] The subsequent efforts of a private association of firms to recruit local labor on a voluntary basis failed even more thoroughly, such that in 1930 not a single "native" was successfully recruited in Machaze by the new private recruiters (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1930: 72–73). Nearly a decade before the Companhia's tenure ended, local administrators had largely given up on trying to stop the flow of labor migration to South Africa, even turning a blind eye to the operation of several motorized transport services within the Companhia's territory, which greatly facilitated the movement of these "clandestines."[12]

Resistance Renewed, 1942–1961

Respite from colonial forced-labor policies ended abruptly for the residents of Machaze shortly after 1942, when the Companhia de Moçambique became the last of the chartered companies to devolve administrative authority over territory in Mozambique back to the Salazar dictatorship in Lisbon.[13] Soon thereafter, the governor general of Mozambique established a new indigenous labor code to protect the labor interests of the Portuguese colony by compelling all Africans to prove that they had been "gainfully employed" for at least six months out of the year. An African subject in colonial Mozambique could prove gainful employment either by establishing his status as a "farmer," as a legal migrant working abroad under the conventions between Portugal and either South Africa or Southern Rhodesia, or as an owner of fifty or more head of cattle. All those who could not meet these criteria were obliged under the law to seek paid wage employment within Mozambique, under a contract registered and supervised by the local district administrator's office (Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique, Circular 566/D/7 of May 15, 1947). Only a handful of the residents of the area were exempted from this forced-labor requirement, because the forms of noncommercial subsistence agriculture that virtually all Machazians practiced did not qualify as "farming" under the new code.[14]

After nearly two decades of respite from forced labor, Machazian men confronted a new legal dispensation that sought to impose on them the "legal and moral obligation" to work within the colony of Mozambique. The effects of this change were drastic, with over 2,100 Machazians

forced to work within the colony in 1942. Conscription in subsequent years, though less effective, was nevertheless significant.[15] In 1944 the entire Mossurize District was designated by the governor of Beira (along with Barue and Gorongosa) as a labor reserve for the industrial and agricultural enterprises in the labor-starved Vila Pery area (the colonial-era name for the capital of Manica Province, renamed Chimoio after independence in 1974) (reference in Serviço de Agrimensura de Manica e Sofala, Relatório Annual, 1953).

Technically, under the new labor laws the role of the district administrator was to "facilitate" the process of labor "recruitment" by educating the natives about their duty to seek "gainful employment," monitoring compliance, and providing "facilitation" to labor recruiters from Mozambican firms. He was nevertheless to refrain from compelling natives to work for any particular firm,[16] even though there is abundant evidence that in practice recruiters continued to rely on direct and often coercive intervention by colonial authorities to secure their labor supply.[17]

Most administrators relied heavily on local régulos to provide them with local recruits. A confidential note circulated in 1953 by the Directorate of Civil Administration in Beira instructed administrators: "Régulos should be instructed to organize of their own accord the eligible men, scheduling them throughout the year for the period that is most convenient to each for the fulfillment of their labor duties" (Circular Confidencial 2581/B/15 do Director da Administração Civil de Manica e Sofala, April 5, 1953).

Not surprisingly, however, the administrators' own reports agree with the oral accounts that few Machazians ever "volunteered" for work within Mozambique during the 1942–61 period. From the very outset of forced labor's reinstatement in 1942 the African population of Machaze actively resisted it. Meeting with the régulos from Machaze and from Espungabera in Mossurize the district administrator in 1946 reported:

> [W]hat they were most frightened of was that thing of contract of which they have genuine horror. . . . [T]heir people do not want to go to work in Vila Pery, and throughout the territory the complaints of those who return are widespread, saying that it rains in the camps, that the beans are infested and the flour is spoiled, that meat is only given on few days and in small quantities, that the fish is sometimes rotten, and that the employers treat them poorly. . . . [They state] that to be taken from their homes against their will to make them work is the same as being imprisoned.[18]

The new forced-labor regulation stipulated in extensive detail the rules about the conditions that native workers should enjoy—ranging from transport to and from the location of work, wages, housing, food, clothing, sick leave, and contract duration (no more than six months). Yet the continued poor treatment of African workers by their Portuguese employers throughout the Beira District soon became a constant theme of official reports. In 1946 one colonial inspector visiting the Circumscription of Mossurize reported that workers returning from their *chibalo* (forced-labor tour) complained of eating rotten fish and of working much longer hours than stipulated in the regulations. The same inspector also commented on the inadequate provision for transporting workers to Vila Pery, noting that over thirty men were crammed into the back of a small truck without protection from the elements for a two-day journey during the rainy season and that over 450 recruits had already been transported in this fashion previously (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946: 284–86).

Six years later, in a 1952 inspection by the National Directorate of Indigenous Affairs, violations of the rules governing the conditions for "native workers" were found in all twenty of the enterprises visited in the district of Beira. The most consistently identified deficiencies were those of inadequate or overcrowded housing, the use of unpaid minors, work being required from sunup to sundown (instead of the nine-hour maximum stipulated in official regulations), and poor food (Direcção dos Negócios Indígenas, Inspecções de Manica e Mossurize, 1952: 343–44). In 1953 the annual report of the National Directorate of Indigenous Affairs concluded:

> [I]t can be affirmed, with certainty of not being falsified, that each employer acts according to his own criterion. He establishes the work schedule, the times when workers may rest or eat, and the duration and regime of overtime. . . . The idea was for the [legal regime] to establish absolute maximum [hours] admissible, prohibiting consequently anything beyond these maximums because *to proceed beyond such maximums would be inhuman and put the health of the native at risk.* Unfortunately, it must be acknowledged that despite this absolute mandate, cases of work that violate these limits are not rare in this province. (Curadoria Geral dos Indígenas a Direcção dos Serviço de Negócios Indígenas de Moçambique, Relatório Annual 1953: 66–69; emphasis in original)

Reflecting on over fifteen years of monitoring efforts, in 1958 the curator general bemoaned the fact that little progress had been made in

the treatment of native workers, despite official reports condemning the abuses and a flurry of decrees and regulations instituted to curb them:

> [U]nfortunately it is no easy task to impose its observation, despite the Code of Indigenous Labor's having been published over three decades ago. . . . As a general rule employers offer the greatest possible resistance to the establishment of just salaries; they remain entirely uninterested in attracting and holding the interest of the labor they need; they cannot be cured of their use of recruitment, limiting themselves to paying the amounts that recruiters demand of them; . . . they do not construct camps and habitations for workers unless compelled to do so; they avoid providing adequate medical care and distribute the worst quality clothing that is permitted. (Relatório do Director dos Serviços dos Negócios Indígenas, Curadoria Geral 1958: 14)

Much as labor migration to South Africa had proven effective in thwarting the forced-labor designs of the Companhia earlier in the century, it once again became a key strategy used by Machazian men to avoid the horrific conditions of forced labor within the colony. Migrants from Machaze continued to circumvent the statutes that technically prohibited them from seeking employment in South Africa—as colonial authorities themselves were well aware. In a classified note to his superiors written in 1953, the administrator of Mossurize commented:

> [A] number of the natives of Mossurize and other circumscriptions make their way through the Alto Limpopo, since for a long time they have been taught by the recruiters to declare their origin in the *regedorias* [chiefdoms] and various administrative departments south of the Save. (391/B/17/1, Referença Confidencial a Nota No. 3199/B/17/1 de 30–4–953 do Administrador de Mossurize ao Director da Administração Civil, May 6, 1953)

Colonial administrators were well aware that employment conditions in South Africa were regarded by the district's residents as much more favorable than those in the colony. In 1946 the administrator in Mossurize interviewed a migrant who had recently returned from working in a mine in South Africa:

> [He claimed that] the food was very good and was abundant, since they received well-ground flour, meat in abundance, and peanuts and beans. In the morning before beginning work they ate meal with sugar and tea or a sweetened drink

> similar to the *pombe* [a locally made fermented drink] that they have in their own lands. He reported that they eat at the table with silverware and not by hand as they do in the village; that they do not get hungry because the work is in shifts and the mealtime is well calculated; that there are many games . . . and cinema, and places to drink with friends on particular days . . . and women who come around on those specific days. (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946, inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja held with Régulos in Machaze on December 18, 1946)

Portuguese colonial administrators also frequently expressed frustration with the considerable disparity between the wages paid to native workers in Mozambique and those they received if working "clandestinely" in South Africa. In 1946, the governor general inspector's report on Mossurize District reported that a standard six-month contract within the colony provided a monthly salary of seventy-five escudos, along with two hundred additional escudos paid at the end of the six months. These wages totaled slightly under eight British pounds[19] at the end of six months, although other administrators also within the larger district of Beira reported minimum wages that could be as low as three and a half pounds for a six-month contract (Inspecção Extraordinária da Provincia de Manica, 1946, 100). In contrast, recent returnees from South Africa reported a minimum starting pay of three pounds per month, with three interviewees reporting wages as high as six, ten, and twelve pounds per month (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946, inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja held with Régulos in Machaze on December 18, 1946: 2). In short, in South Africa earnings were never less than two and a half times those in Mozambique, and they could be up to twenty-five times higher. Over a decade later, in 1958, the report of the Director of Indigenous Affairs stated that the wages paid by two of the largest private employers of *chibalo* labor in the district of Beira had risen to only 120 escudos per month (Relatório do Director dos Serviços dos Negócios Indígenas, Curadoria Geral 1958: 19–21), while during roughly the same time period (1945–58), the average mine wages in South Africa rose by approximately 30 percent (Jones and Muller 1992, 150–55, 256–60; Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 60–63).

Resistance and the Transformation of Migration

While migrating to South Africa continued to be a relatively easy strategy for men from Machaze to avoid colonial labor conscription and to earn

more money, returning and remaining at home increasingly proved problematic. As residents of an area legally constituted as an internal labor reserve, men who returned from the mines faced the prospect of being conscripted, because they were not legally entitled to the exemptions enjoyed by their counterparts in areas of Mozambique south of the 22nd parallel (where recruitment for work in South Africa was legal and accepted by colonial authorities as fulfilling the obligatory "six months of gainful employment" requirement) (Couvane 1989, 2001). Consequently, Machazian migrants chose to spend less time at home in Mozambique in between stints in South Africa in order to reduce their risk of being locally conscripted. In 1946 the colonial administrator in Machaze reported that interviews with migrants returning from South Africa revealed:

> [T]he horror of contract is so great among some that on returning [from South Africa] they do not even enter their own lands, because when they arrive at the border they hear that contract recruitment is in process. . . . [O]thers, for the same motive, sleep only one night at home, returning the next day to the Transvaal. (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946, inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja held with Régulos in Machaze on December 18, 1946)

To avoid forced recruitment at home in Mozambique, men from Machaze also began to seek new types of jobs that provided longer periods of employment and residence in South Africa. Throughout the Companhia de Moçambique's tenure, migrants from Machaze, like most of their compatriots, had been primarily recruited to work as miners. Between 1920 and 1940 the demand for black labor in South Africa's gold-mining industry alone had nearly doubled, with the number of miners employed rising from just below 200,000 to over 380,000.[20] However, mine employment posed specific problems for migrants who wanted to stay for longer periods in South Africa, minimizing the duration of interludes in Mozambique. The employment of Mozambican miners in South Africa was regulated through a series of treaties that specifically stipulated permissible recruitment practices, retention policies, and trip duration. Miners recruited through WENELA, the official labor recruitment agency of the South African mining industry, were limited to a maximum stay of eighteen months of employment. A minimum six-month rest period was mandated in Mozambique before miners could once again be rehired to work in South Africa.[21] Migrants from Machaze who sought to stay in South Africa for longer than the eighteen-month maximum or to return after less than a six-month stay in Mozambique began to explore

new employment opportunities in South Africa's booming industrial and service sectors that permitted them far greater control over trip duration and timing.

In the quarter century that followed World War II the profound structural changes in South Africa's economy significantly reshaped the possibilities for Machazian labor migrants. South Africa's transformation into an industrial society was initiated during the 1930s, accelerating during and immediately after the war. During the war, manufacturing overtook both mining and agriculture in contribution to national income (Jones and Muller 1992, 128–31, 167). Between 1937 and 1950 mine wages remained virtually the same, whereas wages for blacks in manufacturing almost doubled, so that by 1951 manufacturing wages were twice as high as mine wages (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 63–67; Jones and Muller 1992, 128–31). The gap between wages in mining and wages in manufacturing and construction increased even more during the 1960s, so that by 1970 these secondary-sector employers paid, on average, almost three times more than the mines (Crankshaw 1997, 98–100).

Higher wages encouraged the indigenous black population of South Africa to increasingly eschew mine labor in favor of employment in industrial, manufacturing, or service jobs. By 1943 manufacturing had already surpassed mining in the total average number of black laborers employed, while between 1945 and 1955 the employment of nonwhites in the manufacturing sector rose by 88 percent (Jones and Muller 1992, 175). Although the number of black laborers from South Africa participating in mine labor declined from the war-time high of 192,000 in 1941 to a low of 110,654 in 1952, during roughly the same time period the average number of black laborers employed in industries other than mining or agriculture rose from 200,000 to over 430,000 (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 62). By 1972 only 86,399 South Africans worked in mines, while black employment in manufacturing doubled between 1960 and 1975—from 653,000 to 1,308,000 (Jones and Muller 1992, 278).

Throughout the three decades that followed World War II, Machazian employment evidenced a similar shift from mining to manufacturing or service jobs. Although many were attracted to the higher wages, these jobs also afforded Machazian migrants greater control over the duration of their migration and of sojourns back home.

As the data that I collected through life history surveys and interviews with Mozambican migrant men who were active during this transitional period shows, this shift started slowly in the late 1940s, grew steadily throughout the 1950s, and mushroomed in the 1960s and early 1970s.[22]

Type of Employment

	% Mine	% Nonmine	% Mixed[a]
1940–1950 (N = 21)	62%	24%	14%
1950–1962 (N = 31)	48%	36%	16%
1962–1977 (N = 52)	38%	56%	6%

[a]Individuals who undertook migration for both mine and nonmine employment during the period.

Independent evidence of the shift from mine to nonmine migration among Mozambicans more generally is provided by colonial documentation of the growing rates at which miners left their jobs before completing their contracts in the mines during the post–World War II period. Many "first-timers" seeking nonmine employment sought to defray the considerable costs and to avoid the potential documentation problems involved in organizing a trip to South Africa by initially signing up with WENELA for a mine contract. However, after crossing the border they would desert the WENELA camps to seek employment in the manufacturing enterprises near the periurban townships. As early as 1948 Portuguese officials in Johannesburg reported: "[F]or the clandestine emigrant, it is a much easier trip than it was a mere ten or fifteen years ago, given that the WENELA trucks also are used for general passenger transportation, so that the "clandestine" is thus a passenger much like any other" (Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas de Joanesburgo, Relatório Annual, União de Africa do Sul, 1948: 313).

In 1961 the Portuguese curator of Indigenous Affairs in South Africa reported to his counterpart in Beira a nearly fourfold increase (from 2,111 to 7,539) in the documented number of such "desertions" between 1948 and 1960, for a total of 66,904 during this whole period.[23] Fewer than a third of this number were recorded as "recaptured." Moreover, these figures did not include those who fled after concluding their eighteen months of service because their number was stated to be "unknown but presumed to be high."

Migrant men from Machaze thus effectively responded to the colonial government's renewed forced-labor campaign after 1942 in part by shifting to employment outside of the mines that allowed them to limit the amount of time they spent back in Mozambique. Although this trend was also driven by other social factors (explored in more detail in the chapter 2) migrancy continued to be a particularly effective strategy for resist-

ing the pretensions of an intrusive and coercive—if not overwhelmingly powerful—colonial state.

The effectiveness of these migratory strategies in thwarting the colonial government's reinvigorated labor conscription efforts after 1942 was clearly conveyed in the growing fatalism about "clandestine migration" and weary resignation at the failure of any official efforts to stem it that gradually crept into the administrative reports of colonial administrators in Espungabera, much as it had decades earlier in the reports of Companhia officials. In 1953 a senior administrator reflected that his thirty years of experience as a colonial official had led him to the conclusion that this clandestine emigration would be impossible to stop (Direcção dos Negócios Indígenas, Inspecção de Manica e Mossurize, 1953). And in 1961, as forced-recruitment policies neared their end in Mozambique, the colonial administrator in Mossurize noted:

> [W]e have sought to "capture" the clandestine without alienating him, because, in reality, it is impossible to maintain a tight vigilance or to impose measures that prevent clandestinity. . . . We are thus of the opinion that what will be accomplished will be so only ever so gradually" (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1960).

Late Colonial Opportunity: 1961–1974

Throughout the 1950s and 1960s Portugal confronted rising international pressure and criticism over its colonial labor policies in Africa. This pressure, along with the first massive anticolonial uprisings against the Portuguese in Angola in 1962, led the Portuguese government to revisit and ultimately revoke its compulsory labor and crop cultivation policies in all of its African colonies that same year. The definitive termination of forced-labor policies removed one of the most significant factors that had motivated intensified labor migration to South Africa. Around the same time, other significant developments within the colony generated unprecedented economic growth in Mozambique and generated new opportunities for workers interested in remaining and investing in petty trade and other small business ventures within Machaze.

The increase in Mozambique's white settler population was particularly dramatic during the last twenty-five years of colonialism. Whereas in 1950 a total of 48,213 European settlers were registered in Mozambique,

by 1960 this number had doubled to 97,245, and by 1970 it had grown to 158,000 (Newitt 1995, 475; Hall and Young 1997, 4). The lifting of António de Oliveira Salazar's restrictions on foreign investment in 1961 followed by further fiscal liberalization under Marcelo José das Neves Alves Caetano after 1968 accelerated this rate of growth by allowing foreign capital to pour in.[24] However, Machaze never attracted any significant European interest, even during the height of the settler influx.

Since the beginning of the twentieth century, Machaze had been considered to have an insalubrious climate, unsuited to Europeans. After the administration of the Companhia ended in 1942, colonial authorities declared Machaze a "native reserve" area where white settlement was not to be pursued (Serviço de Agrimensura de Manica e Sofala, Relatório Annual de 1953). It retained this status until 1962. Machaze was also labeled an area unsuited for commercial agriculture of the type avidly pursued elsewhere in the colony (in particular sugar and cotton).[25] Accordingly, throughout the waning years of colonial rule, Machazians experienced none of the large land appropriations connected to agricultural *colonato* (planned settlement) schemes to the south in Chokwe, the north in Sussundenga, and along the Manica-Beira corridor (see Chingono 1996; Pitcher 1995; Alexander 1994; Couvane 2001).[26]

The lack of any significant European presence in the area enabled the local population to occupy some of the economic space related to small-scale trade and services that the new European settlers (and Indian traders) had appropriated for themselves elsewhere in the colony.[27] By the mid-1960s a number of local innovators had made significant investments in the form of small tuck (convenience) shops and grinding mill businesses (Relatório sobre a Elevação da População Nativa, Circunscrição de Mossurize, 30 Trimestre 1965). A few returned labor migrants started to raise poultry and goats on a modest commercial scale, transporting and selling them within the colony, in Beira and Vila Pery (Monografia Psicossocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962: 8).

Paradoxically, the launching of the anticolonial war in the north of Mozambique in 1964 brought new benefits and opportunities to district residents in the form of significant infrastructural improvements, mostly to a road network whose previous rudimentary condition had presented a significant obstacle to commercial ventures. Many of the infrastructural developments in the colony during this period, particularly the dramatic expansion of the colony's transportation and communication networks, were directly related to the Portuguese war against FRELIMO.

Although development was primarily concentrated in the urban areas where the growing number of European settlers had taken up residence,[28] the military requirements of the war led to the completion of a basic internal network of paved roads serviced by improved (drained) dirt ones throughout a considerable expanse of rural Mozambique (Hall and Young 1997, 9–11).

By the time of decolonization in 1974, the war had progressed to include sporadic actions a couple hundred kilometers north of Machaze in the Beira-Manica corridor, but it had not arrived in the district. Machaze was far enough away from actual conflict to suffer none of the war's direct effects, yet it was close enough to benefit from some of the colonial government's infrastructural initiatives, in anticipation of the potential future expansion of military activity into the area.

Although seemingly quite basic, many of these improvements were nevertheless recalled during my fieldwork by local inhabitants as having had a dramatic positive impact on their quality of life. Several improvements stood out in particular. Between 1958 and 1967 a network of permanent diesel-powered water boreholes (small-diameter wells) and storage tanks were drilled by the colonial authorities at strategic locations in the district, particularly along the improved dirt-road network (Relatório sobre a Elevação da População Nativa, Circunscrição de Mossurize, 30 Trimestre, 1965; Referência à Nota Confidencial No52/72 de 2/6/972, do Chefe do Gabinete Distrital de APSIC de Vila Pery, July 24, 1972). Given the region's chronic drought it is hard to overestimate the importance of this network, especially in improving the lives of Machazian women, who had the task of collecting water for their households.[29]

Also, during the 1960s a regular bus service from Machaze to the border posts with South Africa and Southern Rhodesia began to operate, using the improved road network in the district. Some migrant men began to use this service to develop their own small-scale trading ventures, and a few Machazians are even remembered for having bought cars and flatbed trucks, which they used to run their own local transportation businesses in the early 1970s. By and large, these men had made the money for their initial investments through work in South Africa and were willing to invest in their home communities now that they no longer faced the threat of forced labor.

The number of commercial establishments in Machaze, which up to 1940 had been limited to the solitary presence of the Indian-run Omar & Ca., grew to include at least seven permanent shops by 1962. Many of

these establishments played a role in the growing commercialization of Machazian agricultural surplus—in particular of corn, millet, and to some extent chickens and cashews—which were sold to them by the local populace, particularly by women. In 1962, the post administrator from Machaze reported that "this being a good year, it is predicted that they [Machazians] will sell a great deal to the commercial shops." He also estimated that up to 30 percent of some household incomes now came from the sale of agricultural products grown in family subsistence plots (Monografia Psicossocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962, 70). This was a new and important opportunity for women to obtain cash by selling the crops they grew.

Despite the dramatic improvement in opportunities in Machaze during the last decade of the colonial era, male labor migration to South Africa continued unabated. Thus, while colonial labor policies played a significant role in forging migration as an effective tool of "resistance" and instituted a culture of migrancy in Machaze, from the very outset migrancy was also driven by other forms of social struggle. These struggles over gendered, generational, and other forms of local social relations persisted well after the demise of chibalo and despite late colonial shifts in the political and economic dispensation.

Perhaps the most important and consequential legacy of Portugal's anemic yet intrusive mode of colonial governance in Machaze was the reinforcement of a political posture of "disengagement" (Azarya 1988) from the state. Lacking hegemonic capacity, colonial strategies of central governance relied from beginning to end on periodic intrusive shows of force rather than on more systematic bureaucratic means. The primary local "political logic" produced by this history was one that sought to minimize interference in everyday life by central authorities. The central state's actions and intention came to be seen by local actors as suspect by default. Colonial rule thus only affirmed a view of central political authority as a source of unwanted attention that should—and usually could—be evaded.

CHAPTER 2

Other Struggles

Migration and the Transformation of Social Relations

In noting the many "everyday forms of resistance" (Scott 1985) deployed by the rural Mozambican peasantry against Portuguese colonial policies, historian Allen Isaacman cautions that "important qualifications can extend and deepen the discussion of hidden forms of resistance. . . . [T]he concept needs to be disaggregated to identify the diverse intentions of the actors as well as the consequences of their actions" (Isaacman 1996, 209). He thus draws attention to the need to "socially situate" (Greenhalgh 1995) the meaning of those important practices that enabled Mozambicans to defy colonial pretensions within specific geographies of social struggle, without assuming a priori that avoiding the colonial state was the only, or even the foremost, concern that shaped those practices.

While chronic colonial efforts to institute a forced-labor regime played an important role in the institutionalization of male migrancy in Machazian social life, the development of a "culture of migrancy" in the district cannot be explained solely as a reaction to the unwelcome intrusive state authority. The relatively limited capacity of colonial authorities to enforce their designs meant that labor migration was never the only way to evade colonial labor conscription. The fact that even before the colonial encounter Machazian men were participating in labor migration to South Africa and that this migrancy continued unabated during the long lulls when colonial administrators suspended the futile task of "voluntary labor recruitment" indicates that other motives were also at work.

The earliest Companhia reports noted that labor migration to South Africa played a vital role in the life-course trajectories of young men by enabling them to earn the money needed for *lobola* (bride-price).

Throughout the first half of the twentieth century the local colonial administrators reported a fairly stable price for lobola of between 25 and 30 pounds.[1] (Migrants who worked in South Africa and Southern Rhodesia were paid in British pounds, which was accepted for most local economic transactions in migrant-sending areas back in Mozambique.) While one working trip to South Africa was generally sufficient to acquire this amount, no fewer than five engagements with the Companhia were necessary to save enough money for this—a factor that greatly encouraged the choice of South African options over internal ones, much to the consternation of successive Companhia administrators.[2]

Its crucial role in enabling young men to marry placed labor migration squarely at the center of intergenerational struggles between senior men, who sought to retain authority and control over sons and other junior kinsmen, and junior men, who sought the means to establish greater social autonomy. Intriguing evidence of both the social importance of wage labor and of the attempt by senior men to retain control over migrant sons emerges from the fortuitous, if unlikely, encounter between two early figures of note in anthropology, Melville Herskovits and Franz Boas, and a young Ndau man, Banda Simango, who was born and raised between the Buzi and Save rivers in Mozambique, not far from the northern border of the current-day district of Machaze.

Born in the 1890s, Banda Simango came in contact with Fred Bunker, a missionary for the American Board Mission in Mount Selinda, a few miles across the border from the Companhia's headquarters for the Circumscription of Mossurize. After receiving education at the Mount Selinda mission he was brought by a former instructor at the Hampton Institute to study at that school in the United States in 1914. After he completed his studies in 1923 he attended the Teachers College at Columbia University for one year. He returned to work for some time with the American Board Mission in an area just north of Machaze (Buzi), although he eventually left Mozambique altogether to work as a missionary in West Africa (Spencer 1975).

It was during Simango's time at Columbia that Herskovits and Boas interviewed him about Ndau customs, which resulted in three articles in *American Anthropologist* (Spencer 1975). Simango also worked closely with a student of Boas's, the ethnomusicologist Natalie Curtis, who recorded a large number of his renditions of Ndau songs and sayings (Curtis 1920). Simango's accounts provide privileged insight into Ndau social life and worldview shortly after the beginning of the twentieth century. The

ethnographic report on Ndau social life that Herskovits compiled on the basis of his consultations with Simango included the following allusion to the social importance of migration and a description of the mechanisms by which the earnings of junior men were subject to the control of their senior kinsmen:

> The accumulation of the necessary amount [for the dowry] is something of a problem for the young man. . . . When a young man is old enough, he leaves home for a time and goes where he can work and earn money for himself. On his return he gives all of his earnings to his father, who then asks him how much he wants for his immediate needs. The son takes a small portion of that amount and then indicates to his father that he should take a portion for himself as a gift. After the father has done this, the remainder is kept for the son by his father—the head of the family is, apparently, the banker for the members of the family, and does pretty much what he pleases with what they have given him to keep for them. He may be called upon for money when the young man is in need of it—as for example, when he gets in trouble or wishes to acquire a wife—but the father would not hesitate to use the sums given him for safekeeping to assist a son other than the one who gave him the money. (Herskovits 1923, 384–85)

Oral accounts suggest that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Machazian men often made only as many trips to South Africa as were needed to accumulate what they needed for lobola.[3] While earnings in South Africa were far higher than in Mozambique, the arduous aspects of a long journey of many weeks usually undertaken by foot over difficult terrain and subject to a variety of dangers played a role in discouraging many Machazians from undertaking many trips.[4] Consequently, around the turn of the century many men only made one trip throughout their entire lifetimes, while others might make two or three at most.[5] Under such circumstances senior men retained significant influence over their migrants sons.

However, throughout the Companhia's tenure the development of technology and regional infrastructure began to transform the possibilities for labor migration in ways that increasingly undermined the social power of senior over junior kinsmen. As early as 1912 labor recruiters were offering motorized transportation from the Mozambican border to destinations in South Africa, much to the chagrin of the Companhia's local administrator.[6] The eventual extension of motorized and rail transpor-

tation in Mozambique throughout the two decades that followed—first in the areas between the Companhia's southern border and the South African border, and eventually even within the Companhia's territory—greatly facilitated the trip to South Africa and ultimately enabled a lifetime pattern of continuous circular labor migration to South Africa to become the new norm.[7]

As migrant men made continuous trips—not merely one or two—throughout their lifetimes, paternal control over migrant earnings slowly began to erode. Although a young migrant might turn over his first or even his second trip's earnings to his father, most of the older migrants I interviewed agreed that he was unlikely to do so after subsequent trips. Instead, during the Companhia's tenure younger men began to use circular labor migration as a strategy for asserting greater social autonomy earlier in life. For many it became possible to acquire multiple wives more quickly—a key route to greater social independence and enhanced status in this polygynous society—since a son's split from a larger coresidential unit under his father's authority was regarded as more viable and justifiable to the extent that it had more houses(*nhemba*), each loosely based on a wife and her children.

Migration in Intergenerational Struggle

Important social developments in Machaze during the Companhia's tenure hint at the extent to which the development of circular labor migration contributed to the intensification of intergenerational social struggle within Machazian communities. The most important of these developments involved both new challenges to, and realizations of, religious beliefs that played a foundational role in ordering Machazian social identities, relations, and worldviews.

Machazians have long thought of themselves as inhabiting a space of social interaction that might be described as a "sociospiritual world," in which their everyday existence is fundamentally shaped by the thorough interpenetration of the spiritual world of the dead with that of the living. In all domains of interaction Machazians account for the agency of spirits, foremost among them the *vadzimu:* one's own deceased ancestors. According to this belief system, the vadzimu intervene in the lives of their descendants in order to correct moral failings or to not be forgotten, usually by causing minor illnesses (rather than grievous harm). Vadzimu

admonishment is deemed most likely to occur when the living neglect to perform rituals of respect. However, ancestral reproach also can be easily triggered by contentious relationships among the living. Feelings of ill will between social actors can motivate the vadzimu to act, particularly in defense of the rights of older and senior kin, whose age and social rank give them with a status that is "closer to the ancestors."[8]

Machazians also believe that the spirits of the dead can be the source of more grievous forms of harm, usually through the vehicle of witchcraft (uloi). Among Machazians, as among many other Shona speakers (Bourdillon 1991), all serious illness, misfortune, and death is attributed to uloi, as attested to in Curtis's rendition of Banda Simango's account:

> The all-pervading belief in witchcraft is one of the most important factors of African life. . . . [T]he normal state of man is a healthful life. Sickness and death are abnormal and when a man dies it is usually because he has been bewitched in some way. Even if he is killed in battle it is because some evil influence has brought him bad luck. Death is never natural. There is always some cause for it. A witch is one who influences others for evil through charms, wicked magic of various kinds, and through power over spirits of the dead. (Curtis 1920, 15–16)

In Machaze uloi is believed to be caused by a *mfukwa,* a particular type or state of spirit motivated to cause death, in conjunction with a specific living actor, who either intentionally directs or unintentionally facilitates the *mfukwa*'s activity.[9] Although uloi can be produced through the intentional intervention of ritual specialists, jealousy or intense hostility can open a path for a mfukwa to act. Thus sometimes a person can inadvertently facilitate mfukwa action against another merely by harboring and publicly expressing hostile sentiments against that person.

It is also widely assumed that those who are most knowledgeable about a person are the most likely sources of such spiritual intervention in that person's life. Intimate knowledge of another's affairs is not only believed to be the most likely source of jealousy but also enables one's "secrets" to be known and spoken so that spirits can act more effectively. This belief, coupled with the fact that kin were those most likely to know the most about one another's way of life, played an important role in shaping the social contours of local conflict—generally locating "problems of uloi" *within* households and extended kinship groups. In Machaze, there has long existed a strong tension between the desire and need for familial support and network relations and the fear that these relations

may become the source of ancestral sanction or of even more grievous harm.

Machazians consult *nyangas* and *nyamusoros,* two types of local healers and diviners, to diagnose the sources of spiritual discontent or of social conflict that have given rise to acrimonious spiritual interaction and that are ultimately the root cause of misfortune or physical malaise.[10] These specialists identify which spiritual actors have caused an illness and can interpret their intentions and the source of their discontent, identify their demands, and ultimately intercede for resolution.

The early decades of the twentieth century, following the return from Bilene and the arrival of the Companhia, were frequently described to me as a time during which the virulence of uloi noticeably increased and the effectiveness of measures against it waned. The efforts by younger men to establish their autonomy from seniors are the most obvious source for growing levels of conflict within households during this time period. Although most of those who described this period of history in Machaze could not identify a reason for the intensification of uloi, some drew strong parallels to postconflict trends in intergenerational relations of which they strongly disapproved. As one elderly Machazian man in Machaze noted:

> In the time of the Portuguese uloi was also a problem. . . . Those problems were always growing, growing because the youth were forgetting to respect the older ones. With war it has become even more difficult. Now even a son will rob his own father and turn him into a mfukwa!

Much as many Machazians at the end of the twentieth century would identify the postcolonial government's assault on ritual practices as a significant "cause" of the civil war and of the droughts that plagued Machaze throughout it, the natural calamities that dramatically punctuated the first four decades of the twentieth century provided ample indication of massive disorder and disaffection in the sociospiritual world. In their annual reports, Companhia administrators stated that severe droughts successively swept through Madanda in 1907–08, 1912–13, 1915–16, 1921–22, 1925–26, 1932–33, 1937–38, and again in 1941–42. The famines occasioned by these droughts resulted in both high levels of mortality and massive population movements. Entire households, and sometimes even whole communities, sought relief by migrating from the lowlands of Machaze to less drought-prone areas—usually north to the Buzi River or west to the more fertile highlands area in Espungabera and Dombe.

Many others fled across the border into Southern Rhodesia. Reporting on the situation in 1912, the district administrator wrote:

> The year of 1912 was for the natives of lower Mossurize a true year of poor luck in terms of the development and production of their crops. . . . [T]he harvest was completely annulled due to the great drought; as some natives from that region have informed me it has been over 10 months since it has rained there. . . . [I]n addition to the lack of foodstuffs the inhabitants of Madanda fight with equally a thousand hardships in order to find water to drink. . . . The greater part of the natives of these *régulados* [chiefdoms] are absent from the Circumscription with their families, having sought food in the circumscriptions of Moribane, Buzi, Sofala, the English territory, and in upper Mossurize. (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório, 30 Trimestre, 1912)

During the 1915–16 agricultural season, drought-induced famine led to a loss in the Machaze area of 1,013 huts—a loss in one year of 23.4 percent of the population due to death or out-migration (Mossurize, Relatório: Arrolamento e Recenseamento, 1916). Perhaps the most devastating of these famines—known as Sikkisiranye—swept through the district from 1940 to 1942, during the twilight of the Companhia's tenure.[11] As this famine gained strength, and well before it reached its apex, the local administrator was already noting its impact on demographic trends:

> The longstanding trend in normal increase in the population of Mossurize suffered its first exception this year, registering a small decline. The very poor agricultural year of 1941 contributed significantly to the exodus of many indigenous inhabitants, and the natural consequences of famine that made its appearance in August had disastrous effects. Your Excellency will therefore note in the charts that follow higher mortality; lower rates of birth, marriage and immigration; and greater emigration than in the past year. Unfortunately, the current agricultural year does not look any more promising and thus a return to normality should not be expected in 1943. (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório do Arrolamento e Recenseamento, 1942: 3)

Not only do colonial accounts bear witness to the devastating impact of these calamities but their social import is evidenced in the role they continued to play as the primary collective markers in oral accounts of the past—the most devastating events were each given their own descriptive name.

Such calamitous failures by the ancestral guardians of the land to ensure its fertility for their descendants would have contributed substantially to a sense that the sociospiritual world was in disarray and that virulent witchcraft was dramatically on the rise. At least two specific occurrences during the 1930s provide strong indications of a growing sense of ontological crisis and desire for a reprieve from uloi among the district's population.

In 1934 the district administrator reported that "sellers of *muchape*" had appeared in the district and were causing an (undesirable) stir among the local population while cheating people out of their money (Carta ao Governador do Territorio da Companhia de Moçambique do Administrador do Distrito de Mossurize, March 15, 1934).[12] Anthropologists working elsewhere throughout southern Africa at the time documented different versions of this movement in parts of present-day Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe; and although its specific form and particular meaning differed somewhat from place to place it was generally described as a "witch-finding cult" (Richards 1935).

As one of the most prominent collective markers in oral history accounts, the muchape movement is recalled in Machaze as an attempt to eradicate uloi, albeit one that ultimately failed and actually backfired. According to most accounts, the sellers of muchape medicine promised to eradicate uloi by first identifying those among the population who were witches and forcing them to renounce their practices. They then provided "medicine" that would guarantee permanent protection against witchcraft. Muchape is most remembered not because it failed to live up to its promise to eradicate uloi, however, but because it was widely believed to have resulted in its subsequent intensification. In particular, several elderly Machazians reported to me that it was only *after* muchape that it became possible for even a father to become a *mfukwa* toward his own children, whereas before this had never been possible—a view seemingly corroborated by the account of Simango.[13] Such a dramatic shift in this belief is at least strongly suggestive of growing intergenerational tension within Machazian society around this time.

Independent Protestant churches also arrived in the district in the 1930s, offering their own solution to the problem of uloi. During the 1930s migrants in contact with the American Board Mission in Mount Selinda (in Southern Rhodesia) brought the first Protestant sect to Machaze. According to oral accounts the American Board church was quickly followed by several others brought back by migrants returning from the

mines in South Africa.[14] The teachings of these churches differed sharply from, and directly challenged, key tenets of established local spiritual belief. In particular, they strictly prohibited the veneration of ancestors and the consultation of nyangas. The spirits invoked by nyangas were described as "demons," artful in deception, who "posed" as ancestors in order to lead souls astray—but who were certainly not the "genuine spirits" of those ancestors. Pastors taught that their members needn't fear such demonic activity because as members of "the family of God" they could count on the protection of the most powerful spirit of all, the Holy Spirit.

These churches not only reinterpreted the source and nature of spiritual malfeasance but offered a potent antidote in the form of the all-powerful Holy Spirit. However, their teachings also represented a radical challenge to the Machazian social order by rejecting the possibility that ancestral spirits could or should play any role in the lives of their living descendants.[15] By denying the very existence—much less need for veneration—of ancestral spirits, the teachings of these churches directly challenged what was perhaps the keystone precept of the Machazian social order—that of senior prerogative. Machazians believed ancestors were the guarantors of a social order that privileged and enacted the power of senior kin over junior kin. As the "ultimate elders," vadzimu were most likely to engage in disciplining activity when provoked by acts of social impropriety in which the obligations of juniors to seniors were not being fulfilled.[16] The eldest members of society were considered to be the closest of all to the ancestors—respected and feared as virtual "ancestors on the way."

The churches also undermined senior prerogative by introducing an alternative to kinship for the constitution of social relations among the living. In proposing the church as "the family of God" pastors appropriated the language of kinship to describe a new form of sociation—that of church membership—while claiming the primacy for this "family" over that of "mundane kinship." They thus challenged what had hitherto been a virtually hegemonic system for expressing and structuring local social relations and authority.

Such challenges resonated with, and in many ways articulated, precisely those intergenerational tensions that had been fostered by the development of the circular labor-migration system. Many of the oral accounts of early conversion to these churches that I collected included descriptions of the acrimony that arose between younger men who chose to join the churches and their senior kin who condemned them for doing so. The proliferation of these churches and their rapid growth in popularity

during the waning years of the Companhia's tenure signaled the intensification of intergenerational social struggle in Machaze and growing concern with the effects of this development as manifested through uloi.

The Social Advantages of Nonmine Migrancy

Concern with the renegotiation of social relations and the effects of social struggle ultimately influenced migration behavior itself. Although the colonial state's efforts to reinvigorate the compulsory labor project after 1942 encouraged Machazian migrants to increasingly seek employment outside of the mines, this shift was also driven by other considerations. In particular, employment in the burgeoning South African industrial and service sectors offered significant new leverage for migrants in their negotiation of domestic and kinship relations back in Machaze. Initially, two aspects of employment outside of the mines were particularly attractive to Machazian migrants: the potential for much higher returns on earnings and for greater control over the form and disbursement of those earnings.

Considerably higher earnings were of course attractive to young migrant men seeking to pay for *lobola* and establish their autonomy at an earlier age. However, the fact that industrial wages were not deferred until the migrant returned to Mozambique was also significant. The 1926 international treaty (subsequently revised in 1964) between the colonial governments in Portugal and South Africa stipulated that a majority of wages paid to official mine laborers had to be deferred for payment back in Mozambique.[17] By contrast, in industrial and service jobs wages were paid in full to the migrant in South Africa, and often on a weekly (rather than a monthly) basis. Migrants paid in South Africa could use as much of that income as they wished to purchase items that were cheaper in South Africa. With the regularization of motorized bus service within Mozambique (all the way to Machaze by the end of the 1950s) the transportation of large amounts of such merchandise became increasingly possible. Starting in the 1940s the most successful of these migrants began to purchase and bring back to Machaze prized large-ticket items such as bicycles and, eventually, radios. Increasingly, those working in industrial and service jobs brought many more gifts and often more cash home than did miners.[18]

The higher wages and greater purchasing discretion afforded by nonmine employment provided more leverage for migrant men in the negotiation of key social relationships. Although fathers or other senior kinsmen

continued to seek some say over the disbursement of the migrant's cash earnings, these senior kin exerted less control over specific goods that a migrant purchased and brought back for specific individuals. Migrants who received the entirety of their wages in South Africa thus found that they could reduce the discretionary power of senior household members over their earnings and open more direct, and less "senior kin–mediated," lines of reciprocity between themselves—as the "giver of gifts"—and those within the household or community who were the "receivers of gifts." In short, those migrants working in industrial and service jobs could more effectively establish their autonomy not only because they earned more than counterparts working in the mines but because they could exert greater control over the social returns on their wages. The migrant men I interviewed often noted the important advantages that gift giving offered over cash in their ability to manage and exercise control over their wives. One migrant who had worked in South Africa since the mid-1950s observed:

> It is very much better to bring back some things than to only bring back rands [South African money]. See—if you have two wives you can give each of them a *capulana* [a cloth wrap used by most women as a skirt], and a dress, and a *bacia* [plastic basin]. If they each see that they have received the same thing as the other they will not be jealous. Only then you will have some peace. But if you only bring back money then one will believe the other has received more. This will be the beginning of problems and more problems. . . . Also, you cannot just leave a woman with so many rand when you go [back to South Africa]. . . . It is only because of the *hondo* [war] that women begin to know how to be with money. Before this they did not have this understanding. Maybe they would even lose or misplace it or be deceived. Sometimes she will not think about your interests. Maybe if you are gone too long she will be deceived by a man [lover]. All my life I have seen that with women it is best to leave only some small money but for the man to bring her the thing he knows she must have from Joni [South Africa].

Organization of and Challenges to Informal Labor Migration in South Africa after 1940

Confronting Influx Control

Although Machazian men may have been increasingly drawn away from the mines because of the new forms of social leverage that alternative

employment afforded them, they also confronted daunting new challenges and risks that had not been part of the mine labor experience. Machazians who opted to work in the industrial or service sectors had to confront all of the difficulties that the black South African population faced. In the postwar period apartheid policy was intensifying and renewed efforts were being made to limit the mobility and residential options of all blacks.

The history of twentieth-century South African "influx control" was, in the words of Hermann Giliomee and Lawrence Schlemmer, "an attempt by the State to keep in balance two opposing forces: the political exclusion of blacks, and the increasing and very extensive reliance of whites on the black labor force" (1985, 2). On one hand, influx control policies embodied the racist ideology of apartheid, endeavoring to keep the black population physically, politically, and socially separate from the white population in a South Africa conceived of by those in power as a "white man's land." On the other hand, these policies also reflected the general dependence of the South African economy on inexpensive black labor. The apartheid regime's evolving legislation also represented an effort to mediate among the often contradictory labor interests of the different sectors of that economy, namely white-owned agriculture, mining, and the secondary and service sector.

By 1920 legislation that aimed to control the residential and employment opportunities of black South Africans to protect the interests of white South Africans was already in place. Subsequently, the Native Urban Areas Act (1923) and the Native Laws Amendment Act (1937) established the general principles of residential segregation and white employment privilege. The black population was conceived of as consisting of two "types": the "tribalized" and the "detribalized." Those black South Africans already resident in the cities were regarded as "detribalized" and were legally granted the right to own property and the right to highly restricted political participation. The remainder of the black population was regarded as still "tribalized" and only allowed to enter the "white" cities inasmuch as their presence served the economic interests of the white population (Giliomee and Schlemmer 1985, 2).

However, with the industrialization of the 1930s and 1940s and the World War II economic boom this legislation was increasingly circumvented by black South Africans responding to the increasing demand for labor and seeking to avoid the increasingly repressive labor practices of rural white farmers (Bonner, Delius, and Posel 1993). The urban white population grew increasingly alarmed at the rapid rate of growth of the

urban black population and the sprawl of informal (illegal) urban settlement. At the same time, white farmers complained about the increasing difficulty of obtaining cheap agricultural labor as a result of this drain. Later in the 1950s representatives of the mining industry joined this chorus of protest as they feared losing their own labor supply (ultimately finding a solution in foreign labor sources) (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 61–72).

In an ever more radical attempt to control black labor in order to serve the balance of these interests more forceful legislation was implemented after the National Party came to power in 1948. A comprehensive pass control system was created through the Natives (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act of 1945 and the Bantu Laws Amendment Act of 1952. According to these laws all South African blacks could only be employed in white urban areas for a period of one year at a time, after which they were required to return to their assigned "homelands" to register for a new contract.

The only exceptions were those given so-called Section 10 rights. Section 10 permitted the following black people to remain in urban areas: (a) persons who had since birth continuously lived in the prescribed area; (b) persons who had worked continuously in the area for one employer for at least ten years, or had lawfully lived in the area with more than one employer for at least fifteen years; and (c) the wife and children of people qualified under the previous two sections. All other black Africans were classified as either migrants (residents on one-year contracts registered through the established labor bureau system) or commuters (those who returned weekly or even daily to their homelands from work in the urban areas). Both of these two statuses had to be established through a registered contract administered by the labor bureau system and did not accumulate credit toward the (a) or (b) criteria for more permanent resident status in the urban areas. Unless specifically exempted under one of the aforementioned provisions all Africans were prohibited from spending more than seventy-two hours in a "prescribed white" area (effectively all nonhomeland urban areas) (Posel 1993, 414).

Those black laborers not exempted under Section 10 could not be legally employed in the urban areas without a specific request by an urban employer for their services. Furthermore, it was illegal for an employer to employ them except through the offices of an official rural labor bureau. These bureaus were given the responsibility of ascertaining that no urban black resident who was exempted under Section 10 was available for an

urban job before allotting it to a rural "homeland" resident. This legislation was ultimately intended to guarantee sufficient black labor for each of the major sectors of the economy (despite their considerable wage differentials) while disenfranchising blacks from a physical or political position in white South Africa.

This policy reached its extreme logical expression with the development of the idea of "independent national homelands" under the Henrik Verwoerd government in the 1960s. The black population was assigned a citizenship exclusive and apart from that of "South African." The old social categories of "detribalized" and "tribalized" were abandoned in favor of this new form of sociopolitical categorization, which deprived all black South Africans of South African citizenship by assigning them citizenship in one or another "Bantustan." The goal of this new system was not only to stop black urbanization but to reverse it by forcibly removing large numbers of the black population settled in "white areas" to these "homelands" (Jones and Muller 1992, 289). Between 1960 and 1983 over two million black South Africans were forcibly removed in this fashion (Giliomee and Schlemmer 1985, 4). The apartheid regime's ultimate goal was for *all* black labor to eventually become migrant labor, including urban industrial and service as well as agricultural and mining labor.[19]

Although the apartheid government's measures presented obstacles to black urbanization, they ultimately proved thoroughly incapable of preventing the massive rural-to-urban migration that occurred throughout the 1960s and the 1970s. The higher wages available in manufacturing and in services in the urban areas attracted a flood of black migrants into the urban areas at the same time that the heightening of rural poverty in the Bantustans drove them out. The process of relocating over two million black South Africans into Bantustans, where subsistence agriculture was already a difficult if not an impossible option (Bozzoli 1991a, 1991b; Wolpe 1972; Murray 1980, 1981; Giliomee 1985; Wilson 1985; Schlemmer and Moller 1985), only deepened rural poverty and motivated outmigration to the urban areas.

Rather than navigating the onerous labor bureau system, the vast majority of black South Africans simply opted to "shoot straight" (the term most often used by black South Africans to refer to migration without approved documentation).[20] They moved to the urban areas and stayed with friends or relatives or in hostels or illegal squatter dwellings while seeking or holding down a job. Such a system forced over half of all black urban dwellers into becoming "incipient criminals" (Frankel 1979, 206, as

quoted in Giliomee and Schlemmer 1985, 7) and to constantly having to evade police crackdowns. It also spawned a huge traffic in illegal identification documents, growth in official bribery, and massive employer complicity in these types of evasion and official corruption.

Obtaining Employment

In the Vaal—the area that ultimately drew the bulk of Machazian labor migrants—it was well known which firms required what (if any) type of authorization or legal documentation in order to procure work. The best paying jobs were usually those in the major state-supported industries in the area such as Iscor (the national steel conglomerate), Vecor (Vanderbijl Engineering—mining), Stewart & Lloyds (British iron and steel), or Eskom (electric public utility company). Iscor and Eskom were (and are) two of the major South African industries. Iscor experienced its period of greatest growth after World War II, establishing its new plants in the Vereeniging area (part of the Vaal) during the 1950s. The Vaal area was one of the fastest growing industrial areas in the country, as subsidiary or client firms of Iscor such as Stewart & Lloyds and Vecor also expanded their plants and activities there (Jones and Muller 1992, 175–79).

Obtaining employment in these companies often meant approaching the local (urban) labor bureau that recruited for Iscor and Vecor; it thus required South African identity papers and sometimes even Section 10 status. With enough money and the right contacts officials could be bribed into granting the needed papers. Occasionally, employers could be convinced to vouch for Section 10 status for their long-term employees, though many were reluctant to do so because Section 10 status would allow the employee to leave for better-paying jobs.[21]

However, many employers made it a point to *not* recruit through the labor bureau, and they had less stringent requirements when it came to identification papers. For example, employment with the Dairyboard was possible with forged identity papers (or in some cases without any identity papers). Employment in domestic service, as a part-time laborer, and in the construction industry (booming as a result of the overall industrial expansion in the area) usually required no form of identification.[22] At some industries, such as Brick and Tile,[23] many migrants reported that they were first employed by simply waiting outside the gate.[24] Ultimately, the legislation and the policies of the influx control system contained contradictions and measures that encouraged many employers and local

officials to become complicit with black workers to circumvent influx control. The concentration of official policing in the townships (rather than in the places of employment) and the minimal fines imposed on employers did little to discourage employers from circumventing the "influx control" system in order to hire "illegals." According to a survey conducted by the Federated Chamber of Industries in 1956, only 38 percent of the firms sampled in the Transvaal area made any use whatsoever of the labor bureau to procure African labor (Posel 1993, 421) as required by law.

Identity Management

The form of identification that a Machazian migrant was able to obtain played a vital role in determining the type of employment he procured and what social institutions and mechanisms he availed himself of while in South Africa. The type of identity papers that first-time Machazian migrants obtained usually were related to how they crossed the international border. Many entered South Africa by foot across the Pafuri border and then made for the Messina area where they would sojourn for a period of a few months in the Shangaan-speaking area of South Africa (i.e., Giyani). These periods, often were used to learn and hone Shangaan language skills and to obtain South African identity papers. Migrants agreed that it was relatively easy to obtain identity papers certifying that one was a South African Shangaan by paying local "traditional authorities" to so attest before government authorities. Traditional authorities in these areas were also complicit in this practice because any documented increase in population in their areas resulted in increased government subsidies (without increasing the number of people in need of services, since few Machazians stayed there for very long).

Those Machazian migrants who opted to go directly to areas of industrial employment (such as the Vaal) usually went with a senior family member or friend with experience migrating to the area in question. In the hostels or other accommodations provided through that family member they studied Shangaan while providing domestic and other services for that relative. Yet another alternative involved the use of a WENELA contract to get through the international border and then deserting this "legal" employer to search for other industrial employment.

Each of these strategies had particular consequences when it came to obtaining identification papers and organizing employment and residence in South Africa, especially for a first-time migrant. Whereas the use of

WENELA for transportation and border crossing allowed a young migrant to reach his destination with relative ease and without incurring social obligations it also created a police file. Moreover, although it got the migrant to the Vaal area it did so without assurance of employment or residence. For these reasons many who deserted from WENELA were more likely to accept employment in construction and other short-term lower-paying jobs that required no identity papers. In contrast, those who went straight to the Vaal area under the auspices of senior relatives often had the greatest security in terms of a guaranteed job and residence. However, the social obligations incurred in the process were far greater because of the dependence on relatives for travel, employment, and residence. Finally, those who obtained identity papers at WENELA's main border processing post at Messina possessed valid documentation for potential employment in South Africa yet were still excluded from Section 10 exemption status as "homeland citizens." Although those who pursued this option faced the risks that confronted all black South Africans legally designated as "Bantustan residents," they did not face the risk of deportation back to Mozambique.

The form of documentation guaranteeing the most secure status and best paying jobs was a genuine South African Section 10 pass. Many migrants progressed over time from a less-secure identity status to a more secure one over successive trips. Thus a migrant might start without any identity papers, then obtain a forged identity pass and finally bribe an official to obtain a genuine Section 10 status. Most Machazian migrant men strove to have some form of documentation that identified them as South African.

Influx Control and Residence

Under the evolving apartheid policies, one of the biggest challenges Machazian migrants faced in industrializing areas such as the Vaal involved housing. Unlike the mines, where compound housing was provided, most housing for industrial and service employment in urban areas had to be obtained privately. Up through the early 1950s some industrial employers provided compound type housing, although the degree to which this was officially sanctioned is unclear. Some companies such as Eskom had legal compounds very similar to those on the mines—thus avoiding some of the labor problems that plagued other industries throughout the 1960s. By the 1960s, however, most of these "informal compounds" had been discontinued, and Machazian migrants found it necessary to

find accommodation in hostels or elsewhere within the rapidly growing townships.

Even though the apartheid government's policies failed to stem black urbanization they did have a significant effect on the density of the black population's settlement in the townships and sprawling illegal squatter settlements that emerged around the country's major urban and industrial areas. Residential legislation came in waves that successively overtook one another, often leaving previous schemes incomplete or creating exceptions in new schemes as old ones were allowed to be partially completed. Before 1937, black property ownership was allowed in designated urban areas throughout South Africa. In the Vaal area, Evaton township had been granted this status at the beginning of the century, and blacks had owned property there since 1905 (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 1). It remained the only location where property rights for blacks were preserved intact and unaltered throughout the entire apartheid era. However, other areas also originally proclaimed as "black" were eventually considered to be "too close" to the "white" settlement areas. In 1935 Toplocation (proclaimed "black" in 1914) had 6,400 black residents. The industrialization of the Vaal area and the war economy led that population to nearly double to 12,259 by 1942 (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 3), even as illegal squatter communities associated with particular companies such as Brick and Tile began to develop in other areas in the vicinity such as Sharpeville.

By 1935 it was decided to forcibly relocate the black residents of Toplocation to Sharpeville, where in 1940 a minimal public housing scheme was initiated (one water tap for every fifteen houses). Although initially conceived of as an area where blacks would be permitted to own their own houses, Act 46 of 1937, which forbade ownership of land or property by blacks, made this option impossible and led to a new administrative arrangement by which the Vereeniging City Council leased the buildings to black residents on a long-term basis. Yet, despite national legislation to the contrary, in 1945 a part of Sharpeville (Phomelong) was redesignated as a place where the black residents could own their houses, and between 1945 and 1959 all the residents of Toplocation (which had been redesignated as an area for whites residence only) were forcibly resettled in Sharpeville (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 5–8). By 1961 Sharpeville was estimated to have 38,212 residents, more than triple the population of Toplocation two decades earlier.[25]

In 1957 South African prime minister Verwoerd announced that the Vaal area could not have four separate "black" locations and that a single area further removed from the heart of the two major "white" cities of

Vereeniging and Van der Biljk Park would be created alongside Evaton Township. This new area, Sebokeng, was to be the relocation site for all the residents of Sharpeville (including those forcibly resettled from Toplocation). The first houses in Sebokeng were built in 1965 by the municipal government (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 9).

A few of the Machazians who had pioneered the crossover from the mines to industrial employment in the 1940s had been able to obtain housing in Sharpeville, and some even obtained homes in Evaton. The establishment of Sebokeng in the 1960s appears to have offered a new residential opportunity taken up by the growing number of Machazian men participating in industrial employment. However, most rented space from South Africans or established shacks on their lots for a rental fee, typical strategies pursued in many areas during this period (Schlemmer 1985), which contributed to the growing population density of the townships. Thus, by 1952 some areas of black residence in the Vaal were estimated to average over twenty people per housing stand (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 7).[26] Other Machazians simply built on the outskirts of the townships, becoming part of the massive illegal squatter settlements that proliferated in the Vaal (and elsewhere throughout South Africa) from the 1950s on. The growth of these informal settlements throughout the country from 1966 to 1979 alone was estimated to range between 137 percent and 458 percent (Schlemmer 1985, 168–69).

Social Effects of the Shift from Mine Migrancy to Other Migrant Employment

Intergenerational Strife over the Meaning of Marriage

The shift from mine migrancy to industrial and service employment had profound and complex effects on ongoing processes of local social struggle in Machaze. The new migrancy options afforded young men even greater social autonomy, and there was much greater variation in the possible outcomes of migration under this new system. By enhancing the ability of young men to achieve autonomy from the elders and by generating much greater potential for socioeconomic differentiation among migrants, the shift from mine migrancy to other alternatives significantly amplified lines of social tension within extended households.

Although the institutionalization of a continuous pattern of circular

migration to the mines had already secured greater financial power and social autonomy for young migrant men, the subsequent shift from the mines to better paying industrial and service jobs made it possible for migrants to accumulate the requisite cash for lobola at an even faster rate and to become less dependent than ever on senior men in matters of marriage. As a result, the social institution of marriage became an even more contested site of intergenerational struggle.

In particular, younger migrants increasingly challenged the meaning of marriage as first and foremost an alliance between the couple's senior kinsmen. Drawing on Simango, Herskovits described Ndau marriage in the early part of the twentieth century:

> [T]he parents of both the boy and the girl have much to say in the matter, and if either family wish to prevent the match they usually can do so . . . [although] if either party to the match insists strenuously enough the parents will give in and grant their consent, for there is great reluctance among the vaNdau to countenance anything which might lead to a break in the family relationships. There is a strong attachment between members of the same family, and it is felt that marriage helps to strengthen the family and build it up, and this is the desideratum of every family among the vaNdau. . . . [E]ven if there are no children divorce does not usually ensue, although in such a case the family of the wife may give the man the sister of his wife at a dowry which does not amount to as much as he originally paid for his first wife. (1923, 382–83)

A number of the oldest migrants that I interviewed described how their wives had been "preselected" by their father when both of the future spouses were still children, or sometimes even before birth, in order to strengthen strategic alliances between their families. However, as young migrant men gained greater economic autonomy from senior kinsmen and became capable of paying their own lobola, the power to select marriage partners increasingly shifted from senior men to the prospective husband. These young migrant men increasingly prioritized their own interests over those of senior kinsmen.

Parents and in-laws reacted to these developments with their own strategies, most visibly by precipitously raising the price of lobola starting in the late 1950s—notably as the transition from mine migrancy to other alternatives gained steam. While district administrators in Espungabera had reported a fairly consistent lobola price for over five decades (it hovered between twenty-five and thirty pounds as late as 1955), by 1962

the district administrator for Mossurize noted that lobola had climbed significantly, reaching levels of up to sixty pounds (Relatório, 10. Trimestre, "Elevação da População Indígena," Administraçãao da Circunscrição de Mossurize, April 6, 1962).[27]

Many of the older migrants I interviewed also noted that during the 1950s and 1960s the structuring of lobola payments also began to change significantly. No longer was the lobola total agreed to beforehand, nor was it acceptable to in-laws that lobola be paid in its entirety up front. Increasingly, in-laws refused to specify at the outset what the total would ultimately be and demanded a series of indefinite payments over time. By maintaining a certain amount of ambiguity about the total amount they would ultimately require, in-laws sought to maintain claims on the resources of migrant future sons-in-law.

The intergenerational struggle over marriage had significant effects on the configuration of gendered power within marriages as well. The selection of marriage partners was increasingly made within a context in which an array of broad social interests (governed by senior men) mattered less than the far narrower interests of individual men. This development, along with the rising price of lobola, reflected a loss of social power and leverage for many wives vis-à-vis their husbands, in particular by making divorce much more difficult for wives than had hitherto been the case.

Fathers who had been the source of their sons' lobola had often prevailed on sons who were discontented with their marriages to avoid divorce because of the broader interfamilial alliances in question. However, individual men who had paid their own lobola were often less concerned with such matters and more likely to press for divorce. Conversely, wives had also been under pressure from their fathers to remain in marriages because their lobola had often been used to consolidate other marital unions (often those of their brothers). The increase in lobola amounts heightened the reluctance of kin to support divorce efforts initiated by daughters dissatisfied with their marriages. The growing autonomy of migrant men thus also introduced new gendered power inequalities that amplified lines of gendered social tension within the Machazian domestic sphere.

New Migrant Risks and Growing Socioeconomic Differentiation

While the shift from mine migrancy amplified vertical lines of social tension within households, the growth of socioeconomic differentiation that resulted from more varied migrancy outcomes also amplified horizontal

lines of social friction among men within the same cohorts. Earnings and return savings had been fairly comparable among all migrants who worked in the mines. However, the new industrial and service options drastically broadened the array of potential earnings and material outcomes that could result from labor migration. On the one hand, these new options potentially allowed for greater and more rapid accumulation of cash and goods than was possible by working in the mines. On the other hand, industrial and service options also held unique risks that made it possible for a migrant to save far less money than he would be assured of bringing home as a miner. Without the deferred pay system that automatically reserved roughly half of total wages for payment at the border on return to Mozambique, those who were paid the entirety of their salary in South Africa could also ultimately spend that pay entirely in South Africa.

Although wages paid in South Africa could be saved or used to accumulate goods to bring back home, migrants equally could expose their full earnings to various risks that could thwart their efforts to accumulate savings. Social interaction in the broader South African sphere was far less restricted or monitored in township residential conditions than was generally the case in mining compounds. Most hostels and alternative residential arrangements were necessarily located on the outskirts of urban areas. The opportunities to spend money in the townships tended to be greater than in the mines. Consequently, as one man noted, many young migrants living for the first time in the townships found that self-imposed fiscal discipline was a difficult task:

> To live [in the townships] you must always have money. . . . [Life in South Africa] is always eating your money because you have to buy everything—food and kerosene. . . . It is too easy to eat all your money because of this . . . and then if you drink at the shebeens [unlicensed local bars in the townships] it is too easy. . . . In Joni [South Africa] all pockets have holes.

Moreover, whereas mine employers provided for all the housing, clothing, food, and transportation costs of their employees, industrial employers varied considerably in the degree of support they provided above and beyond a salary. Overall costs of living were lowest in company compounds, higher in hostels, and highest of all in other informal living arrangements within the townships. Nevertheless, in all cases of service or industrial employment a greater degree of responsibility for living and

other expenses (such as travel) fell on the laborer himself. The need to pay for these living expenses at times also placed savings at risk—higher salaries aside.

Savings could be lost in other ways as well. Many industrial migrant workers (South African or foreigners posing as South Africans) lived in single-sex hostels (dormitory accommodations established by local governments or sometimes by companies themselves) in the periurban townships that mushroomed around the major industrial centers in South Africa during the post–Word War II years. The relationship of hostel workers with other urban blacks who had more permanent residential status under Section 10 often proved problematic. Migrants were frequently looked down on by permanent residents and envied for the money they were believed to hoard. Migrants were sometimes robbed by local gangs of young men (who became known and popularized during the 1950s as *tsotis*) (Bonner 1993; Glaser 1993). As a veteran migrant who had once used hostels but now owned his own house in Sebokeng noted, theft could be particularly disastrous for the many migrants who often carried all of their cash with them on their persons because of the lack of security in the hostels:

> It was too dangerous to leave money in the hostel. . . . Sometimes we left money with a pastor who stayed with us . . . but most carried their money with them. . . . My brother was at a shebeen in Sebokeng, and when he came out he was drunk. Some of the tsotsis saw that he was dressed well and that he was buying a lot of drink so they said: "This one is not from here." So they took his money and beat him when he came out.

Taken together, such risks could sometimes result in men either bringing nothing back to Machaze after many months or even years of work in South Africa or in their having much longer sojourns than originally planned, as they sought to accumulate sufficient goods and money to at least save face on returning to Machaze. Return migrants from South Africa also had to pay for their own travel home—and eventually for a return trip to South Africa. Incidents of failed migration were thus much more likely in nonmine migration, often resulting in longer trips as a result of migrants becoming "trapped" in South Africa by their own lack of success.

Greater costs were also involved in undertaking nonmine migration in the first place. By the 1960s most migrants were using transportation services available within Mozambique as well as in South Africa, radically

reducing the impact of the hardship and length of travel time on migration decision making. Although these transportation services made trips physically far shorter and easier, they also made them more expensive. Increasingly, this cost became a significant factor in migration decision making.

Younger men in particular sought solutions that would allow them to avoid dependence on the largesse of senior relatives, who would retain significant power over the earnings of first-time migrants if they covered this cost for them. Increasingly, young men initiated their migratory career by undertaking the much shorter trip (a two- or three-day walk) across the border to Rhodesia, where they sought seasonal employment in the tea and coffee plantations that lay almost immediately on the other side of the international border. These initial rounds of employment were used to accumulate the cash needed to self-finance a first trip to South Africa. Of the Machazian men I interviewed who had initiated their migratory careers between 1940 and 1975, just over two-thirds had engaged in at least one such round of employment in Rhodesia before venturing a trip to South Africa.

Ultimately, both greater variation in the economic outcomes of migration and the rising costs of undertaking it increasingly translated into greater socioeconomic differentiation within Machazian society. Such differentiation also became more visible within Machazian society with the growth of conspicuous consumerism. More and more migrants sought prized large-ticket items such as bicycles and radios. The rising demand for consumer goods was commented on by the Mossurize district administrator in his 1962 report under a section entitled "Betterment of the Native Population":

> It is pleasing to note the receptiveness manifest in the course of visits throughout their lands, always taking advantage of the opportunities to suggest the need to utilize the benefits of civilization as a vehicle for the realization of necessities, such as the small kerosene lamp, the acquisition of beds and mattresses, clothing and coverings, tables and chairs and clothing above all for women and children. It is curious to note in almost all places visited, something in the manner of the material elevation that is desired, though much is still left to be desired. (Relatório, 10. Trimestre, "Elevação da População Indígena," Administração da Circunscrição de Mossurize, April 6, 1962)

During the first half of the twentieth century the major focus of migrant investment and the primary form of social differentiation among

men had focused on the accumulation of wives. Increasingly, however, the possession of material goods became another way of establishing social standing, particularly among those men who belonged to churches that prohibited polygyny. Many migrants emphasized the importance of church meetings as events at which to exhibit economic success. Suits and clothing were especially important means of demonstrating success. Throughout my fieldwork both men and women in Machaze frequently depicted church meetings as "marriage markets," where men showed off their material success and women sought to identify potential husbands.

Social Strife and Sociodemographic Transformation: The Emergence of Nuclear Family Households

The shift away from the mines, and the challenges and opportunities that characterized new forms of migrancy, had profound effects on Machazian social relations. It significantly heightened intergenerational, gendered, and intragenerational tension and conflict within coresidential and extended kinship units and continued to fuel the perception that uloi was on the rise. These tensions were instrumental in reshaping the basic sociodemographic organization of residence and social interaction in Machaze—accelerating a trend toward the nuclearization of households that had begun earlier in the century.

During the late 1990s, when I was undertaking my fieldwork, Machazians often described the ideal coresidential unit as one in which a man should live along with his wives[28] and their children in a series of *nhembas* (huts) at some distance from their nearest neighbor (often half a kilometer and sometimes several kilometers). These might be located in the same large clearing within sight of each other or at least within the same general vicinity. Each wife would typically keep a separate nhemba for herself and her young children, while her older children would often have their own gender-specific nhembas nearby. Husbands would have a nhemba of their own, often located in a senior wife's compound. As male children matured and began to migrate to earn lobola, the first son was expected to marry and bring his wife to live in his father's "homestead" unit in their own nhemba. When the next oldest brother married, the eldest brother and his wife (or wives) would then move away, to be replaced by his younger brother and his wife. Ideally, at least one son's wife would always be available to help her father-in law and mother-in-law with domestic and agricultural tasks. The youngest son and his wives

were expected to provide care and support for the father (and the wife that was his mother) until they died, taking over the original homestead at the time of the father's death.

Such arrangements are notable for how they diverged from descriptions of both idealized and practiced coresidential arrangements made by other observers earlier in the century. In reflecting on notable changes they had witnessed during their lives, many of the older inhabitants of the district that I interviewed drew attention to markedly different patterns of coresidence that had prevailed earlier in the century, during their youth. They described larger residential groups (sometimes referred to by outside observers as kraals) organized around a senior man who lived in the same compound with all his wives and children, along with all of his sons' wives and children, and often even with his own younger brothers and their wives and descendants. Typically this arrangement would be surrounded by a stockade that most informants reported was erected to keep out wild animals, in particular lions. According to oral accounts the population of such a group could sometimes number dozens of individuals at any one time. One of the oldest Machazian migrants I interviewed reminisced about the household in which he was raised:

> It was very different. . . . There were many more people. . . . My father had many [five] wives, and they all lived together. [In contrast the informant had two wives that lived in nhembas separated by a distance of about two kilometers.] My father's two brothers also lived there with their wives. . . . My father's paternal uncle lived there but was very old and had lost his sight by the time I was this high [indicating with his hand the height of a child of around seven or eight]. I do not know how many children there were because there were too many [to count]. There was a fence-thicket around the nhemba because of the snakes and the lions and elephants. My sister went outside once and was attacked by a large snake.

Such arrangements are similar to those described by the Companhia's early district administrators and by Banda Simango, who described kraals governed by headmen in which even nonrelatives evidently could reside as long as granted permission by the headman (Herskovits 1923, 376).[29] Drawing on Simango, Herskovits described compounds in which "the boys [sons] marry and bring their wives to live in the kraal of their father, and these enlarge the kraal, make its prestige still greater, and help in the work of the kraal" (Herskovits 1923, 386).

Such units had always been subject to schismatic tendencies that threatened and sometimes resulted in subdivision—often occurring during disputes over the succession of the compound's senior man immediately after his death.[30] However, the amplification of both intergenerational and intragenerational social friction among kin is likely to have played a significant role in the tendency of coresidential units to assume a more nuclearized structure over the century. As early as 1919, when circular migration had become entrenched in Machaze, the district administrator in Espungabera described a decline in the number of large coresidential arrangements: "[T]he population of Mossurize is highly dispersed. The large population agglomerations of natives that exist in Sena and Sofala are not to be found in this part of the territory. The most populous settlements have a dozen or so huts and even these are few in number" (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1919).

By 1962, when the shift from mine migrancy to other alternatives was in full swing, the colonial administrator described an even more dramatically nuclearized pattern (that was essentially the same as what I witnessed in the 1990s):

> [T]here is little solidarity within families who are settled in isolation from each other. . . . Each family lives independently. . . . They live in small familial settlements consisting of as many huts as there are wives and another for single sons and another for daughters. . . . They live within distances ranging from one hundred to five hundred meters from each other. . . . When the eldest son of a wife is grown he takes his mother and brothers and makes a new settlement. (Monografia Psicosocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962)

It is likely that the greater socioeconomic differentiation afforded by nonmine migrancy played a significant role in accelerating this pattern of household nuclearization in the post–World War II era. When brothers living in the same coresidential units experienced different levels of success as migrants, social conflict and unit subdivision became far more likely. Migrant men generally took great care to ensure similar or equal treatment among their own wives in order to avoid jealousy and rivalries. However, this concern rarely extended to providing equitable treatment for the wives or mothers of other coresidential men (such as brothers). Jealousy and accusation of uloi—always a strong motive for schism—thus became far more likely in extended households with multiple migrant men than had previously been the case.

Domestic Strife as a Further Motive for Migration

Social conflict within extended households and local communities could in turn generate its own motives for migration and preferences for particular migratory strategies. Indeed, one of the most frequent reasons many men gave for starting a trip to South Africa was a desire to avoid "social problems" derived from conflict with other kin within their extended households. Employment in jobs other than the mines offered certain advantages to those whose migration was driven by such motives.

In particular, such migrants could avail themselves of their official inscrutability to avoid relatives back in Machaze. Migrants who refused to send money home to family members were often the subject of appeals to the Portuguese curator's[31] offices in South Africa. As early as 1948 the head curator's office noted that while it could easily locate miners who were the subject of complaint by neglected family members and could even compel them to send money home on risk of deportation, it was incapable of locating those who were not employed on the mines.[32]

Interestingly, nonmine migration was also considered an effective way to deal with an inevitable by-product of social conflict: uloi. Whereas a mine migrant could be located fairly easily, migrants in the townships could often keep their whereabouts "unknown" to disenchanted family members—and consequently to ancestral or other spirits who might act against the migrant on behalf of, or because of, those relatives, as described to me by a migrant who had first sought work in the Vaal in the late 1940s:

> [At that time] I did not have to worry any more about "social problems" because my family did not know where to find me. In Machaze I told them I was in the mines so that when they complained about my absence the vadzimu would look for me there and would not find me because I was actually here in Vereeniging.
>
> [However], this became more difficult later on. As there were more people from Machaze working here, news could get back. After we started sending letters is when the vadzimu "found us," and uloi became the same problem here as in Machaze. We did not know that the letters that they sent to us would allow the vadzimu to find us—but the vadzimu accomplished this by following those letters that our relatives sent back to us.

Throughout this period ambiguous feelings toward kin were also man-

ifest in the ways Machazian migrants organized their lives in the South African townships. While family members could, and often did, provide vital information or support, many men sought to avoid the complicated obligations that could come along with these arrangements. Whereas longer-term and more established migrants were often willing to bring first-time migrants back to the township with them in return for certain services, they were often reluctant to be located by needy relatives, particularly if those who sought their assistance were their seniors. Many of those migrants spoke of a long-standing and strong preference for associating primarily with friends rather than relatives while in South Africa. Even today Machazians in the townships remain reluctant to reside near close relatives who might make onerous claims on their resources, sabotage their attempts at managing the flow of information back to relatives in Machaze, or serve as the source of social conflict.

Many migrants from the same family thus also chose to belong to different churches. The rapid growth of church membership among Machazian migrants throughout the shift from mine to township-based migrancy reflected the vital role that churches came to play during this period in providing migrants with crucial social networks. The knowledge and contacts required for obtaining identity papers, securing employment, and organizing residence in the townships required assistance from others, particularly for younger migrants. Because migrants preferred to avoid incurring obligations toward kin, churches became the key forum through which they procured their identity documents, sought employment, and even found accommodation in the townships without relying on family members.

Many Machazian church leaders rose to prominence precisely because of their ability to act as key brokers in procuring employment for other Machazians in South Africa. In the course of my fieldwork I tallied thirty-nine Machazian men who reported finding employment in one specific industry in the Vereeniging area between 1955 and 1982 because of the intervention of one such broker. In my own interview with this pastor he estimated that the number of Machazians for whom he had found employment in this particular industry over a period of almost thirty years numbered between two thousand and twenty-five hundred men. Such brokers could provide employers with assurances that increased the attractiveness of the prospects they referred. Each broker had a vested interest in protecting his own reputation with his employer and thus in monitoring the performance of those he recommended. Problems with employees could thus be effectively redressed through these brokers.

This system also guaranteed against absenteeism and the impact of sudden and unexpected leaves of absence. Thus, when a church member was about to leave for Machaze for an extended period, a pastoral broker would usually ensure that person's replacement with another church member. Such assurances, along with the fact that as "illegal foreigners" Machazians were unlikely to become involved in organized labor disputes, made many employers see migrant laborers obtained through such brokers as more "stable" and dependable workers (Posel 1993, 426).[33]

Many of the churches that Machazian men attended during this time had a significant number of native South African members. Consequently, the coverage that these networks could provide throughout the major industrial areas of South Africa far surpassed that which kinship could usually offer:

> When I decided to go to Free State [the Orange Free State area] I did not know anyone there. . . . There were some from Machaze, but I did not know them. I was transferred by Eskom. . . . My pastor sent a letter to the pastor of the Zione church, and when I arrived there I lived with him for two months. . . . He was Xhosa. . . . Later he took me to a place and said here is where you can build your house.

The assistance provided through the church members and leaders did not entail the same kind of asymmetrical obligations that characterized a kinship system organized around seniority. All church members were equally obligated to assist one another. Churches also allowed the cost of certain forms of social support to be borne by a much broader constituency. Funerals, the costs of return trips, and support for those who were unemployed was often provided by churches rather than by kin. Moreover, expected donations, although frequent, were nominal and thus helped to avoid situations in which any one individual had to pay a large sum at any one time.

Social Transformation during the Last Fifteen Years of Colonial Rule, 1960–1975

During the waning years of Portuguese colonial rule social life in Machaze continued to be transformed as a result of seismic political, economic, and demographic shifts within the Mozambican colony and parallel sociodemographic developments within the South African townships.

Three developments in particular converged to offer many Machazians unprecedented new life-course options: the end of compulsory labor practices, the colony's dramatic economic development, and the growing possibilities for more permanent and formally sanctioned marital unions in South Africa. However, the new social possibilities that emerged from this convergence also upset established configurations of power within the core social institutions around which everyday Machazian life was organized. In particular, they transformed community-level authority into a site of heightened social contestation and set the stage for a novel reconfiguration of marriage that had profound implications for gendered and intergenerational relations throughout the war-torn and postconflict decades following Mozambique's independence in 1975.

The End of Chibalo and the Reign of the Mambos

I have already discussed how the termination of chibalo affected socioeconomic opportunities in Machaze during the last decade of colonial rule. Another of the most significant, if inadvertent, effects of the chibalo regime's demise was the undermining of the local authority of the régulos.

The Portuguese had incorporated the traditional authorities into their administration of the rural areas where the Indigenous Code was applied as the legal and administrative framework for non-European subjects. Their policies culminated in 1944 in the creation of a new local traditional authority figure called the "*régulo*," who was designated as the "administrative auxiliary" of the colonial government (Portaria Provincial No. 5639, July 29, 1944). These authorities were to be paid commissions from the hut taxes they assisted in collecting, from forced-labor recruitment, and from the sale of mandatory crop cultivation in the areas under their control. Their role in the distribution of land and in the resolution of minor local conflicts on the basis of customary practices was also recognized. Customary law was to be applied by these authorities only to African (nonwhite) populations in the areas designated as rural "Circunscrições" under the administrative purview of colonial officers appointed by the colony's governor. (Urban areas and other areas of primary European residence or under direct European economic control were designated as "Concelhos" and governed by the same civil and criminal code that applied in Portugal itself.) (Trindade 2003).

Throughout the colonial era the authority of local régulos had rested

on two pillars. One of these pillars was the power and responsibility invested in them by the colonial state. While benefiting directly from their position by receiving a percentage of the taxes collected in the area under their authority and by being exempted from paying taxes themselves, the primary leverage that régulos had with colonial authorities rested in the indispensable role they played in securing chibalo recruits at the behest of local administrators.[34]

The power of local régulos was equally derived from their culturally designated role as the ritual intercessors with the spirits of powerful ancestors, who were the guarantors of the land's fertility, and from their derivative functions in local dispute resolution and land allocation. Organized into a loose hierarchy, régulos presided over a regional system of annual rain/fertility ceremonies and were charged with assigning plots of unoccupied land to newcomers and to sons of local residents who were seeking their own homesteads.[35] They also presided regularly over the process of resolving local disputes, which most frequently involved accusations of uloi; charges of marital infidelity; and disputes over property, land tenure, and natural resource use. Régulos performed these tasks with the help and counsel of advisers known as *madodas.*

The abolition of compulsory labor significantly undermined the "colonial pillar" of régulo authority, at the same time that the "cultural pillar" of this authority was being challenged by the growing importance of churches and the growing preeminence of church leaders. Church teachings against ancestral veneration had always represented a direct challenge to the very ontological basis of régulo authority. However, this threat grew far more serious as churches and church leaders came to play a more central role in migration to South Africa during the 1950s and 1960s, when township-based migrancy overtook mine migrancy.

As Machazian men increasingly forsook the mines for employment in South African industry, they sought the assistance of pastors in Machaze who would write letters of reference to sister congregations in South Africa and who could provide advice (many of these pastors had been labor migrants from Machaze to South Africa at one point). Churches also became indispensable in other culturally vital roles for migrants living in the townships—such as ensuring the repatriation of those who died while working in South Africa. Unlike miners, whose employment included this benefit, those working as "illegal foreigners" in the townships were forced to seek other recourse, which they found in the churches.

Consequently, migrants increasingly included pastors back in Machaze

in that select group of people whom they took care to honor with gifts on returning from South Africa. In contrast, régulos, who played no role in the organization of Machazian interaction in South Africa, were rarely given similar consideration. Some pastors and church elders also began to take on some of the local conflict-resolution roles that hitherto had been the purview of the régulos, urging their congregants to resolve these disputes "within the family of God" rather than by "seeking advice from demons." In 1966 a colonial administrator reported that in Machaze "some régulos complain that the *mefundisses* [church leaders] were overstepping bounds, even baptizing in the wells used by the population and saying that they were more important than the régulos themselves" (Relatório sobre a Elevação da População Indígena, Mossurize, 20 Trimestre, 1966).

The reactions of some régulos during this period (such as Tuco Tuco, who, according to several oral sources, was particularly adamant in refusing to let churches operate within his territory) often garnered at least tacit support from Portuguese colonial officials, who not only harbored hostility toward the growing number of indigenous Protestant sects that dared to challenge the monopoly of the Roman Catholic Church but strongly suspected that they were promoting politically subversive ideas (Monografia Psicosocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962, and Nota de Referência à Circular 345/SDI, Mossurize, May 15, 1964).

It was during this period that Machazians now locate the emergence of a new form of "sociospiritual problem"—the "reign of the *mambos*"—that interestingly enough served to buttress the eroding power of local régulos.[36] These *mambos* were the ancestral spirits of recently deceased régulos, who began to be identified by diagnosticians and healers (nyangas and nyamusoros) as the spirits who were acting virulently against the population. Up to this time the spirits of the régulos had been primarily associated with protection of the land and with ensuring its fertility. However, during this period the spirits of many of the régulos who had been regarded as among the most powerful under the colonial chibalo regime—such as Chikwatira—began to be identified as mfukwas.[37]

Mfukwas were the hardest spirits to appease and deal with, and because the mambos were former régulos, these spirits were viewed as particularly powerful and motivated to kill. Redress usually required extensive consultations with nyangas and nyamusoros and a payment of some sort to the descendants of the mfukwa. Arguably, the emergence of the "reign of the mambos" reinforced the power of two categories of actors in

Machazian society—the régulos and the nyangas/nyamusoros—precisely at the time when both were suffering a growing crisis of legitimacy.[38]

Interestingly, the doctrines and practices of many of the Christian churches also changed during this period, in part as a reaction to this new sociospiritual crisis but also because of the growing competition among church leaders for followers. As church leadership became an increasingly important pole of local social power (and economic benefit), pastors not only challenged the authority of régulos but increasingly vied for power and status with one another. Church leaders thus deployed doctrine increasingly in order to compete. For example, new rules concerning marriage were often invoked to recruit members while preventing congregant losses. In a number of churches women were prohibited from marrying members of other churches, since it was assumed that such unions would result in their loss to their husband's church. Conversely, men were often encouraged to marry nonchurch members with the understanding that their wives would be brought into their church.

The churches that reportedly grew the fastest during this period were not those that had first established themselves in the late 1930s and early 1940s such as the American Board but the new so-called Zionist sects.[39] These churches were distinct from their predecessors in two primary respects: many permitted polygyny, and, perhaps most importantly, they increasingly accommodated fundamental Machazian beliefs about the existence and activity of ancestral spirits in the lives of the living. Within some of these churches certain leaders, namely those designated as "prophets," began to intercede with these spirits in a manner very similar to that of nyangas and nyamusoros, although they claimed to be empowered to do so by the Holy Spirit (rather than by one of the three types of ancestral spirits that empowered nyangas and nyamusoros). The Holy Spirit was also regarded as particularly effective in combating the mambos.[40]

It became somewhat common for new churches to emerge in the Machaze area during the 1960s, and the number of new churches multiplied as quarrels among leaders often resulted in schisms that established new congregations.[41] Of the oral histories of eleven churches in Machaze that I was able to obtain, seven resulted from such fissions. The proliferation of churches multiplied the poles of local power and further intensified competition over local community authority within Machaze. Heightened social tensions at this level played their own significant role in setting the stage for the civil war during the immediate period that followed the end of colonialism.

Incipient Transnational Polygyny

Another of the social developments during the waning years of colonial rule that had profound implications during the war resulted from the sociodemographic transformation of the South African townships. While the controlled and regulated social environment of the mines had limited the exposure of men to contact with South African women, the townships allowed for the development of more robust forms of conjugal union in which a fuller array of obligations and expectations other than sexual services might be involved.[42] The massive influx of South African women into the urban areas during this period also improved the "conjugal market" in terms of potential conjugal partners for men from Machaze. Whereas in 1950 women were estimated to make up less than 30 percent of South Africa's urban and periurban population, by 1980 they were reported to make up 45 percent of the urban population, and in some places, such as in Soweto, to have reached virtual parity with the male population.[43]

Men from Machaze offered several benefits over South African men to this flood of urbanizing South African women. Although often occupying less well-paid jobs, Machazian men were less likely to remain unemployed than urban South African men, who often refused to take certain types of jobs altogether. Men from Machaze also had fewer family members who could make demands on these women.

Based on the life history surveys I collected, whereas only 10 percent of those migrating to South Africa during the 1940s (N = 21) reported being involved in a conjugal relation with a South African woman during that decade, over 33 percent of those migrating between 1962 and 1978 (N = 52) reported being involved in such relationships. However, by themselves such figures do not fully convey the important shift in how these relationships were coming to be redefined. The qualitative shift in the rights and obligations that defined these relationships is more evident in ethnographic accounts, such as the particularly illuminating example provided by Mutisse of his own "conjugal trajectory" during a migrant career in South Africa that spanned the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s:

> On my first two trips I never thought about a South African woman. On the first trip I lived in a company compound . . . on the second one in a hostel. . . . I also lived in a hostel on the third trip, but during that time I had to go often into Vereeniging and I kept seeing this Xhosa woman who was working as a domes-

> tic. . . . We eventually were together but she lived at her employer's house and I lived in the hostel. But she would sometimes wash my clothes and make food. I sometimes gave her some money to help with her expenses. . . . I did not see her after I came back on the next trip from Machaze, but I also got a job that trip as a domestic and I came to know and be with another Xhosa woman who was the domestic next door. We had a child and I supported her for some time, but we had disagreements. . . . I did not pay lobola. . . . Later, after we separated, I met a Zulu woman who was working at a supermarket in Van der Biljk [Park]. Although we lived separately we spent a lot of time together, and when she had the child I decided to pay lobola. . . . At that time [1963] I did not plan to come back to Mozambique again. It was very expensive, and after I had paid half she left, and when I tried to pursue her, her brothers beat me very badly. . . . I went back to Mozambique and was married later that same year. . . . After my wife in Machaze was pregnant I returned here to Sebokeng. . . . Later I met a Shangaana woman and she also had a child. . . . I moved to Sebokeng in 1967 so we could have a house together. . . . I only returned again to Machaze in 1970 and then again right before the Portuguese left, which I saw [in 1975].

While few biographical accounts of one individual so fully describe the successive evolution of rights and responsibilities assumed in the relationships undertaken by Machazian men with South African women, such accounts do generally describe a qualitative expansion over time, in the rights and obligations that defined these attachments between South African women and migrant men from Machaze.

Notably, those few men who reported exploring conjugal options with South African women during this period also maintained attachments and social investments—including spouses—back in Machaze. This represented a significant new social development. Although before the 1950s oral accounts and colonial records alike mention that migrants occasionally took wives in South Africa, they also describe these men as permanently abandoning their home communities, never to be seen or heard from again. In contrast, Machazian men in the waning years of colonial rule were beginning to explore and develop a new social option—that of "transnational polygyny" (Lubkemann 2000a). Still an incipient and experimental social model at the time of decolonization in 1975, this new social possibility played a prominent role in shaping the social options and possibilities migrants explored during the civil war that arrived in Machaze in 1979.

Situating Migration

Throughout this chapter I have demonstrated that migration was continuously and dynamically resituated as a strategy deployed in a multitude of social and political struggles at various levels in Machazian society. Although it became a particularly effective strategy for resisting onerous colonial policies it was also deployed in a complex array of local social and micropolitical struggles. Migration in Machaze was thus simultaneously a critical strategy for negotiating the immediate authority of elders, for consolidating gendered power, and for resolving threats and concerns grounded in local beliefs about uloi. Migration throughout the colonial period was thus never merely a response to macrolevel political or economic dynamics but also to "other struggles"—generational and gendered—within households, families, and communities. As often as not, Machazian migrants were recalibrating their position in local social relations, even as they were also attempting to negotiate their relationship with the colonial state. The chapters that follow demonstrate how the gendered and generational social struggles that played a primary role in shaping colonial-era labor migration up to 1975 continued to shape postcolonial war-time displacement (1977–92) and the further development of migration regimes after the end of Mozambique's civil war.

Uneven degrees of colonial power and penetration posed "the problem of handling the West" (Nandy 1983) in different ways and to varying extents for different peoples and social groups within the legal borders of colonized societies such as Mozambique. In studying the trajectories and specific actions of colonized peoples we must not only seek to identify the heterogeneity of their experiences with colonial power but also the variable extent to which "resistance" balanced concerns with "other struggles" in shaping social action. The importance of determining appropriate proportionality looms largest as we seek to identify the determining links between the colonial and the postcolonial, for ultimately this distinction is one that implicitly privileges macropolitical change. Inasmuch as strategies of resistance such as migration were also implicated in social struggles cast in local terms, the continuities that shaped these strategies across "named" breaks in history—such as that between the colonial and the postcolonial periods, or between "peace" and "war"—may be found to weigh as heavily in shaping behavior as the differences.

SECTION II

The Social Conditioning of War

Although anthropologists have long addressed conflict within societies and between social units, few have paid much attention to the violent contests for political dominance and state power that have so profoundly marked the ascension of the nation as the hegemonic political form. Until recently, most anthropological studies of organized violence have focused on its role in maintaining order in and organizing "stateless societies" (e.g., Chagnon 1968a, 1968b, 1979; Vayda 1976; Ferguson 1983, 1990) or its role in the evolution of social complexity (e.g., Otterbein 1970; Webster 1977; Carneiro 1990; Haas 1982, 1990; Cohen 1984). Or they have debated the relative weight of biological, sociocultural, and economic-material factors in fostering organized violence (e.g., Vayda 1976; Abler 1979; Ember 1982; Ferguson 1983, 1990, 1994; Chagnon 1979; Divale and Harris 1976; Harris 1972, 1979, 1984; Carneiro 1994). Thus, while the "national order of things" (Malkki 1995a) has played a prominent role in shaping anthropology's treatment of many other social and political processes (not least of all, warfare's "paradigmatic victims," refugees), for a long time the discipline's framing of organized political violence largely excluded the contemporary state.

However, this did not mean that armed struggles in which state power was at stake were irrelevant to the social processes or settings cultural anthropologists were studying. Throughout most of the twentieth century quite a few classic ethnographers were immersed in societies that were being profoundly shaken and transformed by state-induced violence and political turmoil. Some opted to bracket out such conflagrations from their analysis—viewing them as aberrations from the "normal" course of the everyday life they took to be their scientific object of study. E. Evans-Pritchard wrote ethnographies that were long referred to as paragons

of holistic analysis (1940) yet that entirely ignored how recent colonial conquest and ongoing military pacification campaigns had profoundly affected the social practices and organization of the groups he was studying. As anthropologist Sharon Hutchinson (1996, 28–35) has noted, the irony in this case was all the greater because it was the "problem" of pacifying and administering the Nuer of Sudan that led to Evans-Pritchard being hired by the British colonial regime to undertake this research in the first place.

The midcentury dominance of structural-functionalist theories of social and cultural organization played a significant role in minimizing the discipline's treatment of violent political conflict throughout the colonial era—particularly in Africa. Processes (such as war) that implied societywide violence, flux, and destabilization presented particular problems to a theoretical framework that described all social practices in terms of their contribution to the reproduction of social order. Even though leading theorists such as Victor Turner (1957) and Max Gluckman (1960) eventually drew anthropological attention to social conflict, they nevertheless emphasized its role in reproducing structural continuity rather than in effecting social change. Violence, when it was analyzed, tended to be of the limited, contained, and socially controllable sort found in "ritual," rather than the more socially pervasive, indeterminate, and socially transformative kind resulting from war.

Anthropological interest in the broader and more sustained contemporary forms of organized political violence in which state power is at stake is a rather recent phenomenon, one related both to the dramatic decolonization struggles that erupted in so many of the societies in which anthropologists worked and to the discipline's growing preoccupation with theorizing social change. Violent political upheaval has regrettably become an almost paradigmatic feature of the postcolonial condition, shaping the social trajectories and subjectivities of hundreds of millions of people, sometimes over the course of decades and generations. Organized violence has thus insisted on an accounting from the anthropologists who work in the shadow of its persistent and pervasive presence.

Recent anthropologists have contributed to the study of violent political upheaval by examining organized political violence as a social project that is as culturally informed and embedded in historically specific social contexts as any other. David Lan's landmark ethnographic study of the armed struggle against the racist settler regime in Rhodesia was one of the first to bring this theoretical sensibility to bear on the analysis of a

contemporary war (1985). Lan highlighted the pivotal role that spirit mediums played in securing social legitimacy for the freedom fighters who sought to overthrow the white minority regime of Ian Smith. In presenting the Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army (ZANLA) guerrillas to the people as the legitimate heirs and descendants of the original ancestral spirit owners of the land, the mediums effectively reframed a political struggle originally inspired by Marxist ideology in locally relevant terms that mobilized massive popular support. Their recasting of what the war was about in turn shaped the practice of military violence itself. Lan thus documents how ZANLA guerrillas obeyed ritual prescriptions and proved responsive to restrictions that mediums placed on their use of violence. Guerrillas also assumed violent tasks that the mediums had assigned to them—such as ferreting out and punishing witches (Lan 1985, 166–69)—thus confronting "threats" that would not have otherwise been suggested by their avowed Marxist precepts. In this manner local ritual specialists played a significant role in mediating the interfaces of violence among the guerrillas, the population, and the agents of the colonial state by mobilizing vernacular understandings of power that garnered popular support and restructured the dynamics of violence itself.

Subsequently, ethnographers such as Paul Richards (1996) in Sierra Leone, Heike Behrend (1999) in Uganda, Stephen Ellis (1999) in Liberia, Christian Geffray (1991) and Ken Wilson (1992) in Mozambique, Christopher Taylor (1999) in Rwanda, and Sharon Hutchinson (1996) in Sudan have followed Lan's lead and expanded on his ideas by exploring how the violent pursuit of political objectives has been socially organized and conditioned in a variety of postcolonial contexts.

Several of these nuanced ethnographies reveal how war-time violence is an expression of culturally specific understandings of the ontological topography of power itself. In his analysis of the specific forms of violence perpetrated in the Rwandan genocide, Christopher Taylor (1999) described how Rwandan notions of national political power draw metaphorically on culturally specific beliefs about the body and biological reproduction. Terms used to conceptualize social reproduction serve as the basis for how social order and disorder are understood at various levels, including that of the "national body" itself (Taylor 1999, 110–25). Consequently, military tactics used during the infamous 1994 genocide that often struck outside observers as "irrational"—such as the proliferation of roadblocks, often within view of each other—are revealed as less arbitrary or senseless when understood as displays of strength in the

ability to regulate the flow into, and to purge, the corporate body (Taylor 1999, 130–37).

In her analysis of the genesis of the Holy Spirit Movement in northern Uganda (the precursor to the infamous Lord's Resistance Army) Heike Behrend (1999) demonstrated how specific local histories and culturally scripted interpretations shaped what both the organizers and armed participants in this violent insurgency understood the war "to be about." She argued that the interrelated depravities of genocidal state violence, famine, economic destitution, and the explosion of AIDS experienced under successive predatory postcolonial regimes (Idi Amin, Milton Obote, and Yoweri Museveni) were interpreted by the Acholi of northern Uganda as evidence of the rapid growth and spread of witchcraft. The appeal of Alice Lakwena, the Holy Spirit Movement's founding leader, was derived from her promise to eradicate this scourge of witchcraft. Consequently, her armed insurgency's agenda was far more than simply a war against the government but, rather, was a cosmic struggle against spiritual malfeasance. Understood in these terms, the insurgency was not the source of violent aggression but a response to it.

In Mozambique, Ken Wilson (1992, 1994) documented the emergence of a movement late in the civil war in the northern provinces of Zambezia and Nampula that was organized around a charismatic individual's claims to have access to spiritual power that enabled his followers to similarly "make war on violence"—but only by wielding "white weapons" (the term used to refer to weapons that did not use bullets, but only inflicted harm as a result of gleaming, or "white," metal, i.e., knives, machetes, scythes, and other agricultural implements) and pursuing seemingly suicidal tactics of unprotected frontal assault. Nevertheless, these self-designated "Naparamas," a Macua word meaning "irresistible force" (Vines 1991, 18) succeeded for some time in sweeping large areas of these provinces free of the insurgency (RENAMO). They captured the imagination of a population that was thirsting for an end to bloody civil conflict by casting "violent war" itself as an evil to be eradicated—paradoxically enough through ritualized forms of violence.

When viewed together, these anthropological studies vividly demonstrate how contemporary armed insurgencies creatively draw on culturally and historically specific idioms and yet are far from being merely "traditionalist" in their objectives or driven by "primordial sentiments," as Africa's "new wars" are often depicted (Richards 2005). Rather, these violent movements mobilize a creative fusion of symbols—some of contemporary and even "global" provenance and others from a more idiomatic

past—to propose drastic solutions to the pressing problems of the present, which include historically structured social and political exclusion, thwarted expectations, and shrinking economic opportunities.[1] From this perspective, contemporary African warfare is relocated from the realm of the exceptional and placed within a much broader repertoire of local enactments of a "malcontent modernity" (Comaroff and Comaroff 1999). It is thus positioned at the extreme end of a broader continuum of culturally informed tactics for countering the insecurity, volatility, and dashed expectations that result from complexly nested forms of subalterity that are often rooted in political and economic processes that are global in scope—processes such as colonialism, frontline status in the cold war, or structural adjustment.

Some of the other tactics in this continuum are far less violent—as in the proliferating forms of charismatic Christianity that promise to harness the power of the greater force of the Holy Spirit against the perils of invisible power (Sommers 2001; Ashforth 2000)—while other practices have proven rather more dramatically aggressive in form (Geschiere 1997; Comaroff and Comaroff 1999; White 2000; Ashforth 2000; Niehaus et al. 2001; Smith 2001). Ultimately, by situating organized political violence within this continuum, anthropologists of contemporary African conflicts have insisted on placing war "back within the range of social possibilities, as something made through social action, and something that can be moderated by social action, rather than viewed as so exceptional as to require 'special' explanatory effort" (Richards 2004, 3).

The three chapters in section 2 explore how the Mozambican war, as manifest specifically in Machaze, was constituted and moderated through social action. More specifically, these chapters explore the social conditioning and production of the war in Machaze as the result of interactions among the postcolonial government with a political agenda forged by a specific history of anticolonial resistance, a heterogeneous local population with its own historically forged attitude toward political power, and an incipient insurgency created and backed by hostile foreign powers.

In chapter 3 I deploy and further develop the theoretical concept of "structural violence" to describe how Machazians experienced dashed expectations and a dramatic deterioration in their living conditions during the first five years of Mozambique's independence. The intrusive social, political, and economic policies of the postcolonial regime generated deep grievances among the district's residents. Machazians came to blame the new government for their condition, even though many of the new difficulties that they faced were partially attributable to much

larger international political and economic developments. Machazians insisted on understanding the new government's practices in terms of their already existing ontological logics and categories of power—despite FRELIMO's own frontal political assault on those very categories themselves. Chapter 4 details how Machaze was gradually transformed into a war zone through the nonlinear interpenetrations of structural and acute violence. The FRELIMO government initially misinterpreted the reluctance of local residents to comply with government relocation orders as evidence of their support for the insurgency—when in fact that reluctance was largely grounded in other concerns. The postcolonial government reacted with increasingly coercive measures that ironically transformed their misplaced fears into reality, eventually driving some residents to avidly support RENAMO.

Engaging with the emergent historiographic debate about the social causes and dynamics of the Mozambican civil war, I argue that the insurgency's early appeal to many of the district's residents must be understood against the backdrop of a long history of attempts to maximize distance from an intrusive central state that had been reinforced by the postcolonial policies discussed in chapter 3. While much of the debate over whether RENAMO garnered any local legitimacy has revolved around the question of whether it ever developed a full-fledged political vision of the nation, I suggest that it was precisely the *lack* of any program for the central state that most appealed to a population historically subjected to unwelcome state intervention.

The dynamics of popular participation at the outset of the conflict were ultimately driven by two forms of misrecognition: that of FRELIMO, which initially misrecognized local strategies of disengagement for support of the insurgency, and that of the local populace, which misrecognized the insurgency's lack of a national political project for a vision of political order in which the local presence of the state would be minimized. Extending this argument beyond the confines of the Mozambican war, I argue that analysts of other conflicts with similar histories of state-society relations may themselves misrecognize local political agency as illegitimate, anemic, or even nonexistent because they miss the possibility of local visions of the "political" that do not accord centrality to the state. Ethnographic approaches that originate in the historically informed and culturally expressed understandings of local actors may offer a better understanding of the social conditioning of political agency.

Finally, in chapter 5 I explore how ethnography can also productively inform the analysis of the dynamics of war-time violence. A growing num-

ber of anthropologists have emphasized the expressive capacity of violence in war zones—casting it as a dramatic form of public communication shaped by the cultural grammar of its expression, rather than merely part of a strategy for minimizing local dissent through terror tactics. For Sierra Leone, Richards (1996, 2004, 2005) has convincingly argued that public dramaturgy is as much a part of the arsenal deployed by opposing military factions as are the more obviously lethal weapons they wield in their hands. Acute violence is a factor at the very center of the dramaturgical technologies of war, yet it achieves its objective less through the disempowerment of its victims and more through the messages that such bodily inscriptions communicate to a broader public about what might transpire and why. Victims of violence are thus not always or even most often the primary intended audience for the messages so painfully inscribed on their bodies. Thus the Revolutionary United Front's tactic of cutting off of the hands of civilians in Sierra Leone (Richards 1996), the meticulous brick-by-brick razing of every vestige of physical infrastructure in RENAMO's "destruction zones" in Mozambique (Wilson 1992), and the hobbling by machete of already immobilized victims by the *genocidaire* in Rwanda (Taylor 1999)—all these acts of violence that to outsiders have seemed acts of wanton and meaningless brutality are revealed through ethnographic contextualization as sophisticated (if tragically consequential) forms of political discourse, messages rendered with dramatic clarity by organized political factions for those who share the same social context and its cultural idioms, whether for an opposing faction or a broader public.

However, all the aforementioned ethnographies investigate wartime violence as an expression of the interests and "political projects" of armed factions locked in a contest for national power. In chapter 5, I incorporate another layer into the anthropological analysis of contemporary wars by demonstrating how wartime violence in Machaze (and throughout Mozambique as a whole) was significantly shaped by local-level tensions that had little to do with the war's "master political narrative" or its partisan narrators. Many residents of Machaze managed to appropriate both the government's and the insurgency's capacity for violence in order to engage in local social struggles that were largely unrelated to the contest for state power. I argue that ethnography is particularly well suited to assess the violent dramaturgy of "fragmented wars" (Lubkemann 1998, 2000a, 2005a) that are shaped by myriad local subplots which may articulate with national political projects but are also driven by their own semi-autonomous scripts.

CHAPTER 3

Imposing the New Mozambique

Sowing the Seeds of Postcolonial Disillusion

In the first five years that followed Mozambican independence in 1975 the expectations of Machazians were first raised to euphoric levels and then dramatically dashed, leaving them to struggle with new challenges that significantly hindered their efforts to pursue their life strategies. During this period Machazians had to contend with rising levels of structural violence.

The concept of "structural violence" originated with Johan Galtung (1969), who defined violence as "those factors that cause people's actual physical and mental realizations to be below their potential realizations" and who noted that such results can, and often are, the product of specific political and social structural forms. Elaborating on the concept, others such as Peter Uvin (1998) have defined structural violence as "institutionalized inequalities of status, rights and power . . . that are not the result of freedom of choice by the individuals or groups who are victimized, but rather are the consequence of a more powerful group's use of coercion, which becomes institutionalized into legal systems, and justified through mythology, religion, philosophy, ideology, and history" (104).

While drawing generally on these conventional definitions, my concept of structural violence is narrower, more dynamic, and emphasizes subjective over objective criteria. As used by Uvin, Galtung, and others, structural violence refers to extreme degrees of social inequality that prevent the socially marginalized from achieving a particular threshold of living conditions.[1] However, analysts who use the term "structural violence" tend to reserve for themselves the right to determine where that threshold lies and what conditions constitute it. Analysts thus differ

considerably in how they specify that threshold—from the optimal conditions that would allow subjects to "realize their full potential" (Galtung 1969) to far more basic conditions of mere survivability (Uvin 1998). For some scholars the concept of structural violence is merely another way to refer to the institutionalization of social inequality itself—at least when that inequality outrages the analyst (Farmer 1997; Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois 2004).

Rather than referring to the ways in which structural conditions can engender a violation of some objective that is, externally determined threshold, I use structural violence to refer to the subjective sense of acute deprivation produced by changing socioeconomic and political conditions. By "deprivation" I am referring to the subjective package of sentiments—of disappointment, disempowerment, loss, and frustration—that results when groups or individuals perceive that their own experience is falling short of some standard they expect and believe they have a right to achieve.

As Uvin and others have rightly noted, growing social inequality can, and often is, the source of such sentiments. However, social inequality by itself does not always produce a subjective sense of deprivation. Indeed, the vast majority of the world's people live under conditions that are both marked by quite dramatic inequality and that deprive them of realizing their full potential—yet many accept this condition as simply "the way things are." When people are socialized to accept inequality as normal, then its persistence—even in extreme forms—may not violate their expectations nor, consequently, generate sentiments of deprivation, even among those who are most disadvantaged by structural conditions. In short, social inequality without a subjective sense of deprivation on the part of those disadvantaged by it is not structural violence—it is merely social inequality.

Structural violence as I define it is inherently wrapped up in dynamic processes of structural change. More than absolute thresholds or social differences, it is the way in which social transformation can reduce the capacity for subjects to realize their own expectations—and most particularly those they associate with normal everyday living—that matter most in generating sentiments of loss and deprivation.[2] Structural violence thus occurs when changes in the broader social, economic, and political environment render everyday and strategic life projects dramatically more difficult or even impossible to realize.

Deep grievances were generated among many Machazians by the

dramatic deterioration of economic conditions and the imposition of new policies that were meant to profoundly transform local socioeconomic organization and political order. Although many of the mounting difficulties Machazians confronted were at least partially attributable to much broader political and economic currents that the new Mozambican state itself struggled to contend with, in this chapter I explore why most Machazians blamed their deteriorating conditions on the postcolonial government, as well as the political consequences of this attribution. The roots of this process arguably lie in the fundamental differences between the expectations held by Machazians and the new FRELIMO government about what decolonization would mean in terms of governance, the role of the state in local lives, and the postcolonial social and economic order. The Machazian expectations were informed by localized and specific experiences with a relatively anemic colonial power that produced strategies and understandings of "resistance" that differed substantially from those that FRELIMO forged throughout the course of its decadelong armed confrontation with colonial power.

The Meaning of Decolonization in Comparative Perspective

The ways in which Portuguese colonial rule was experienced and dealt with by Mozambique's rural populations varied greatly from place to place, giving rise to different understandings of what decolonization was all about when it occurred in 1974. As detailed in chapter 1, the intrusion of Portuguese colonial authorities into everyday life in Machaze, though at times heavy-handed and often unwanted, was relatively tenuous, sporadic, and limited in its scope and effectiveness. Whereas Portuguese policies undoubtedly presented Machazians with onerous challenges that affected their lives, many factors allowed them to frustrate colonial designs in ways that were not possible in some other parts of Mozambique. In particular, the ease with which its residents could pursue migration options in Rhodesia and South Africa or seek refuge in the recesses of the district's vast and inaccessible hinterland severely limited the effectiveness of the Portuguese in governing an area they regarded as lacking any important economic resources.

However, in many other rural areas of Mozambique the Portuguese yoke weighed much more heavily and colonial power proved a far more pervasive force in the shaping of everyday life. This was particularly the

case in those areas where the Portuguese implemented forced cash-crop cultivation of sugar, rice, and cotton. The impact of forced cotton cultivation was dramatic north of the Zambezi River, where eight out of the colony's eleven mandated cotton growing areas were located. There the colonial authorities used harsh measures to compel rural populations to prioritize cotton over staple-crop cultivation, often resulting in chronic food insecurity, hunger, and malnutrition (Isaacman 1996; Pitcher 2002). The numbers of Mozambicans involved in forced cotton cultivation in these areas never fell below 250,000 between 1938 and 1961, and at times exceeded 450,000 (Isaacman 1996, 45, 143).

This much harsher and pervasive experience with colonial power led to deep popular discontent that eventually gave birth to the anticolonial armed movement. In one such area in the far north, a Portuguese administrator in 1960 called out troops that eventually fired on local protesters seeking the freedom of rural leaders who had been imprisoned for attempting to establish indigenous cotton-production cooperatives that would have challenged the colonial state's monopoly. The infamous Mueda Massacre galvanized opposition to the Portuguese throughout the far north of the country, particularly among the Makonde people, who were its primary victims. Not long thereafter (in 1962) with the support of Tanzania's president, Julius Nyerere, the Front for the Liberation of Mozambique was organized to unite a variety of recently formed Mozambican organizations with nationalist and anticolonial objectives. Availing themselves of Makonde networks that spanned Mozambique's northern border with Tanzania, FRELIMO's first armed action in their war for liberation took place in September 1964 in the northern Cabo Delgado Province when 250 armed guerrillas trained in Algeria attacked Portuguese military positions (Newitt 1995, 523).

Plans to open additional fronts throughout the country were curtailed by the coordinated efforts of the Portuguese, Rhodesian, South African, and Swazi secret police forces that uncovered FRELIMO's underground networks and arrested over fifteen hundred FRELIMO sympathizers (Hall and Young 1997, 14). During its early years, FRELIMO also suffered from schisms within its own ranks that ultimately proved crucial in shaping its political direction and practice. Initially, FRELIMO's leadership had been drawn largely from two different strata of elites: local rural elites in northern Mozambique who had mobilized in opposition to Portuguese agricultural policies that threatened to impinge on their prerogatives, and educated urban elites, many of whom had been educated

abroad and who were classified as *assimilados*, that is, those few among the nonwhite population deemed to have met the colonial criteria necessary to be reclassified as "civilized."[3]

Many assimilados acutely felt the contradictions and implicit abuses of a colonial racial classification system that both enabled them to experience greater educational opportunities than most Mozambicans of African descent while at the same time marginalizing them as "second-class citizens." Higher education had also exposed a number of them to the milieu of anticolonial ideas and ideologies sweeping the international landscape after World War II. Increasingly, the cosmopolitan wing of FRELIMO urged radical social revolution as part of the anticolonial struggle, while the wing of the party tied to the northern rural elites remained far more reluctant to revamp the indigenous social system associated with traditional headmanship (from whose ranks many were drawn). Tensions between these groups eventually erupted into open conflict when, in 1968 and 1969, in a swift succession of events that followed the assassination of FRELIMO's first leader, Eduardo Chivambo Mondlane (who had worked to maintain a unified front), key leaders from the rural elite wing defected to the Portuguese, while other rural leaders tried to organize a rival organization that was based on ethnicity. This schism ultimately left the cosmopolitan wing to consolidate its power within FRELIMO and ultimately resulted in the movement's adoption of a more explicitly Marxist ideology. In those areas of the far north where FRELIMO was able to gradually gain control and exercise some modicum of governance it began to organize villages, emphasizing communal work and property ownership. It also increasingly challenged and replaced traditional authorities (Hall and Young 1997, 27–34).

As the anticolonial war progressed through the late 1960s the Portuguese military developed a strategy aimed at containing FRELIMO activity in the remotely populated rural areas of northern Mozambique. As part of this strategy they began to force rural inhabitants to relocate into fortified settlements cordoned off by Portuguese troops in an attempt to drain FRELIMO of peasant support. At the same time they pursued a scorched-earth strategy meant to render uninhabitable those areas in which FRELIMO had come to exercise some form of control.

While this strategy proved largely effective in containing FRELIMO's activity within the northern provinces of Cabo Delgado and Niassa throughout most of the 1960s, these brutal tactics eventually began to backfire. By 1973 FRELIMO had gradually extended its influence

throughout the province of Tete in areas north of the Zambezi River, aided by local populations alienated by the forced villagization policies and the growing anti-Portuguese hostility among the hundreds of thousands of northern Mozambicans they had displaced. In the early 1970s FRELIMO also benefited from reversals in Zambian and Malawian government policies, when they began to allow FRELIMO to use their territories as bases for operations. Yet despite over a decade of engagement in armed anticolonial struggle, at the moment of decolonization in 1974 FRELIMO was still far from having achieved a military victory and had only recently launched sporadic actions in many of the provinces south of the Zambezi River.

It was the dramatic unfolding of events in Portugal itself in the first half of 1974 that thrust decolonization on Mozambique with a speed that caught FRELIMO by surprise. Led by junior army officers, the 25th of April Revolution (1974) in Portugal was in large part a response to the impending failure of Portugal's anticolonial war on another front—in West Africa in Portuguese Guinea (Guinea-Bissau since independence). Although the Portuguese military had suffered a slow deterioration of its positions in Angola and in Mozambique, it still remained in control of the vast majority of the territory and of all the key economic and population areas in those two countries. However, in Guinea the Portuguese military faced imminent collapse and outright defeat. Unable to convince the dictatorship to negotiate an honorable withdrawal and also motivated by other professional grievances, junior officers in the Portuguese military staged a successful coup that quickly gained broad popular support in a country exhausted by over a decade of colonial war. By July 1974 independence for the colonies was publicly announced by the coup leaders in Lisbon. On September 8, 1974, Portugal's new government acceded to FRELIMO's demands that it be recognized as the only legitimate representative of the Mozambican people, resulting in a cease-fire and the formation of a new transitional government.

In the immediate aftermath of the September 8 announcement an armed uprising staged by white settlers erupted in the capital city of Lourenço Marques (renamed Maputo after independence), only to be put down by Portuguese troops on orders from Lisbon. In the aftermath of September 8 the Portuguese settler population began to flee en masse. By early 1975 over two-thirds of the colony's white settlers had fled the country (Hall and Young 1997, 45). Many committed acts of industrial and other forms of sabotage as they left, compounding the negative economic

effect of their withdrawal for Mozambique. Portuguese troops began to be quickly repatriated in October 1974. An interregnum government with a Portuguese commissioner, joint military participation, and a FRELIMO-dominated cabinet ran the country up until the official day appointed for independence (June 25, 1975), when FRELIMO assumed power.

In the wake of this rapid unfolding of events, FRELIMO went virtually overnight from being an organization driven by primarily military objectives, with activities confined to remote and sparsely populated parts of the territory, to assuming responsibility for the governance of an entire nation in the throes of economic collapse. Although FRELIMO's accomplishments in the "liberated zones" of the far north had been noteworthy, its capacity to meet the challenges of public administration for an entire country was extremely limited.[4] The country's administrative posts were rapidly filled by thousands of FRELIMO members, many of whose only qualification was their loyalty to the party and record as anticolonial combatants.

Decolonization in this fast-forward mode had extremely different meanings for the Mozambicans who lived in different areas of the country. Some parts of Mozambique had experienced decolonization as a process that took place over many years. Thus, in areas such as northern Cabo Delgado where the anticolonial war had been fought the longest and where FRELIMO had gradually consolidated its control, a decade of armed anticolonial struggle had shaped expectations about what independence would imply for the socioeconomic and local political order and in consolidating commitment for the movement (Borges Coelho 1993; West 2005).

However, in other parts of the country local expectations about what independence would or should imply had been far less influenced by the armed anticolonial struggle. Unlike the populations of Tete, Niassa, and Cabo Delgado provinces, the residents of Machaze had not witnessed the physical violence of warfare, nor had they been subject to the forced villagization that the Portuguese military had so brutally implemented elsewhere. Neither the Portuguese nor FRELIMO had any significant military presence in the district at the time of independence. Indeed, it was only during the last two years of the war that FRELIMO was able to initiate political mobilization efforts and launch sporadic military action against the Portuguese forces in the northern districts of the province of Manica. However, as residents of the province's southernmost district, Machazians remained largely unaffected by these events.[5]

In Machaze other factors had also conspired to limit the visibility of the anticolonial armed struggle during the last decade of colonial rule. During the war, the heightened vigilance and activity of the Portuguese Secret Police (PIDE, after 1970 renamed the DGS—Direcção Geral de Seguranca) played an important role throughout the colony in limiting and distorting information about the conflict, particularly in the noncombatant zones such as Machaze.[6] More specifically in Machaze, the historical orientation of labor migration southward toward South Africa and away from the northern districts of Manica and Sofala (where the Portuguese had typically sent forced-labor conscripts to work) limited local interest in, or attention to, developments even in the north of the province, much less in the far north of Mozambique where the anticolonial war was fought in earnest.[7]

In summary, when decolonization suddenly dawned in Mozambique, Machazian worldviews included little reference to the armed anticolonial struggle. Anticolonial resistance in Machaze had primarily consisted of strategies of disengagement from colonial authorities rather than any attempt at replacing colonial rule itself. Concomitantly, Machazian visions of the postcolonial future did not anticipate the radical reorganization of the local social, political, or economic order. If the district's residents welcomed independence they did so because they envisioned it, if anything, as an end to the central state's onerous—if often unwieldy and ineffective—intrusions into local life. Rather than the culmination of a long process of political struggle as it was in northern Mozambique, decolonization in Machaze was virtually an overnight event that brought the area's residents into an encounter with the brand-new government organized by FRELIMO with its own distinctive outlook on the role of central authority. Within the first two years of independence the differences between the new government's vision of the postcolonial future and that imagined by the residents of Machaze became starkly—and consequentially—clear.

Political Engineering of the "Command Society"

The new postcolonial government's social and political policies at the local level were shaped by a strong predisposition to distrust and ultimately target "tradition" for elimination in much the same way as "colonialism." Throughout the anticolonial struggle FRELIMO's leadership had

increasingly come to believe that the peasantry had to be led out of the "trap of tradition" through forceful guidance.[8] While it proclaimed that the "masses" provided a source of vital energy that could be harnessed to the task of social transformation, the population was also seen as a potentially reactionary force easily subject to the sway of economic, ethnic, and other sectarian interests that could hijack the socialist vision of the future held by the leadership. The rural peasantry was viewed as particularly susceptible to being misled by their "traditions," which held the seeds for the continuous reproduction of their own oppression.

The internal schisms that threatened FRELIMO in the late 1960s only reinforced the negative views that many urban-born assimilados already had of cultural customs as an obstacle to modernity and social progress (Hall and Young 1997, 65). Ethnic animosities that hindered the expansion of the struggle into the Makua and Yao areas later in the anticolonial war only fed these views. During the final years of that struggle FRELIMO had manifested increased hostility toward local cultural practices and toward local traditional authorities, many of whom were viewed by party leaders as complicit with the system of colonial rule.

Almost immediately after coming to power FRELIMO stripped all the traditional authorities that had operated under the Portuguese colonial system of any remaining legal authority. In September 1974 FRELIMO established two alternative forms of local governance. In areas it had "liberated" during the anticolonial struggle it established "cells" composed of local FRELIMO militants. In areas such as Machaze, where FRELIMO had not been able to develop a significant presence before independence, it established *grupos dinamizadores* (dynamizing groups), led by secretaries (*secretarios*), all of whom were required to be members of the party and whose appointments had to be approved by the FRELIMO hierarchy. Throughout the country the first grupos dinamizadores were created in a somewhat improvised fashion, under what were initially fairly loose guidelines provided by the new government (Hall and Young 1997). Machazian interviewees report that during large public gatherings called by FRELIMO officials dispatched to the district, the assembled populace was asked to suggest possible candidates. In other locations, eyewitnesses reported that individuals were simply appointed to these posts by the official who presided over the meeting.

Initially, several local régulos in Machaze were chosen to serve on these committees as were other local leaders, in particular pastors and individuals with responsibilities in the myriad local churches. Many

were selected because their age, social position, and record of wise mediation as *madodas* (council of elders) in local disputes vested them with legitimacy in the eyes of local residents. By most accounts, little attention was paid to the question of party membership. Nor was prior record of activity in support of FRELIMO at issue since the movement had never developed a presence in the district during the colonial era. Consequently, at least in Machaze, FRELIMO's early administrative measures did not noticeably challenge local notions of political legitimacy or the power of all local social elites. In fact, most régulos in Machaze continued to carry out many of their functions, including local dispute resolution, land allocation, and presiding over annual earth fertility/rain ceremonies.

However, in February 1977, when FRELIMO held its Third Party Congress and formally declared itself a Marxist-Leninist party, it established a more drastic political agenda in which a politically induced transformation of social and economic relations would simultaneously modernize the country and eradicate all discriminatory practices—both colonial and traditional. This approach justified more intense state intervention in social, political, and economic life at the grassroots level. During the Third Party Congress FRELIMO once again reorganized the structure of national governance to reflect its political vision and more effectively carry out its plans for social reengineering. A hierarchy of national, provincial, and district party assemblies were to be led by the central committee of the party. Leaders at lower levels were appointed by, and expected to implement directives from, the central leadership. Party membership rules were made far more restrictive and now included "the need to live exclusively by one's own labor," "to reject the accoutrements and practices of 'traditional' society," and "to adopt the tenets of 'scientific socialism.'" Grupos dinamizadores became the unit of local governance for the whole country, with all leaders and members expected to be party members (Hall and Young 1997, 50–56).

These measures had an enormous social impact in locations such as Machaze. Many of those who had led or participated in the first grupos dinamizadores found themselves now disqualified from such posts because of their identification with "traditional" and "obscurantist" social status or practices. Régulos, polygamists, church leaders, nyangas, and nyamusoros were all excluded. These new restrictions inadvertently rendered other criteria—such as seniority and old age—problematic as well, since in the Machazian context older men were far more likely to

be either polygynous or, if monogamous, church leaders. Consequently, in Machaze, the new members of the reconstituted grupos dinamizadores were drawn disproportionately from marginal elements of local society. According to many of the accounts that I collected in Machaze this process sometimes vested power in people who did not comply with many, or even in some cases any, of the criteria by which authority was locally recognized and legitimized:

> When the [district] administrator said that President Samora Machel had ordered that no one could hold two posts some of those who were secretarios and in the church had to leave their posts . . . while others left the church because they preferred to be secretarios. There was a lot of opportunity at that time for those who wanted "confusion." Look at that one who stays over there. . . . He became secretario when he told the administrator he had left the church, . . . but he had [really] been expelled by the other bishops because he had been stealing from the church. . . . Sometimes respectable men could be chosen as secretarios, but many times it was only those who were close to the administrator, who could give him a place against which to lean. . . . Some who were thieves and only wanted the "power to eat" also became secretarios.

As occurred in many other areas of the country (Geffray 1991; Alexander 1994; Chingono 1996; Honwana 2002; Igreja 2002, 2003; Lundin 1996; Hall and Young 1997; Santos and Trindade 2003; West 2005), FRELIMO also began to take more dramatic measures against Machazian traditional authorities and other forms of "practitioners of obscurantist custom." Many Machazians vividly recalled the public debasement of the institutions of the régulos and of the nyangas and nyamusoros. In what were proclaimed by FRELIMO officials as "acts of liberation" a number of the district's régulos were publicly beaten and forced to reveal the secret locations of their sacred family *campas* (where the bodies of their ancestors—previous régulos—were buried). According to many eyewitnesses, several of these graves were dug up and the remains burnt in an act of public desecration. Many residents also vividly recall the event at which the black, white, and red cloths and the elephant tusks used by the most important régulo in the area (Mecupe) to initiate the yearly rain ceremonies were destroyed with considerable fanfare. FRELIMO's local campaign against reactionary "obscurantist superstition" also involved rounding up nyangas and nyamusoros for "public testing" meant to prove them as frauds, or simply to censure and humiliate them.

These acts by state officials struck at the core tenets of local authority around which community governance had been arranged throughout most of the previous century—and in a far more dramatic and profound way than had either the occasional interference of Portuguese officials in succession disputes or the rising power and influence of the churches and their leaders. Thus, throughout the colonial era the yearly rain ceremonies that served as the key performances by which the local sociopolitical order was publicly reaffirmed had never been subjected to official interference. In these ceremonies the régulos, as "chief guardians of the land," reaffirmed their authority as the privileged intercessors with the ancestral spirits who owned the land and ensured its fertility. The sequence of such ceremonies, which were carried out throughout the district over a period of roughly a month, also enacted an idealized hierarchy among the different régulos and subordinate subchiefs (often referred to as *mambos*).[9] At least in theory the ceremonies were supposed to start first with Mecupe (the chief régulo for the entire area of Machaze under the Portuguese), proceed to the thirteen main régulos associated with major areas of the district (Bassane, Tevere, Butiro, Tuco Tuco, Manassa, and so on), and then to lesser mambos responsible for smaller areas and groups of people. This system of cascading politico-ritual performance ultimately ended in the coresidential household with the honoring of dead ancestors under the supervision of the senior male head of the extended household.[10] In taking dramatic public measures against Mecupe and the other régulos and prohibiting the rain ceremonies, FRELIMO struck at the institutional cornerstone of the local sociopolitical order.

Churches and church leaders were also subjected to repressive action. In what many interpreted as a move to discourage church attendance, local FRELIMO officials in Machaze scheduled long-lasting mandatory "mobilization and education" meetings during the Saturday and Sunday times typically allotted by many local residents to church attendance. Those who failed to appear at these meetings fell under a cloud of suspicion for having demonstrated a "reactionary" and "incorrect" attitude. Pastors were also prohibited from receiving gifts from returning migrants and from collecting fees for their healing services, which were labeled as "exploitative practices" by FRELIMO officials. Those migrants found with "church letters" were harassed, occasionally beaten, and their travel papers confiscated, preventing them from continuing their journey to South Africa. Such measures inadvertently jeopardized the social networking dynamics that organized the migratory system to South Africa.

FRELIMO also increasingly encouraged its local officials to intervene in the minutiae of social life to a degree unprecedented under either colonial or precolonial authorities. Machazians witnessed a continuous wave of visits by outside officials who arrived as part of the *brigadas* (brigades) charged with "mobilizing" and "educating" the local population. These brigadas sought to intervene in and reengineer a broad array of local social and economic practices, ranging from public health and hygiene to gender relations and political education. For example, the Organization of the Mozambican Woman (OMM) led a well-remembered campaign in Machaze against the practice of polygyny, as it did elsewhere throughout the country (Urdang 1989; Casimiro 1992; Sheldon 2002).

Ironically, many of the "liberating solutions" that the OMM advocated to what is saw as the "polygamy problem" reflected very little understanding of the potential impact of particular measures on the rights and quality of life of local women. Many Machazian women in polygynous marriages were incensed by the suggestion that a man should keep his first wife and divorce the others. Not only would such measures increase the social vulnerability of the divorced woman but they could often impose a greater labor burden on the woman who remained in the marriage. As I discovered in my interviews with many Machazian women, these heavy labor burdens were often a significant reason why first wives often not only consented to their husband's polygyny but occasionally encouraged it and even played the lead role in selecting a co-wife.

The tactics in many "public education" campaigns were also described by many Machazians as profoundly humiliating. For example, the OMM led a campaign that focused on establishing new hygiene and health practices in the household. First, a large public meeting that explained the campaign was held, after which the visiting brigades would conduct individual household visits during which they pointed out violations and shortcoming in the prescribed standards—and not infrequently in what was taken to be a highly condescending manner. Many of the women who had received such visits felt deeply humiliated in ways similar to those reflected in the comments of one woman I interviewed in Machaze: "[The OMM leaders visiting my home] said that we were 'primitive' because we did not wash our clothes and pans every day. They would come into the threshold without asking, all of them together in a group, and [they] laughed at me when they said these things."

Such "faults," publicly pointed out in tones of derision, often failed to take account of the onerous or even impossible labor that some of the

measures advocated by the visiting OMM brigades would have required. As one woman remarked, "Did they think that I had more days than they did to get all that water and still do my other work?"

Postcolonial Policies: The Command Economy

Much like the social reengineering that FRELIMO sought to promote in Machaze, many of the new government's economic policies were not only considered onerous and intrusive by the district's residents but they also reflected a poor grasp of the exigencies of local subsistence and of the relationship between social organization and practices and ecological and economic risk. From the outset FRELIMO saw the radical and rapid transformation of Mozambique's economic production as the main means for achieving postcolonial social transformation. Modernization would be achieved through massive mechanization and the reorganization of household subsistence agriculture and capitalist industry into enterprises that relied on communal labor. Thus, on June 25, 1975 (the day of official independence) FRELIMO announced the nationalization of land, followed in the next few months by the nationalization of social services, education, medicine, and education.

The majority of the white population that had not already fled after the failed September 8 putsch began to leave the country, along with a large proportion of the technically and commercially skilled blacks and small-business owners from Mozambique's large Indian population. The abandonment of businesses, farms, and services caught the government by surprise and caused FRELIMO to nationalize over three hundred of these industries before the end of 1976. FRELIMO also reacted to the unforeseen collapse of the country's commercial network by attempting to create a centralized rural commercial system. In Machaze, as elsewhere throughout the country, rural shops were taken over by the government and turned into *lojas do povo* (communal "people's stores"). However, lacking experienced managers and capital the postcolonial government was never able to manage and supply the *lojas do povo* (Wuyts 1985, 190–92).

It was not long before residents in Machaze, as in many other rural areas throughout the country, were forced to confront a growing scarcity of goods for sale in the district, even as inflation drove up the prices of those few goods that remained available. The acute scarcity of even basic con-

sumer goods became a major complaint on the part of a population whose consumption habits had grown exponentially during the last twenty years of the colonial enterprise, when migrant prosperity had made radios, bicycles, and other large-ticket items into standard fare in everyday life.

FRELIMO also instituted new policies that set fixed (and much lower) prices for the purchase of agricultural products at the lojas do povo and stifled the market for agricultural surplus that had begun to develop with the expansion of the rural commercial network and the improvement of roads during the previous fifteen years. In Machaze, the collapse of the market had a particularly profound effect on women because this was the only source of cash available to them other than that provided by migrant spouses and sons. Efforts by the state to exert exclusive control over rural agricultural trade also subjected successful local entrepreneurs to price controls that cut into, or even nullified, their profits. Several successful Machazian traders faced the outright confiscation of property they had bought through migrant earnings, including grinding mills and privately owned vehicles, when these were appropriated by local officials for "communal use"—such as transporting local party officials and visiting dignitaries.

Among the measures that generated the greatest resentment throughout Machaze was the creation of the *maachambas do povo*.[11] The maachambas do povo were large plots that were designated for communal farming under official supervision, often located on prime land that was easily accessible to motorized transportation. All local households were required to provide labor and seed contributions for these maachambas. The labor demands made on each household varied considerably from location to location. Thus, for example, in the area of Mecupe, informants generally reported that each household had to contribute the labor of one of its members (male or female) one workday per week to the maachamba do povo. However, in Tevere several respondents mentioned that every capable adult member of a household was required to contribute one full day of labor per week to this effort. In Chipudje informants reported that each household was required to contribute workers two days per week.

Such demands proved particularly problematic in Machaze at times when subsistence farming required heavy labor inputs. In an area where the first heavy rain is often followed by a long period of weeks in which there is little or no rainfall, the timing of initial planting can make the critical difference between crop failure and success. The loss of labor to

maachambas do povo during this period could throw this delicate system out of balance if household plots were planted too late to benefit from the first heavy rain. Other critical periods in which increased labor demands on the part of the maachambas do povo competed with household agriculture involved the periods of the *saachas* (weedings/hoeing).

The area's long history of erratic rainfall and chronic drought had led the population in Machaze to develop careful forms of risk diversification that the new maachamba do povo policies interfered with in other ways. A first planting was not infrequently lost due to a particularly long dry spell after a first rain or, conversely, to excessive rainfall. Consequently, to hedge their risks, whenever possible district residents staggered their planting, sowing only parts of their fields at any one time. This allowed them to keep seed in reserve in case a first planting proved a loss. However, FRELIMO officials in charge of the maachamba do povo in some areas of the district reportedly required households to plant—and then replant—the maachamba do povo in its entirety each and every time a crop failed. Not only was this an additional drain on labor but it also drained household seed reserves. One man recalled how this policy created significant hardship for his household:

> We already had too little seed because of the [poor] previous season. . . . Four times the secretario came and took this much [holding up a basket approximately sixteen inches wide and deep]. Four times! . . . That was a year of hunger for us because we had to plant the same times for us as well, but in the end we had too little to plant [for ourselves]. We planted only the part and left the rest [of the field] alone.

Perhaps most significantly, the compulsory labor requirements of the maachamba do povo increasingly invoked parallels with the deeply resented forced-labor policies pursued on and off throughout the previous century by the Portuguese colonial authorities. Disenchantment with this policy became particularly pointed when district residents witnessed how the crops produced in the maachambas do povo were used.

When initially explaining the need for the maachambas do povo local FRELIMO officials had emphasized that the crops produced in these fields would be used to feed those who came to visit and assist in the development of Machaze. This was a hospitality function analogous to the responsibilities that had previously fallen on local régulos, but now it was to be the common duty of the whole population—an explanation that had

by and large been accepted as a reasonable one by local residents. Many district residents also reported they had been promised that the remainder of the products of these fields would be distributed among the local population. Other residents recalled that initially they even welcomed the maachambas do povo when it was explained to them by officials that the surplus would be used to help those whose agricultural efforts failed in any given agricultural season and would thus provide a form of communal insurance.

However, at the end of the first agricultural season trucks were sent by central authorities to cart the first harvest of the maachambas do povo away without any compensation to the local population. These measures triggered feelings of deep resentment, betrayal, and even outrage—as reflected in the accounts of two witnesses:

> When the trucks arrived they loaded the sacks of millet and barley in one morning and left without ever saying where they were going. They never told us anything and they took it all. At first the secretario also did not know why this had happened, but then he said it was the government that needed it and had ordered it, perhaps for the military. After this no one in Chipambuleque wanted to work in the maachamba do povo the next year. But the secretarios would beat whoever didn't work. They did the same thing next year as well, which is why I started to hate the maachamba do povo. I went back to South Africa to find work before the following season.
>
> When the trucks took everything [produced in the maachamba do povo] it was wrong because they did not even pay us. What advantage was there in working without any payment? I preferred to work in my own fields.

The maachambas do povo represented a communal work and property ethic that was relatively alien to the social fabric in Machaze. That this policy did not immediately engender outright resistance in Machaze is perhaps indicative of a brief moment of opportunity after independence when the new government might have brought about a shift in local views toward greater engagement and identification with the state. The trucks that carried away the first fruits of the maachambas do povo thus bore a much heavier symbolic burden than reflected in the mere tonnage of foodstuffs that they carried. They also carted away what may have been an opportunity to revamp local perspectives and attitudes toward centralized state authority. Rather than recasting local political culture, these measures framed Machazian interpretations of the postcolonial state

in the all-too-familiar terms that had long been applied to the colonial administration, dramatically reinforcing the weight of a long history of disengagement with central authority.

International Factors in the Deterioration of Life in Machaze

While FRELIMO's social and economic policies generated considerable resentment, international developments significantly amplified many of their effects by contributing to the deterioration of economic conditions in Machaze and throughout Mozambique as a whole. The newly independent nation was particularly hard hit by the rising oil prices and deteriorating terms of trade that affected so many developing nations in the mid-1970s.[12] However, political developments in the southern African subregion played an even more important role in Mozambique's economic downturn and ultimately in the rapid deterioration of living conditions, particularly in rural areas in which so much of economic life revolved around labor migration, including Machaze.

In March 1976 the Mozambican government closed its border with Rhodesia, in compliance with UN sanctions against the pariah white-minority regime of Ian Smith. Mozambique also granted ZANLA guerrillas permission to use its territory as a base for action against Smith's regime. These moves had grave consequences for the newly independent nation. The combined loss of Rhodesian transit tariffs through the port of Beira, tourism, and other forms of international trade was estimated at over $400 million during this period (Abrahammson and Nilsson 1994, 106). Mozambican support for the anti-Rhodesian insurgency also resulted in a undeclared retaliatory war being waged by Rhodesian troops throughout Mozambique's border provinces starting in 1976. Ostensibly in pursuit of ZANLA guerrillas, Rhodesian military incursions were also devised as part of a larger strategy to cripple Mozambique's infrastructure and destabilize the new FRELIMO government (Hanlon 1984; Hall and Young 1997). The province of Manica was one of the primary theaters for these incursions and the overall campaign of destruction.[13]

Oral evidence suggests that, unlike those areas nearer to the border or with economically and militarily strategic infrastructure, Machaze did not attract much direct attention from Rhodesian troops. However, the effects of this undeclared border conflict were nevertheless profound for the area's residents. At least one refugee camp was established near the district

center for populations fleeing from border areas within Mozambique affected by the conflict and for people from across the international border seeking refuge from the war and sympathetic to ZANLA. According to oral accounts, the burden of feeding these people fell largely on the local population.

It was also during this time that local *milicias* (policemen) began to be recruited and trained. Milicias not only were meant to provide community policing that would substitute for the *cipaes* who had served under the régulos, but they were also intended to be the keystone of a national mandatory civil-defense system that would "mobilize popular power" against subversive and reactionary elements (Samora 1985). Machazian milicias, individuals recruited to provide part-time national self-defense and policing in the communities they lived in, came to play a more specific and perilous role during the Rhodesian border war. Many were assigned to undertake the dangerous tasks of courier, porter, or armed escort service between Machaze and the district capital of Espungabera, which was located at the Rhodesian border. The one-hundred-kilometer trip exposed them to the danger of aerial bombardment and the possibility of meeting Rhodesian forces, especially as they approached Espungabera. Unpaid for this work, a number of these milicias eventually deserted and fled to Rhodesia, where they were later among the first Machazians recruited by RENAMO to fight against FRELIMO.

Perhaps the most profound result of the border war in Machaze was its effect on migration. As the Rhodesian border became increasingly militarized, it became far more dangerous to cross, restricting migratory options for young men in the incipient stages of their migratory careers. The Rhodesian plantations along the border had long played an important role as the first migratory destination for most Machazian men. Earnings from these much shorter and easier trips were used to finance subsequent travel to South Africa. Without this option, and with the simultaneous collapse of the country's internal market for labor in areas such as Beira and Chimoio, migratory possibilities were drastically reduced for young men who sought to "come of age," inducing growing frustration in the face of unprecedented obstacles to achieving key life-course goals (most particularly earning money to pay for lobola).

At the same time, mounting tensions between the new Mozambican government and the apartheid regime in South Africa created yet another series of obstacles for Machazian migrant laborers, particularly those who remained employed in the mines. In an attempt to reduce its dependency on foreign labor and increase economic pressure on the new FRELIMO

government, South Africa cut its recruitment of Mozambican miners by over 60 percent.[14] A series of administrative measures taken by the new Mozambican government as part of its overall strategy to exert more centralized control over the economy also contributed to the collapse of South African demand for Mozambican mine labor. The FRELIMO government declared all Mozambican passports from the Portuguese regime invalid, yet it proved incapable of expeditiously providing replacements, so many miners were unable to meet the requirements for reentry and return to jobs in South Africa. Many longtime migrants found that such delays caused them to lose preferential rehiring treatment that had begun to be instituted by the mines and in other key industries in an attempt to stabilize skilled labor. In 1976 the Mozambican government also closed seventeen of the twenty-one WENELA mine-labor recruitment centers that formed a network throughout the rural south of the country (International Labour Organisation 1987, 7). The four centers that remained open were located in the urban centers of the south, particularly Maputo, while all those in the rural interior and on the northern border of South Africa (those most relevant to Machazian migrant men) were closed. The route through Maputo was considerably longer and increasingly difficult in light of the postindependence disarray of transportation services within Mozambique. It also proved more costly to Machazian migrants, who now had to pay for shelter and food in an urban setting while waiting for their new passports.

Finally, international labor migration also became more difficult when FRELIMO instituted new policies requiring officially approved "traveling papers" for travel within Mozambique itself. Authorized by local party officials, these papers required a person to declare a specific origin, destination, and motive for travel. This internal pass system erected a new and serious hurdle for the growing number of Machazians who worked in industries and services in South Africa other than the mines. Whereas previously these migrants had primarily had to worry about the international border (and to a much lesser extent about possibly being caught within South Africa) they now had the additional worry of traveling without proper authorization within Mozambique itself.

FRELIMO in Local Terms

Machazian responses to the policies and practices of the postcolonial government were neither static nor monolithic, even with respect to

some of the more drastic measures undertaken against key local institutions and customary practices. Some who benefited directly from these changes—such as individuals who had once been socially marginalized but now found themselves empowered as secretarios or milicias—even greeted FRELIMO's policies as a personal boon.

Yet FRELIMO's efforts to reengineer society were so pervasive in scope and undermined such a broad range of local institutions and social practices that they left few individuals in Machaze without some cause for resentment. Thus, even the accounts of many of those who were initially most supportive of FRELIMO and who had benefited in important ways from its policies often reflected considerable ambivalence about the regime:

> I was made a secretario during the time of the Ian Smith problems [Rhodesian war]. I used to live in Chipambuleque before RENAMO arrived but have lived here in Chitobe since the *bandidos* [bandits, i.e., RENAMO] came to this area, and I saw the whole conflict from this place even though I am no longer a secretario. I was a FRELIMO until they said that to be a secretario I could no longer be a church member. For awhile I stopped leading the church, but then I went back and stopped being a secretario. They beat me at first. But then because I came with my family into the village they did nothing more. I remained here during the whole war and have not left this place to this day.

In Machaze, the cumulative challenges that FRELIMO mounted against polygyny, churches, religious belief, local systems of governance, private property, and domestic and communal labor arrangements—and their effects on the migratory system, subsistence, the administration of justice, and gender relations—had a threshold effect that generated a social backlash that crosscut most social and economic differences. Consequently, the negative views of central political authority that had guided interaction with the colonial state were not only reaffirmed but significantly reinforced.

Ironically, FRELIMO's assault on key local social institutions not only failed to effectively eliminate the ontological presuppositions with which district residents understood the dynamics of their everyday existence but paradoxically exposed the postcolonial state to local evaluation in terms of those very premises—and in ways that had never before shaped local understandings of central-state authority. By and large, the Portuguese had sought to maintain themselves outside the of black box of indigenous Machazian social life, limiting their presence to points of articulation

with the specific institutions (the régulos) that enabled them to achieve their primary practical objectives (taxation and, less effectively, obtaining labor).

Consequently, for most Machazians the colonial authorities were only vaguely and indirectly related to the everyday concerns they sought to navigate in everyday life, concerns such as marriage, subsistence, and avoiding uloi. Concomitantly, a negligible role was reserved for the Portuguese in the local belief system that Machazians used to explain the root causes of the most pressing problems of everyday Machazian life—such as periodic drought, failed crops, sickness, domestic strife, or failing economic fortunes. In a system of belief in which the ultimate reason for misfortune was attributed to the agency of ancestral and other spirits, the Portuguese were never seen as being directly involved.[15] Consequently, the cause and remedy for most misfortune in life was to be sought in the dynamics of the local kinship and community social struggles that motivated ancestors to act in the lives of the living, not in the tensions of a much more sparsely articulated political relationship with colonial authorities.[16]

However, in stark contrast to the Portuguese, FRELIMO sought to pry open the black box of local social relations and cultural practices and to dramatically reconfigure its contents. The postcolonial regime's challenge was a frontal one, a blunt proposition that the local system of beliefs should be simply replaced. Moreover, unlike the churches that also had challenged key cultural tenets decades previously, FRELIMO's methods were far more sudden and far more reliant on instrumental force, seeking to impose compliance rather than appealing for conversion.

By claiming authority over the intricate recesses of social and cultural life into which the Portuguese had never ventured, the postcolonial state found itself inadvertently and paradoxically incorporated into the very local moral calculus it sought to undermine. From the outset, even those who had supported FRELIMO had not always understood the government's measures in the same terms as the party agents who were sent to organize and to explain their significance. Thus, for example, the official take-home message of the public debasement of nyangas and régulos was intended to be the falseness of superstition, demonstrated through acts that openly defied the power these institutions claimed. Yet paradoxically, many residents of the district interpreted these acts in ways that actually affirmed the belief system whose falsehood was supposedly being demonstrated. Thus, one of the most widely held interpretations of the burning

of the graves of former régulos was that it was as an innovative attempt to alleviate the suffering of the populace at the hands of those powerful spirits who had become particularly virulent and predatory during the previous two or three decades (the "reign of the mambos" described in chapter 2).

Many who witnessed or participated in these acts saw them as a novel—if controversial—tactic for addressing problematic spiritual power and disorder, rather than as evidence that such power was nonexistent. Even some local FRELIMO officials appear to have held such views. Thus, in one large public meeting held after the burning of a local régulo's grave, a local secretario was reported to have mockingly noted that now that the *campas* had been destroyed the "reign of the mambos" was over. Therefore, he announced, there would be no future need for the services of nyangas since there would now be no mfukwas for those who practiced uloi to invoke.

FRELIMO's actions were thus seen by many as analogous to previous historical innovations undertaken to curb the intensity of witchcraft.[17] As discussed in chapter 2 both the muchape movement and the churches had gained adherents largely because they offered solutions to perceived intensifications in uloi. Despite initial waves of fevered enthusiasm and mass subscription, neither was seen as having ultimately succeeded in this task. Machazians generally came to believe that FRELIMO's efforts also failed and that the virulence of uloi actually increased because of this latest challenge to the authority of the ancestors—much as had been the case after muchape.

The growing hardships and emergent violence that eventually coalesced into the "war" provided what for most residents was the most self-evident proof of this failure. Many Machazians specifically blamed FRELIMO's burning of the *campas* and its prohibition against holding the annual rain ceremony for the poor agricultural season of 1977–78, remembered as the "Bean Hunger" because beans were the only food that people could buy, barter, or trade to survive. The far more severe droughts and deadly famines that ravaged the district throughout the decade that followed were also attributed to these acts and the sociospiritual disorder they occasioned.

Thus, while the Portuguese colonial state and its agents had been relegated to the negligible role of "backdrop" on the general stage of moral action, the inadvertent result of the postcolonial government's social policies was that the state was now recast as a central figure in the moral

drama of everyday Machazian life—and one increasingly blamed for the disarray in the sociospiritual world. Moreover, FRELIMO's incorporation into the local moral calculus extended and amplified local tendencies to mistrust and seek disengagement from central authority. During the first few years of independence a conspiracy-theory atmosphere evolved in Machaze, rampant with rumors of sinister hidden motives lurking behind virtually all government activities undertaken in the district.

One rumor that continued to circulate even after the war was over was that the immunization campaigns carried out by FRELIMO during the first years after independence were in reality part of a secret plot to control Mozambican migrants.[18] In particular, smallpox vaccinations left a visible scar in a specific location on the body that South African police in the townships came to use as a ready marker that the bearer was Mozambican. Designated by Machazians as the "mark of Samora" (with reference to Samora Machel, Mozambique's first president after independence), most Machazian migrants believed that the ultimate purpose of this immunization campaign was to allow the Mozambican government to control their movement to and from South Africa.[19] Such rumors were reinforced by the growing difficulties many migrants had in obtaining passports, filing for work at the WENELA centers, or in traveling within Mozambique without the correct papers:

> We waited for over two weeks at WENELA in Maputo. There were hundreds of men. When the official came out he started choosing who could work, but because he was a Shaangaan he said he didn't want anyone from the center [of the country]. . . . At night at the kiosk this Shangaan in a suit started to speak badly about us because we were Ndau, saying that we were "bandits" and should be put in prison.

Many Machazians who attempted to migrate during this time were quick to point out that the only WENELA centers not closed down by FRELIMO after independence were those located in the major urban centers of the predominantly Shangaan-speaking south that were farthest away from the central region (Ndau) of the country. FRELIMO's leadership was dominated by southerners, as were the brigadas and local officials sent by the party to the district.

As mistrust of the state reached a fever pitch, even wilder rumors gained currency throughout the district: that nobody would be allowed to keep any private possessions, that women would now belong to everyone

who wanted to avail themselves of their sexual services, and that everyone's children would be rounded up and sent away to FRELIMO schools for "proper education" where they would be free from the "obscurantist" and "primitive" influence of their parents and that they would "belong" to the "nation of Mozambique." Although I found no evidence that such extreme measures were ever realized—or even announced by state officials—in Machaze, such fearful possibilities nevertheless seemed increasingly credible to more and more of the district's residents as their disillusionment with and fear of the new government grew.

The Reaffirmation of Disengagement

The sudden demise of Portuguese colonialism provided Machazians with momentary hopes that a break from heavy-handed state intervention was imminent. All indications from oral accounts are that independence was a moment of celebration in the Machaze District and that FRELIMO was initially received by the area's residents with open arms. The expectations generated by decolonization soared high enough to trigger decisions for permanent return among some migrants who had been long absent in South Africa:

> After the Portuguese left they were saying that back in Mozambique a black man could have his own businesses and shops. I had five "tuck shops" here in Sebokeng . . . and a house, but I sold all of them and went back that year to Machaze in order to open a shop there. Up to that time I had thought of staying in South Africa and only visiting in Machaze, but when I heard of these opportunities I decided to go back [for good]. I was old enough and was not even thinking of coming back to South Africa after that because I believed things would be better in Machaze after the independence. . . . The Portuguese were gone and we could go about our life without trouble.

However, the first few years of independence thoroughly dashed such hopes and reaffirmed longstanding local attitudes of adversarial disengagement with central authorities. FRELIMO's policies came to be viewed as the latest in a long succession of undesirable intensifications in central-authority intervention. To many of the district's residents the postcolonial state's policies were far more egregious than anything suffered under the Portuguese—so much so that RENAMO eventually won

considerable support in Machaze (as in some other quarters of Mozambique) by promising to "bring back the Portuguese"!

Certainly, some district residents—such as régulos, nyangas and nyamusoros, and pastors—suffered more directly from FRELIMO's efforts to refashion the local social order. However, virtually all Machazians recalled the relatively short interlude between independence in 1974 and the civil war of the 1980s as a period of dramatic deterioration in their economic conditions, of an unprecedented degree of undesired state intervention in their lives, and of constraints imposed on their personal and collective freedoms that significantly hampered the pursuit of essential life projects and long-established life strategies. Certainly by 1979, on the eve of the district's entrance into full-blown war, the postindependence euphoria had long since dissipated and most Machazians viewed the postcolonial government with varying degrees of discontent, ranging along a continuum from passive and fearful tolerance to enthusiastic support for armed insurrection. Labor migration to South Africa had reintensified, as men fell back on well-worn strategies for coping with intrusive political authorities and economic duress. In short, even if the most overt forms of violence were meted out to those who represented the local social institutions that FRELIMO sought to replace, larger political and economic conditions converged with the postcolonial government's policies to expose the overwhelming majority of Machazians to rising levels of structural violence.

Other ethnographers of war, such as Paul Richards (1996) and Peter Uvin (1998), have noted that experiences of deepening structural violence can lay the groundwork for organized political violence. Uvin, in particular, notes how structural violence lowers the barriers against the use of acute violence by increasing frustration as expectations become harder to meet, by fostering sentiments of deep humiliation, by heightening the desperation of those who confront the often-catastrophic deterioration of their life chances, and by decreasing the legitimacy of social institutions that not only fail to respond to a growing sense of crisis but are often complicit in its constitution (Uvin 1998). In chapter 4 I explore how the sentiments of grievance engendered by the growing gap between expectations underwrote local political agency in Machaze at the outset of armed hostilities.

CHAPTER 4

Society and the State

Mutual Misrecognition at the Gathering of War

Although the disillusionment with the new postcolonial government that emerged in Machaze was shared by much of the rural population of Mozambique, the origin of armed opposition to FRELIMO can be conclusively traced to external intervention by the newly independent nation's hostile neighbors—the white minority regimes in Rhodesia and South Africa. In fact, even before independence, Portuguese and Rhodesian security forces had generated plans for a clandestine "pseudo-terrorist" (Flower 1987) movement of black Mozambicans to combat FRELIMO's expansion. Some of the more notorious and brutal actions of the colonial war have been attributed to these elite Flecha (Arrow) units.

After Portuguese decolonization, the Smith regime sought to recruit Mozambicans who had served in such units in the Portuguese military.[1] Many black Mozambicans who had served in the colonial military fled to Rhodesia when Mozambique gained its independence. They were later joined by others who were avoiding the "reeducation" camps that FRELIMO established for the internment of Mozambicans who had cooperated with the colonial authorities or who publicly opposed the government's new policies (Vines 1991, 15–20). These exiles were sought as recruits by the Rhodesian regime in its effort to create a Mozambican counterinsurgency to destabilize its newly independent neighbor.

According to the posthumously published memoirs of senior Rhodesian security operative Ken Flower, the first military unit of Mozambican exiles was established and trained in Rhodesia in 1976. This unit initially acted as scouts for Rhodesian troops, but eventually it began to develop

its own activities within Mozambique—as RENAMO, the organization that eventually waged a countrywide civil war against FRELIMO.

The history of RENAMO's early development is shrouded in selective silences and contradictory claims. Many important details about the establishment and earliest years of the movement, which was also the time when it first appeared in Machaze, are still a matter of considerable uncertainty. RENAMO's earliest membership was evidently a mixture of former colonial troops and disaffected former FRELIMO members. Different accounts describe these FRELIMO defectors variously as the product of factionalism within the organization, soldiers who had turned to banditry during the colonial struggle or soon after independence, or troops dissatisfied with the lack of spoils after the Portuguese capitulation (Hall and Young 1997, 46–49, 117–18; Vines 1991, 11–17).[2] What is generally accepted is that without the support of the Rhodesian and later the South African regimes, RENAMO would have been unable to develop its military capacity and become a significant threat to FRELIMO.

Until its capitulation in 1979, the Smith regime not only organized and equipped RENAMO but also provided it with an indispensable safe area within Rhodesia from which it could launch its military operations. In the wake of the Smith regime's defeat and Zimbabwe's independence in 1980, South Africa's decision to take over sponsorship of the fledgling movement prevented it from collapsing.[3] At the time of Zimbabwean independence RENAMO's forces were transported en masse by aerial convoy from their Rhodesian bases to South Africa. Reinforced with training and equipment from the South Africans, RENAMO contingents were airlifted into central Mozambique the following year and were regularly resupplied by the South Africans.

Although the importance of the Rhodesian and South African regimes in the early development of RENAMO's military operations is largely undisputed, scholars have argued at length over whether the movement primarily pursued interests dictated by external taskmasters or whether the organization had a genuine political agenda of its own. Though this still ongoing debate is beyond the scope of this present book,[4] what is germane here are the *popular perceptions* of RENAMO and its agenda and how these perceptions led actors to position themselves as they did in the violent struggle for Mozambique as it first emerged and later escalated and evolved. Specifically, in this chapter I explore how the popular political alignment in the district, which generally skewed in favor of RENAMO, may have been based on popular misrecognition of the organization's lack

of an alternative vision for the state, for a vision of a political order in which the state would withdraw from its locally intrusive posture.

Although it was not the very first district in which RENAMO was active, Machaze is one of a handful of places in which the early popular understandings and reactions to RENAMO are most opportune for study because of the sustained and systematic military attention that it received from both sides very early on in the war. According to local officials, the district headquarters (Chitobe) was an important staging area for FRELIMO's earliest assaults on Sitatonga (1980) and Garagua (1981)—two of RENAMO's first major bases in Mozambique.[5] Sitatonga Mountain lay just to the northwest of the Machaze area and had long figured prominently in the region's sacred geography. In Machaze, Sitatonga was believed to be the home of the most powerful "rainmakers" in the region, known as Nhamunissa. Meanwhile, Garagua was a two-or-three-day walk to the southwest.[6] The "military war" was thus a reality in Machaze many years before the conflagration took on national dimensions.[7]

According to some of the residents I interviewed, rumors of anti-FRELIMO political activity circulated in Machaze virtually from the time of independence. By mid-1976 the Rhodesian Directorate of Psychological Warfare had begun to collaborate with some of the most influential former Portuguese settlers to initiate radio broadcasts that criticized FRELIMO's policies, ideology, and leadership.[8] Although not ideologically sophisticated, the broadcasts of Voz de Africa Livre (Voice of Free Africa) focused on many of the changes and policies that rural Mozambicans most resented, such as the *lojas do povo* and the *maachambas do povo*. Small transistor radios were widely owned by households throughout Machaze, having become a standard purchase item for migrants during the decade before independence. The proximity to Chipinge, where these transmissions originated, rendered the broadcasts easily accessible to the majority of the population.[9]

In Machaze, FRELIMO almost immediately took measures to limit public exposure to this propaganda. In public meetings held throughout the district FRELIMO officials announced that listening to Voz de Africa Livre was strictly prohibited. If radios were found or reported as having been tuned to that frequency, transgressors were subjected to beatings and the confiscation of their radios. Ironically, these measures only generated further resentment against FRELIMO and reinforced the claims that Voz de Africa Livre levied against the government.

Yet, despite the growing dissatisfaction with FRELIMO's policies and

the development of a "favorable local ear" toward Voz de Africa Livre broadcasts, there is little evidence that there was any enthusiasm among the district's population for an armed insurrection against the central government. RENAMO's first actions within the district were neither broadly supported by the population nor did they lead to immediate mass adherence to its cause. The first two significant military actions in Machaze involved attacks on the *lojas do povo* in Chitobe and in Chipudje in late 1979, which according to eyewitnesses resulted in the burning and looting of both shops and one fatality:

> I was in the shop in Chipudje when they came from across the [soccer] field firing their guns. I ran the other way into the bush with others. It was a big confusion and I could not think of anything but running. Later at night, after the shots were over, I came back near to the village to see if it was safe. I could not see any fires or any people, so I stayed in the bush that whole night. The next morning, I saw some people I recognized around the shops, and I called out to them. The men with guns had taken everything out into the road, and whatever they did not carry away they had destroyed. All the papers and the shelves were burnt and the roof was broken. No one was killed, but I heard that one woman had been shot in her foot. Later we heard that the shops in Chitobe had also been attacked earlier and that one of the employees there had been killed. At first we did not know who they were, but later we heard they were called the Matsangaiisse.[10]

Local residents reacted to these events with a mixture of confusion and alarm. Many thought the attack had been orchestrated by Rhodesian forces, while local officials maintained that it was the work of *bandidos armados* (armed bandits). According to many residents this was also the first time that activity in the district was attributed to the "Matsangaiisse"—the group that would eventually become better known as RENAMO.

Despite widespread dissatisfaction with the *lojas do povo,* this destructive act did not win much approval from most of the population. Minimal as they may have been, these shops were the only commercial outlets in the district. Immediately after the attack on Chipudje several influential men in the community sent word of the attack to the district administrator in Mossurize and requested that regular army troops be sent for protection. When the administrator responded that soldiers could only be sent if the local population could provide them with housing and food, local elders rapidly organized this support.

Villagization

However, local desire to collaborate with and seek protection from the state quickly began to dissipate when the government reacted to the attacks by taking more forceful measures aimed at restricting contact between the incipient insurgency and the local population. The most polarizing of these measures were the government's efforts to relocate the district's highly dispersed local population into fortified settlements or *aldeias communais* (communal villages).

Well before the arrival of RENAMO, a policy of communal villagization had been an integral part of FRELIMO's ambitious plan for national economic, social, and ideological transformation.[11] Central Committee reports from FRELIMO's Third Party Congress reveal a nationwide strategy for resettling the rural population into planned villages to contribute to economic development by reshaping agricultural production through communal organization and mechanization. This concentration of population also was intended to generate economies of scale in health care and education.

Villagization was supposed to make the rural population more accessible for political reeducation, thus facilitating the cultural and ideological transformation that would eradicate "obscurantist and oppressive tradition" and "capitalist reactionaries" and replace it with the "rational and scientific" tenets of socialism.[12] The "total socio-political role" of the communal village envisioned by FRELIMO is well described by anthropologist Harry West:

> FRELIMO leaders viewed the political initiatives embedded within villagization, however, as inseparable from other ends. To render possible "socialist modernization," and to protect it from the perceived predatory tendencies of "feudal" rural institutions such as the *autoridades gentilicas* [so-called traditional authorities] who had formerly collaborated with colonial rule, government and party institutions had to reach rural residents where they lived and to displace forms of political organization grounded in the logic of kinship and given continuity according to principles of hereditary succession. (West 1998, 155)

As early as 1977 many areas of the former liberated zones in Cabo Delgado had already been successfully "villagized" with little overt resistance or economic disruption (Coelho 1998, 63). However, this same policy met

with considerable popular resistance elsewhere. In large portions of such provinces as Nampula, Manica, Sofala, and Tete social and economic organization was predicated on dispersed settlement patterns—in contrast to northern provinces where concentrated settlements were already the norm. Anthropologist Christian Geffray (1991) was one of the first to argue that FRELIMO did not adequately consider whether the social formations and subsistence economic systems throughout the rest of the country were as amenable to the model of rural development that the movement had introduced with at least some success in the northern "liberated zones" during the anticolonial war. In his view, the imposition of a model that did not dovetail with local socioeconomic exigencies and cultural sensibilities contributed significantly to the alienation of the population from the new state in the area of his field research in Nampula Province. This was also the case—albeit for other specific reasons—in the district of Machaze.

FRELIMO's rather sudden demand that district residents abandon their individual homesteads and relocate in a densely populated settlement ran counter to a century-long trend toward greater demographic dispersion. As described in chapters 1 and 2 this trend included household nuclearization driven by the efforts of younger migrants to seek autonomy from elder kin; a perception that uloi was intensifying, which placed a premium on the greater social insulation and privacy that dispersed residence afforded; and the continuing need of the growing population for large land allotments on which to carry out slash-and-burn agriculture in an environment where land was rapidly exhausted.

FRELIMO's relocation order also had particularly serious implications for household agriculture. Many district residents received the order to relocate during one of the most critical periods of the agricultural cycle with the heaviest labor demands—the hoeing (*saacha*) season. Household members typically maintained a number of noncontiguous and often highly dispersed fields, some of which were far enough away from their main residence to justify building temporary lean-to shelters for overnight stays when intensive labor inputs were required. Resettlement into the villages during the most labor-intensive periods of the agricultural cycle would have dramatically increased the distances people would need to travel to reach their fields. In many cases, reaching those fields, working in them, and returning to the villages within the newly established curfew times would have been physically impossible. In short, for many residents immediate compliance with FRELIMO's villagization orders would have involved sacrificing much of the year's agricultural production.

In an environment in which mistrust and resentment of state authority had reached new heights, many district residents were reluctant to subject themselves to greater government scrutiny and control. One man I interviewed in Machaze noted that many also feared the consequences of the heightened social surveillance by neighbors and kin that the side-by-side proximity of village living implied:

> In the aldeias people lived one next to the other just like that. Everyone could see your secrets. If there was a problem in the family then your neighbors had to know about it. [Because of this] the problem of uloi was too serious. . . . Nobody wanted to live in the aldeias because of this problem.

Finally, the fact that RENAMO had carried out most of its armed attacks against communal villages was not lost on a population that feared that any relocation into targeted areas would do more to jeopardize than to safeguard them.

Interestingly, most local accounts of the unfolding events indicate that RENAMO's early activities in Machaze were not characterized by the indiscriminate mass kidnappings, forced recruitment campaigns, or acts of symbolic brutality that later signaled its arrival in other areas of the country (see, for example, Gersony 1988; Minter 1989; Wilson 1992; Human Rights Watch 1992; Vines 1991). Instead, RENAMO evidently mounted a "hearts and minds" campaign by recruiting several Machazians who were particularly disaffected with FRELIMO to serve as liaisons. They were tasked with informing local leaders and residents of the movement's objectives and with garnering local public support.

Many eyewitnesses recall in particular the pivotal role of a local man named Sigauke in organizing the first of these information campaigns (he reportedly died later in the war). Before independence Sigauke had operated a prosperous small local business established with savings he accumulated as a migrant to South Africa. According to several eyewitnesses he had fled from Machaze in late 1976 after arguing with a local secretario who had requisitioned his automobile for the use of visiting FRELIMO officials. The exact story of his recruitment into RENAMO in Rhodesia was not possible to ascertain. However, many eyewitnesses agreed that he reappeared in the district shortly after the attacks on Chitobe and Chipudje, first visiting the homes of several régulos, madodas, and other local notables, including some pastors, to explain to them the "Matsangaiisse program." With the collaboration of some of these men he later

successfully organized a series of larger public meetings held in remote areas and kept secret from FRELIMO secretarios. Eyewitnesses generally reported that these meetings drew strong attendance, sometimes numbering even in the hundreds.

Sigauke reportedly explained the Matsangaisse agenda in the most concrete of terms as getting rid of the secretarios, reestablishing the old régulos, terminating the maachambas do povo, dispersing the communal villages, and bringing back the Portuguese and Indian traders to the rural shops. Hardly a sophisticated political blueprint for an alternative national political order, this concrete agenda nevertheless resonated deeply with the concerns felt by many of those who attended these events in Machaze. According to many of these eyewitnesses, Sigauke's speeches proved instrumental in encouraging some residents to begin providing more active support to RENAMO and even resulted in a wave of young men volunteering to join its forces.

At this early stage, RENAMO violence in the district appears to have focused narrowly on the most visible signs of local state presence: government buildings, the emerging aldeias communais, and government officials such as secretarios and milicias and health clinic workers and teachers. As a result, a steady stream of local officials and other district residents closely associated with the FRELIMO government began to relocate into the aldeias communais.

District residents reacted in a variety of ways to the selective targeting of these FRELIMO officials. One eyewitness to these evolving events commented approvingly:

> When the "Matsangaiisse" arrived they looked for the secretario and for the teacher and for the milicias. They killed one of the milicias, but the others had warning and ran away to the FRELIMO village. [These troops] did not do anything else, and when we saw this then we knew that it was only if you were FRELIMO that you had to be afraid. Many people were glad when the secretario left because now no one was there to give speeches and say we should go to the maachamba do povo. The secretario had been very hard and made many people suffer hard treatments when they came to him with problems.

Others noted that while they may have approved of the exodus of FRELIMO officials they were far less enthusiastic about the violent means employed:

> When the Matsangaiisse came the secretario fled to the village because he knew that they would kill him. When they could not find him they found his brother who was visiting and they killed him because of his brother. Someone [a kinsman of the interviewee] had told the secretario that the Matsangaissas were there because they wanted him to leave the village so we would have no secretario . . . but he did not know that the Matsangaissas would kill his brother. This has caused us "social problems" [with mfukwa] that we did not want. We only did not want the secretario anymore.

FRELIMO's Interpretation of and Reaction to Noncompliance

As RENAMO's activities in the district increased and few residents other than targeted officials and their families complied with the state's order to move into the villages, government authorities began to draw conclusions about what the population's refusal to relocate meant. News of strong attendance at meetings such as those organized by Sigauke only reinforced growing suspicions that the population outside the aldeias was colluding with RENAMO.

Consequently, FRELIMO began to pursue even more aggressive strategies to force people into the villages. According to the accounts of several local FRELIMO officials, the provincial governor sent troops to forcibly relocate the noncompliant population. Patrols were ordered to burn homes and confiscate or destroy crops found outside of the village in order to compel the population "in the bush" to relocate into the aldeias—if not by preference or force, then out of need. Those brought into the villages by force were only allowed to visit their fields if they left family members behind (in essence, held as hostage) and if they obeyed strict curfews. This campaign reached its greatest intensity when the military initiated long-range artillery fire from the communal villages out into the surrounding "bush" in a rather bizarre effort to frighten people into the villages.

Vividly remembered by many residents, these tactics met with limited success. If anything it seems that the government's measures encouraged those who managed to elude the military dragnet to disappear even deeper into the brush. A growing number of Machazians sought refuge in remote areas that were more distant from the communal villages, where the numbers of government troops garrisoned began to grow significantly. Yet, by most accounts, these remote areas of refuge were

not—at least at first—under RENAMO's influence. Most of those who found refuge in these locations had fled because they wanted to avoid FRELIMO troops rather than because they intended to support or join RENAMO.

However, frustrated FRELIMO officials and troops in the aldeias apparently drew little distinction between RENAMO supporters and those who simply sought to avoid villagization. All resistance to government directives was increasingly interpreted as a sign of support for RENAMO. Government patrols thus started treating all those found outside the villages as if they were RENAMO collaborators. Eyewitnesses reported that women and children were more often than not brought back to the villages, while men were often beaten or killed on the spot. According to the accounts of some government milicias, adult men captured by government patrols while alone or in small groups were almost assured of being killed—on the theory that they must be enemy combatants.[13]

As military action by RENAMO intensified and the aldeias were subjected to repeated attacks and growing isolation, a siege mentality seems to have gripped many government officials in ways that affected how they treated even the population under FRELIMO's control. In this environment the slightest suspicion could easily carry deadly consequences, as noted in the following eyewitness recollection:

> After some time there were more attacks on Chipudje, and finally another one on the store that had been rebuilt but with a [thatched] roof like those on the *palhotas* [huts]. My house was one of the few that was made of bricks and cement and was also big enough to have a tuck shop[14]—it was built over there on the edge of the aldeia near the road. When they attacked [the store] the second time they came from every direction. When we heard the shooting my wife who was there with me ran into the room where my children were and hid under the bed with them. I went outside to the adjacent palhota where my other children were staying—but they had gone inside and were hiding inside, only I did not know that and thought they had run into the aldeia. I started to follow, but then I realized that the shooting was in front of me [which meant] that the bandits had already passed by my house and were between me and the aldeia. Then I had to run into the bush. My wife and children had already run away but in a direction I did not know. They stayed in the bush hiding for two days and then came back into the village when they saw a woman getting water and she told them it was safe. I remained hiding for three days. I was scared [but]

> finally I needed to look for my family. When I came back the [FRELIMO] soldiers beat me severely because they said that I had run toward the bush instead of the aldeia because I was helping the Matsangaisse. I was scared of what they were thinking. . . . I decided to leave with my [youngest] wife to be in the bush. . . . Some time later I heard that the [FRELIMO] soldiers were looking for me to kill me because they said I left the village to tell their secrets to the Matsangaisse. But I had not seen the Matsangaisse except when I heard their shots in Chipudje.

Understanding Popular "Political Agency" in the Mozambican Civil War

The history of the Mozambican civil war is being reforged, with particularly close attention to the question of RENAMO's status as a movement with genuine popular support. For a long time the dominant view was that RENAMO's "popular support" was coerced—a product of terror tactics (Hanlon 1984; Gersony 1988; Saul 1985; Mazur 1989; Vines 1991; Wilson 1992; Roesch 1991, 1992). Yet even during the war itself, when a more ideologically slanted and experientially circumscribed historiography prevailed, some analysts who collected extensive testimony from Mozambicans and foreigners who had lived in RENAMO areas concluded that the picture was more complex (Minter 1989; Geffray 1991; Human Rights Watch 1992). Above all, some analysts noted that RENAMO's successes, even after its external backing declined, pointed to the need for more penetrating analysis:

> Lacking all features we have come to associate with successful insurgencies in Africa, such as charismatic leadership, or easily identifiable ideology, it [RENAMO] has failed to develop a political identity commensurate with its military strength. It has no clearly defined regional base, relies on widespread forced recruitment, and behaves with notorious brutality towards the civilian population. Yet it operates throughout the length and breadth of Mozambique and holds the state in virtual paralysis. Since it lacks rear bases and therefore depends upon local provisioning, it must be able to obtain compliance over large areas of rural Mozambique. . . . [T]he question . . . in particular is how an organization with so little appeal that it must rely on widespread forced recruitment can achieve such a measure of "success" against the Mozambican state. (Hall 1990, 39)

Questions about RENAMO's popular appeal only increased after its surprisingly strong showing in Mozambique's first and second national elections. In the first national election (1994), after the civil war had ended, RENAMO garnered 37.8 percent of the vote nationally (Mazula 1995). However, in Machaze District, RENAMO won by a landslide, receiving almost 80 percent of the vote.[15]

As one of the earliest sites for RENAMO activity, growth, and development, Machaze provides an important place in which to examine the question of how and why a movement that has been well documented as predatory throughout much of Mozambique was able to garner local support and legitimacy when it first began to emerge. Local political alignments are a complex issue that requires a nuanced analysis of the historically constituted basis of political agency (Gengenbach 1998; McGregor 1998; West 1998; Englund 1995, 2002; Chingono 1996; Alexander 1994).

Although there is no doubt that RENAMO's early development and even survival depended heavily on the material support of foreign governments, in Machaze the incipient movement rallied a substantial following without overt coercion. It is particularly difficult to argue that the only basis of RENAMO's appeal was terror, when the majority of the district's residents initially opted to live in areas under RENAMO's influence rather than in areas under FRELIMO's control.

The importance of growing "internal" popular support—in Machaze and a handful of other nearby districts—for the incipient insurgency should not be underestimated, not least of all because of the rather precarious state of RENAMO's military fortunes early in the war.[16] Between October 1979 and December 1981 the three major RENAMO bases within Mozambique fell to the Mozambican army. In the first of these actions—against the base in Gorongosa—the movement's leader Andre Matsangaissa was mortally wounded (Vines 1991, 16). Sitatonga, just northwest of Machaze, fell a few months later in early 1980 (Vines 1991, 19), while the base established in Garagua (just southwest of Machaze) fell in December 1981 after RENAMO had been reintroduced into the country by its new South African backers (Vines 1991, 20).

Because Machaze served as a major staging point for the government's military action against both Sitatonga and Garagua, news of the *bandidos*' defeat most certainly was widely circulated throughout the area in which RENAMO was attempting to establish its foothold. Yet during the same two years in which it suffered these military setbacks, the best estimates are that RENAMO's strength grew from between five hundred to a thou-

sand combatants to over eight thousand (Hall 1990, 40). While the training, supplies, and logistical support provided by the South Africans made it possible to arm these recruits, accounts from such places as Machaze suggest that these early numbers were reached at least in part through voluntary rather than coerced recruitment. In my own survey of fifty former RENAMO combatants and their families I found that 62 percent of those who reported joining RENAMO before 1982 did so voluntarily (whereas less than 15% of those who joined after 1982 were volunteers).

Christian Geffray's *La cause des armes au Mozambique* (1989; translated into Portuguese in 1991 as *A Causa das Armas: Antropologia da Guerra Contemporanea em Moçambique*) represented a watershed in the analysis of local political alignment in war-time Mozambique in departing from the view that RENAMO was incapable of generating genuine popular backing. Based on a combination of fieldwork done before the arrival of RENAMO in rural districts of the northern province of Nampula and during the war itself with people who had left RENAMO-held zones, *La cause* was the first study to present evidence that, in some areas, support for RENAMO was (at least initially and in part) uncoerced and even enthusiastic. Geffray argued that initial popular support for RENAMO was primarily the product of widespread rural discontent with FRELIMO policies that suppressed and oppressed cultural practices and identity:

> [The opposition to FRELIMO] by both the dominant and dominated members of rural societies was a matter of liberating social life from its seclusion, of eliminating the oppression and humiliation that the discourse and the attacks of the FRELIMO state instilled in the spirit of each [Mozambican] about the value of his existence. . . . [T]his recuperation of an insulted identity, this quest by wounded personal dignity, provide the only historically intelligible collective motivations for understanding the sacred union that was reborn between the chiefs and their dignitaries, and the joy, the hope, that the populations felt on the eve of that "beautiful and just" war. (1991, 54)

Forced villagization and collective agriculture constituted the backbone of FRELIMO's plan for a uniform rural modernization within a socialist framework for development, and any social structures seen as impediments to this plan were targeted. Geffray identified FRELIMO's disenfranchisement and humiliation of traditional authorities as the catalyst for popular opposition. In his view, these authorities were acknowledged by the population as representing the dignity and cultural identity

of all, and consequently their mistreatment carried broad symbolic import that had a critical impact on popular perceptions:

> I will not insist on the importance [for the popular turn against FRELIMO] of the notables in the chiefdoms, whose authority and dignity was seen to be affected. The facts and testimony throughout this book will clearly show the importance of their political position and the disastrous effects of their marginalization and humiliation. *All* of the *local* interpretations about the origin and the meaning of the war refer to this aspect. It is simply emphasized that with the alienation of these notables, though the elimination of their political, social, and religious prerogatives, and in the face of the vehement discourse which ridiculed, threatened and insulted them, the populations understood that it was their very own social existence that FRELIMO was negating. For this reason they felt shame, a paradoxical feeling of being obliged to pass into clandestinity with all their social existence and history, occasioned by those who, in their name, had ended colonial oppression. (1991, 19)

Perhaps the greatest virtue of Geffray's work was to place the question of popular support for RENAMO on the table and to insist on an investigation of the political agency of Mozambique's rural inhabitants that took their cultural terms of reference seriously.

However, in offering no explanation as to why local populations valued "injured traditions" enough to rise up and fight for their preservation—other than their continuity with the past—Geffray seemed to use an antiquated concept of "culture" that cast symbolic systems as largely disarticulated from political and economic processes. Bridget McLaughlin and Alice Dinerman have both rightly noted that Geffray's focus on cultural oppression and identity failed to include any significant analysis of the impact of FRELIMO's policies on the economic life of a subsistence society. Although Geffray recognized that villagization had dire effects for many people's subsistence strategies (as was also the case in Machaze) he argued that this policy was primarily resented as a technique of social control rather than because of its economic impact. He also failed to analyze how rural lives were affected by constraints on migration and the collapse of the national economy, even though people in rural Nampula were enmeshed in economic relationships that extended to urban areas and even across international frontiers (McLaughlin 1992)—much as was the case in the (seemingly) isolated rural backwater of Machaze.

Dinerman and McGregor have also pointed out that some of Geffray's

empirical findings from his fieldwork in Nampula cannot be easily reconciled with his main theory that popular support was primarily a reaction to "cultural oppression." His main argument that "the restoration of traditional practice and identity" was the primary motivator for early adherence to RENAMO does not dovetail with his observation that rural youth were attracted to RENAMO because of the empowering and enriching opportunities of a military lifestyle, which supports an interest in overturning culturally sanctioned patriarchal and age-based authority systems.

The idea that the past legitimacy of social forms might be the sole basis of popular political support for RENAMO fails to explain the empirical evidence in the Machazian case. For example, it fails to explain why certain FRELIMO policies that broke with established practices—such as introducing the maachamba do povo and the challenge to the authority of the régulos—did not immediately or uniformly elicit widespread resistance but only did so later.

Some have argued that discussions of popular political alignment during the Mozambican war should pay greater attention to other forms of social differentiation such as class (Abrahamsson and Nilsson 1994), ethnicity (Geffray 1991; Roesch 1992), or other social dichotomies such as that between "rural" and "urban" populations (Geffray 1991). However, these explanations also fall short in explaining popular political agency in Machaze. In particular, there is little evidence that the distribution of population between RENAMO-held and FRELIMO-held areas corresponded with particular social cleavages of class or any other primary form of social differentiation. The sociodemographic profile of people who ended up in the villages—age, generation, education, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and gender—was not noticeably different from that of those who ended up fleeing into the bush. Although certain fairly specific and restricted social categories tended to align more often with one side or the other—régulos, nyangas, and nyamusoros with RENAMO; secretarios, milicias, and public functionaries with FRELIMO—even these roles were far from being hegemonic predictors of the political alignment of particular individuals.

For example, although RENAMO specifically sought the support of the régulos in the Machaze area, not all of them aligned themselves with the insurgents. Several fled to the communal villages because they were fearful they might be seen by the government as RENAMO supporters if they did not. In several such cases a member of the régulo's family took on his role in the nearby RENAMO-controlled area.[17]

Dinerman has convincingly argued for the need to "preserve the possibility that different social strata adhered to RENAMO for different reasons" (Dinerman 1994, 13). If we expand this statement to include the inverse possibility—that support for FRELIMO was similarly motivated—a number of novel and complicating possibilities are opened up for explaining local political alignments throughout the country during the war. Thus, in both Manica (Alexander 1994) and Niassa (Englund 2002) disputes over village headmanship were identified by ethnographers as playing a significant role in shaping political alignment for or against RENAMO. In an analysis of urban youth recruited by RENAMO in southern Mozambique, Carrie Manning demonstrated that individuals joined RENAMO's ranks both because they opposed FRELIMO and because of the positive incentive of personal socioeconomic advancement (Manning 1998).

A variety of social and economic interests were important in shaping the political alignment of many Machazians (the role of such "micropolitical" struggles in shaping both war-time violence and migration is the central theme of the next chapter). Nevertheless, it is problematic to reduce local political agency to a function of local social interests. In particular, this view does not account for the fact that individuals simultaneously occupied many different social roles, which could inform their interests in different and sometimes mutually contradictory ways: for example, the secretario who was also a church member, the woman who had some sons who were milicias and others who joined the Matsangaiisse, the daughter of a nyanga whose husband was a government-paid teacher.

Any satisfactory analysis of the Machazian case must account for the fact that, despite the complexity of such vested interests, the overwhelming majority of the population ultimately chose to relocate in areas away from FRELIMO's immediate control, areas that eventually mainly fell under RENAMO's sway.[18] This systematic popular preference cannot be explained solely with reference to myriad personal socioeconomic interests, major forms of social differentiation, or by any interest in defending "oppressed culture." Rather it is evidence of a degree of local recognition of, and preference for, one vision of the macropolitical order over another. Paradoxically, the idealized political order that Machazians generally aspired to was not actully shared by RENAMO. I argue that a majority of Machazians opted to resettle in RENAMO-controlled areas because they mistook that organization's failure to articulate an alternative to FRELIMO's vision of state-society relations as an indication that central state authority in local affairs would be minimized in the political order RENAMO sought to usher in.

Machazian Political Agency in War and the Implications of Misrecognition

The notion that some rural populations may have aligned themselves more readily with RENAMO because they preferred one vision of political order over another has hitherto not been given very serious consideration by most analysts of the Mozambican civil war, in large part because there is broad agreement that RENAMO never had a well-articulated political program or ideology. This was particularly true during the earliest years of the movement's existence when Rhodesian and South African interests played a dominant role in shaping RENAMO's operations on the ground. Many analysts have pointed in particular to RENAMO's growing predilection for predation against its own civilian population after it lost South African logistical support to argue that RENAMO only fabricated a political visage late in the conflict to win legitimacy from an international audience (Saul 1985; Geffray 1991; Hanlon 1984; Vines 1991; Minter 1994). Geffray summarizes this conclusion: "RENAMO is evidently not an association of bandits. But it is also not a political organization, and it has no project whatsoever for the populations it has lived off of parasitically for almost fifteen years" (Geffray 1991, 25–26). In short, this argument holds that local populations could not adhere to RENAMO's political agenda because RENAMO had no such agenda. The evidence from my own fieldwork in Machaze, most particularly the depictions of the message of the movement's earliest "hearts and minds" operatives (like Sigauke), does not contradict this view.

However, these prevailing arguments fail to consider another possibility, that of a popular misreading of RENAMO. Indeed, the Machazian case offers evidence that the local population *perceived* in RENAMO's actions a political vision, *despite the organization's lack of a political program.* By separating out the question of RENAMO's actual program from popular *perceptions* of political agendas on both sides, it is possible to conclude that many local residents saw RENAMO as a vehicle for fundamentally transforming the macropolitical landscape. Specifically, many Machazians recognized in the very concrete and ideologically unsophisticated prescriptions advocated and enacted by RENAMO's local agents (such as Sigauke) the possibility for reestablishing greater distance between themselves and a central state that had grown increasingly intrusive.

Paradoxically, it was precisely RENAMO's *lack* of any explicit model

of articulation between local lives and central authority that resonated most profoundly with Machazians. RENAMO's initial silence about the configuration and local role of the state left room for Machazians to imagine the macropolitical backdrop for their lives in the terms of their own choosing—a vision that was most notably characterized by the virtual absence of central state authority.

Popular fear of (state) authority and fantasies about its absence predated colonialism itself. Thus early Portuguese administrators in the region were baffled by the apparent contradiction between the allegiances pledged to the Portuguese throughout the region after Gungunhana's defeat and the reluctance to accept Portuguese mandate as a substitute; they were unable to recognize both as expressions of yearning for relief from the intervention of central power. Gungunhana's tributary rule, colonialism's labor-hungry governance, and FRELIMO's attempts to revolutionize society—all supported the most tried and tested political truism: the state meant trouble. These historical dispensations reinforced a reflexive posture of disengagement as the central feature of Machazian political agency.

From this perspective, RENAMO's local appeal in Machaze was not related to any interest in safeguarding an imperiled traditional way of life, nor was it a response to cultural humiliation. Rather, it was a reaction against the most notable locus of power to which growing structural violence could be attributed—the state itself. Machazians did not seek to simply defend cultural practices for their own sake but, rather, reacted with a feeling of deep and growing deprivation in an environment of rapidly shrinking social and economic opportunities. Notably, many of the lost opportunities most resented were quite recent, only introduced during the last decade or two of colonial rule, rather than timeless traditions.

Somewhat similarly, Manning has argued that in southern Mozambique

> people joined or supported RENAMO for a variety of reasons ranging from personal problems with authorities to disagreement with specific government policies or ideology to ethnic-based grievances. As such it is in a similar position to many anti-colonial movements in Africa—it draws from a loosely bound, diverse group of people united only by their common opposition to something else. (1998, 188)

However, to argue that people knew what they were against—even if they were against it for different reasons—gives short shrift to the possibility that people shared common ideas about what they were for. Popular

political alignment in Machaze involved more than merely social opportunism (though this too mattered) and resulted from more than the mere convergence of different grievances and social interests. It was ultimately motivated by a broadly subscribed vision of state-society relations.

What this vision involved was driven home to me in the course of a discussion in Machaze in which a group of men answered my question "What would be the best way to be governed?" with a description of how the "original" (Tonga) inhabitants of the area had lived and governed their own families and affairs. In a twist on the more commonly recounted origin story in which Ndau settlers had come from the west and dominated the original Tonga inhabitants (see chapter 2), one of the participants (a régulo himself) explained: "When the Nhamundas saw the way of life [of the Tonga] they too wanted it because they saw it was better. This is how they came to stay here together."

This highly "localist" vision of political order was that of the Machazian population itself and not that of RENAMO's leadership. Whereas RENAMO's leadership thought—crudely perhaps—of *replacing* the state, Machazians thought rather in terms of *banishing* the state. Thus, the legitimacy RENAMO enjoyed early in the war in Machaze may well have been merely fortuitous, an inadvertent outcome of its lack of a statist political program happening to coincide with the local population's idealization of a state-society relation that had been honed by an environment of rapidly intensifying structural violence, which they attributed to the postcolonial state's interventionist policies.

Notably, as the war wore on RENAMO was subjected to the same sort of evaluation as FRELIMO. In a manner akin to that noted by Geffray in Nampula, subsequent local experiences with more predatory forms of RENAMO management led to growing local disillusionment with RENAMO in Machaze, motivating efforts at disengagement from this pole of political authority as well.[19] However, against Geffray, I argue that the popular disillusionment with RENAMO in Machaze during the course of the war had little to do with popular realization that RENAMO did not have a political agenda or blueprint of its own. I argue precisely the contrary: it was RENAMO's lack of political vision of the state or a program for its local articulation that gave it local legitimacy.[20]

There is broad theoretical importance in the point that RENAMO may have resonated locally precisely because it *lacked* the type of state-centered structural and ideological architecture that most Western-influenced social scientists have been trained to recognize as the marker

of political authenticity. Much of the social analysis of war-torn Africa presumes that "imagined communities" must be articulated around a vision of the nation-state in order to qualify as authentically political. Consequently, visions of the political landscape that do not take the state as their final object or articulate a vision of it are thus subject to misrecognition as socially opportunistic and dismissed as essentially nonpolitical.

The Machazian case arguably reveals that those who draw such conclusions may be privileging their own lived experience of the hegemony of the state (Young 1994) when constructing the analytical categories they use to explain political perceptions and alignments that actually operate with reference to other imagined possibilities. Alternatively, ethnography that identifies the terms with which historically and socially constituted subjects conceptualize projects of macropolitical power can offer a powerful analytical antidote to the study of political agency in armed conflicts, and most particularly in contexts in which histories of state interventionism have generated a strong local desire for the state's absence, rather than for its reconfiguration or for its capture.

Blurring War and Nonwar

In summary, the trajectory of Machazian war-time political agency was driven by both failed expectations and multiple forms of misrecognition, both by the state (which misinterpreted resistance to its policies as support for RENAMO) and by the local populace (which misunderstood RENAMO's political agenda). If the sudden demise of colonialism provided Machazians with momentary hopes that a potential break with a history of heavy-handed state intervention was imminent, the first few years of independence thoroughly dashed these hopes and reaffirmed a longstanding posture of adversarial disengagement with central authorities. FRELIMO's policies came to be viewed as the latest in a long succession of undesirable intensifications in central-authority intervention. Although some district residents—such as régulos, nyangas, nyamusoros, and pastors—suffered more directly and acutely from FRELIMO's attempt to dramatically refashion the local social order, most residents noted a dramatic erosion in the quality of their lives and encountered growing difficulties in the pursuit of essential life projects and established life strategies. Even if the most overt forms of violence were visited on those who represented the local social institutions that FRELIMO sought

to replace, a set of interrelated conditions conspired to expose the majority of Machazians to rising levels of structural violence.

For most Machazians armed violence was not experienced as a phenomenon disassociated from the mounting structural violence that had characterized everyday existence since independence. In the Machazian case, the line between structural and acute violence is analytically far from distinct, and the progression from one to the other far from unilinear. The postcolonial government's misinterpretation of the political meaning of local strategies of disengagement led it to pursue increasingly coercive measures that set in motion a vicious cycle of reaction and counterreaction: the local population responded to FRELIMO's efforts by seeking to avoid the attention of the state through historically proven strategies, which in turn reinforced government suspicions of local complicity with RENAMO and led it to take even more extreme measures against the population. Ironically enough, this cycle ultimately generated a significant base of local support for RENAMO that had not existed when the movement first appeared in the district. That support rested on a misrecognition of RENAMO's lack of a political project for the state as an actual program to minimize the state's presence in local lives.

Although retrospective analysis can trace the full course of this cycle as a descent into full- blown war, this result was not self-evident to those caught in the unfurling of these events at the time they occurred. Far from providing clear signs of impending "war," many of the initial Machazian encounters with acute violence—the forced villagization campaign, the assaults on the shops—lent themselves to ambiguous and contrary interpretations about what was likely to come next. For most of the district's residents war did not come on them with a suddenness akin to that of being thrust into the dark after a light has been switched off.

Rather, most accounts of living through this frightening and confusing time seem more analogous to the experience of being slowly overtaken by a patchy fog in which banks of mist, varying in their inscrutability, are punctuated by patches of clarity, with little to indicate whether they will deepen into a storm or dissipate momentarily. The episodes of violence and distress that Machazians confronted in the gathering moments of the war often gave way to stretches of mundane normality in which conditions improved and danger subsided.[21] In short, the first four or five years of insurgent activity in Machaze were experienced more as a seamless extension of already deepening structural violence than as a dramatic break with the past.

An understanding of the dynamic interpenetration of structural and acute violence is crucial to an analysis of warscape agency. As I have already detailed, the behavior of refugees and other warscape inhabitants tends to be implicitly understood as instinctively reactive—driven by "flight or fright" impulses—and subject to little considered deliberation (Kunz 1973, 1981; Richmond 1988). Such reductionist depictions presume (among other things) that a stark and self-evident distinction can be drawn between "war" and "normal everyday life."

"War" is usually depicted as a distinct and well-defined phenomenological condition, temporally and sociogeographically bounded by forms of social, political, and psychological experience that are fundamentally different from those that precede or follow it. More often than not, specific events frame particular periods as ruptures in the flow of social process that are designated as "wars." Such periodizing events usually involve acute violence of the organized and "political" kind—such as a declaration of war, an opening assault on military installations, a raid to free political prisoners, a truce, or a surrender of arms.

However, many Machazian accounts did not so easily offer up unambiguous—much less consensual—markers with which to neatly demarcate the experience of "war" within a linear flow of events. Instead, Machazian stories about the beginning of the war tended more often to convey a sense of mounting uncertainty and unease, rife with ambiguous interpretations of changing circumstances whose implications were far from self-evident and which were colored by differing views about what witnessed events might foreshadow. Thus, most accounts of the war's arrival were similar to the following account, which is perhaps most noteworthy for the fact that the woman who recounted it only realized she was in a "war" (*hondo*) after having fled armed violence several times:

> We were just sitting when five men came and greeted us [clapping gesture] from over there [the old woman pointed toward the edge of the clearing]. They said, "Father, we are hungry." My husband told them to sit here. I killed a chicken and they ate chicken and *sadza* [cooked cornmeal]. Then they saw we had some *canyu* [a fermented fruit drink] and asked for some to take with them. Then they left. Two of them had guns and the others had *catanas* [machetes]. Some days later some milicias came by, and they said they were looking for the "*bandido armados*" [armed bandits]. My husband said he did not know any *bandido armados* but that some men had come by earlier. Then the milicias said, "No. You know them too well because they came here directly.

We know this because we saw the boot prints coming straight to your house. Why did you not say they had visited you?" Then they beat my husband very badly. It was because of this that my husband left to Joni [South Africa]. [Some time later] the milicias came back and took my son to the aldeia, while I was out in the field. When I came back I had to follow after him with the little one and my daughter who had been hiding in the bush because she was afraid the soldiers would beat her like they had beaten her father and brother. We stayed in the aldeia until I had to come back for the next saacha [hoeing]. It was very far, so I stayed here [instead of returning to the village]. . . . Then the milicias came looking for us again, but my son, my daughter, and I hid in the bush so they could not find us. They burnt down our house when they could not find us and they took many things—pots and clothes and all the chickens. After that we were afraid to work in the fields because the milicias might catch us, so we just sat and waited. We were very hungry so I took the children to find my father because he lived a long way from the aldeia. When we arrived they made a place for us. Before the last saacha soldiers came by where we were staying and they took all of us and our goats and chickens to another aldeia. They said everyone had to come because of "*hondo.*" That is when I heard about this thing of "*hondo.*"

In the Machazian case the seamless interpenetration of structural and acute violence charged events with an emergent and unpredictable quality that blurred the boundaries between conditions of "war" and "nonwar." Throughout my fieldwork I found that posing the question "When did the war arrive in Machaze?" had a frustrating tendency to elicit a range of remarkably dissimilar answers from different respondents. Often different respondents narrated "genesis events" that occurred several years apart. Some of the more typical responses included "FRELIMO brought war with it when it arrived" and "when the Portuguese left"—both events that occurred years before RENAMO was even organized. Others offered eyewitness accounts of the early armed attacks by RENAMO against local shops that occurred throughout 1979 and 1980.

However, for many, *hondo* arrived as a moment of personal epiphany much as it did for the woman quoted above—long after the district had been swept by various waves of insurgent and counterinsurgent violence. Viewed cumulatively, Machazian narratives reveal the "war" as a gradual and uneven layering of structural and acute forms of violence and uncertainty, rather than as a sudden and distinct rupture in the flow of everyday life. In short, particular claims about when and where the war started

are post-facto rationalizations. They rarely reflect the confusion and uncertainty with which people struggled as they sought to interpret events while they were living through them.

Consequently, rather than reacting as if they had been suddenly immersed in circumstances that were thoroughly alien and novel, Machazians tended to confront and cope with the looming challenges through strategies that had been deployed in the past. Thus, rather than being a mere reaction to the political programs of the parties contending for state power, Machazian political agency remained grounded in a historically forged logic that sought to minimize the state's presence rather than to capture it. In the long gathering storm of war we thus clearly see Machazians using the past to interpret and formulate responses to their uncertain present.

CHAPTER 5

Prosecuting Life by Other Means

The Social Logic of Violence in a Fragmented War

As a violent form of political action, war has classically been understood as a phenomenon that is organized by the governments and/or insurgencies that are contesting power at the national and international level. The dynamics of war-time violence (its specific forms, timing, who enacts it, who suffers from it, and why) are most often explained with reference to the ideologies, interests, and the social logics of those who most noticeably evidence the technical means for perpetrating it. These are typically the armed political factions that pursue state power through military action. The social analysts of Mozambique's postcolonial civil war have often analyzed the dynamics of war-time violence in precisely these terms, explaining the savagery of military violence against civilians in certain parts of the country as a tactic for controlling local dissent (Geffray 1991; Vines 1991; Finnegan 1992; Minter 1994) or as an attempt by a nominally weak military force to use terror to gain influence it could not achieve on the battlefield against a superior conventional force (Hanlon 1984; Gersony 1988; Saul 1985; Wilson 1992; Minter 1994; Nordstrom 1997).

More recently, the complexity of many contemporary conflicts throughout Africa has given rise to another view of war-time violence, which is seen not as the disciplined monopoly of political factions but as disorganized chaos and social contagion. Many of the subaltern world's "new wars" (Richards 2004) appear less precisely located, spilling back and forth across borders, the lines between combatants and noncombatants blurred, and the objectives of warring factions less distinctly "political" in the sense that privateering and pillage play a greater role than ideology in

motivating and shaping violence. If the violent enterprise of war has always been depicted as destructive and disorganizing, these conflicts tend to be cast as hyperchaotic and randomly, even incomprehensibly barbaric. As Paul Richards notes, the images that predominate in depictions of these "new wars" are "epidemiological," equating the spread of mass violence with the relentlessness and mindlessness of a viral contagion capable of "infesting" entire regions (2004, 2–3).

Against this view of "meaningless and arbitrary violence" Richards argues that these "new wars," like all wars, should be understood "as long-term struggles for political ends," and thus as one form of social project among many, organized by social agents embedded in specific cultural contexts. Ethnography, Richards suggests, is particularly suited to the task of analyzing violent political struggle because it is capable of rendering the political contest in the terms of those who are fighting. In this chapter I extend Richard's insight by demonstrating how ethnography can reveal how war-time violence can be socially organized and far from "meaningless" or "arbitrary," even when it is not monopolized by political factions struggling for state-level power.

More specifically, in this chapter I describe how the residents of Machaze appropriated the means of violence of the two national parties to the civil war (FRELIMO and RENAMO) and harnessed it to other social agendas. I explore how military violence was diverted and deployed in an array of social struggles defined in terms of highly localized and culturally distinct logics that were largely unrelated to the contest for state power. For many of Machaze's residents, the war created new opportunities for pursuing a wide variety of social objectives that had little to do with RENAMO's or FRELIMO's political objectives or even their own idealized vision of state-society relations. These "other struggles" were related to gendered or generational power configurations within households, to seeking socioeconomic advantage, and to the pursuit of redress for personal grievances. In short, in Machaze the "Mozambican" civil war quickly became about much more than simply the violent contest for state-level political power, that is, war as defined by Carl von Clausewitz's famous dictum, "War is the pursuit of politics by other means." It also became about the prosecution of everyday life through more violent means.

Although it is certainly essential to understand the political projects of the "national" or "state-level" parties to war and the ways in which local populations understand, engage, and react to such projects, analysis

that restricts itself a priori to the social and cultural composition of war's master (macropolitical) narrative provides an incomplete understanding of the organization, dynamics, and social experience of war-time violence and of the strategies (migratory or otherwise) that the inhabitants of war zones formulate to respond to violence. In Machaze local assessments of risk and strategies for coping with violence often had little to do with the political programs of either of the national parties to the war.

Although political parties with statist agendas may be the primary perpetrators of acute violence in war zones, they are often not the only—and perhaps in many cases not even the primary—shapers of war-time violence. Although the struggle for political power in Mozambique provided both a rationale and the means for increased violence, national political agendas often did not guide its deployment in Machaze—often because local RENAMO or FRELIMO agents were unwittingly manipulated by local inhabitants, and sometimes because they appropriated power for their own private ends.

The dramaturgical prosecution of war in Machaze was a highly complex staging of violence characterized by articulated, yet often semiautonomous, shadowy, and highly localized, subplots. These parallel dramas had their own origins and logics that problematized, and were informed by, the more obvious narrative that occupied center stage in the "war," that is, the struggle for state power. My goal in this chapter is to model an anthropological approach to war-time violence that investigates its causes and shaping forces rather than assuming the primacy of macropolitical factors.

Social Animosity and Its Mechanisms of Redress before FRELIMO

Before the war, the problem of managing local social antagonism was a significant concern for Machazians. One of the major roles of the traditional authority system before and during colonial era had been to arbitrate local property, marriage, household, and community disputes.[1] Machazian expectations of these authorities were grounded in the fundamental belief that social governance should revolve primarily around effectively managing the sociospiritual relations believed to powerfully impinge on all aspects of their everyday lives. Machazians believed that virtually all social conflict and misfortune had an underlying sociospiritual

root cause. The ontological basis of local beliefs about the relationship between misfortune and social strife is crucial for understanding key elements of popular sentiments about social order and justice and the practice of social dispute resolution in Machaze. This ontology's defining feature is what might be termed a "moral view of causality," a worldview that assumed that beyond the evident mechanics there lurked more fundamental moral causes.

This is perhaps best illustrated by contrasting the Western theory of illness with the beliefs of someone from Machaze. When I contracted malaria during my fieldwork and was told that its "cause" was a parasite transmitted via mosquito, I accepted this explanation as a full description of the cause. In other words, I deemed this information sufficient for identifying what I needed to do (take quinine) to remedy my plight. However, a resident from Machaze, though quite likely to accept exactly the same mechanical explanation for how I contracted malaria, would not see this as a full and sufficient explanation. Instead, he or she would likely ask additional questions that would never even occur to me, such as, "What is the moral failing or problem that caused the mosquito to bite this person in the first place? Why did it bite him and not someone else?"

Fundamentally different ontologies implicitly inform these understandings of causality. One view sees causation as fully explained in mechanical and nonmoral terms (the mosquito bit me by chance), and the other sees an additional and ultimately more fundamental level of moral causation behind the mechanical (the mosquito bit me in particular because of some moral failing on my part, or because of someone else's moral agency). The "moral view" is not opposed to the "mechanical view" but is supplementary to it, requiring additional and more fundamental causal grounds than those provided by mechanical explanations, without in any way rejecting those mechanical explanations. For Machazians all problems such as illness and misfortune were believed to ultimately be indicative of a point of contention between social actors—of disarray in a social world that included not only the living but also the spirits of the dead—that required its own form of treatment.

Machazian understandings of the basis for legitimate local authority were thus cast in a register similar to that described by anthropologist Harry West in his analysis of the social logic of power in Niassa in the far north of Mozambique:

> As Muedans have [historically] reproduced the discursive genre of *umwavi* [sorcery], they have sustained distinctive sensibilities about the workings

> of power in the world they inhabit. They have interpreted and engaged with their world through a dynamic but enduring cultural schema (Ortner 1990) historically sustained within the discursive genre of *uwavi.* According to this schema, power is by definition the exceptional ability to transcend the world most people know in order to gain leverage on the world to extraordinary ends. Sorcerers move in a realm beyond the visible world. From this privileged vantage point they envision the world differently than ordinary people do and bring their visions to fruition, generally in the service to their own selfish interests and to the detriment of neighbors and kin. . . . According to this cultural schema, however, not all power is destructive . . . (but also) finds beneficent manifestation in the acts of responsible authority figures who—like maleficent sorcerers—possess the ability to enter into the invisible realm to elaborate and realize transformative visions of the world. (West 2005, 6)

In a context in which Portuguese authorities conspicuously abdicated from any involvement in questions of predominant local "political concern," Machazians relied heavily on their own local institutions to identify effective sources for the "the exercise of beneficent power [that] entailed transcendence of the world produced by maleficent sorcerers and the undoing of their destructive acts of power" (West 2005, 7). Much as in the context described by West, Machazians also viewed social governance as revolving around the skilled task of invisible power's continuous management in "an unending series of transcendent and transformative maneuvers, each one moving beyond, countering, inverting, overturning, and or reversing the one preceding it" (West 2005, 7).

To Machazians the primary challenge was managing and mitigating the core mechanism of malevolent power's activation: social animosity. Machazians conceptualized their social world as including continuous social interaction between the living and the spirits of the dead. Foremost among these spirits were one's own deceased ancestors (vadzimu), believed to intervene in the lives of the living in order to correct moral failings, usually by causing minor illnesses. In a historical context of rising intergenerational friction they were viewed as capable of causing (and increasingly willing to do so) more grievous harm, which had formerly been attributed almost exclusively to malevolent "foreign" spirits. Some spirits, such as the much-feared mambos (dead régulos) were believed to be the source of particularly grievous forms of harm.

Although it was firmly believed that spiritual malevolence could be activated through conscious acts of sorcery by those seeking to further selfish interests or attack social rivals, Machazians also believed that

spirits could be inadvertently mobilized simply because of ill will. Ill will, particularly if publicly expressed, could serve as a "portal" or "channel" through which malevolent spirits could act opportunistically to cause harm.[2] An unfortunate event, such as a child's sickness, could easily spark accusations against social rivals and antagonists. Envy was viewed as a particularly likely source of spiritual malfeasance. It was usually attributed to those who had relatively intimate knowledge of an individual's affairs. Suspicion thus most often fell on members of one's immediate household or extended kin—a husband, a daughter-in-law, or a co-wife.

If the fundamental sociospiritual root cause of social conflict and misfortune was not addressed it would leave the matter unresolved and justice incomplete at a fundamental level. All problems were believed to be indicative of disarray in a social world that included not only the living but also the spirits of the dead. A concern with identifying the genealogies of social animosity—whether purposive or inadvertent—and mitigating its damaging sociospiritual effects centrally shaped the objectives and dynamics of all forms of local arbitration—including local property, marriage, household, and community disputes.

Although the colonial government technically vested the régulo with sole authority in exercising local customary law, in Machaze this hardly describes the complex local institutional framework of actual practice. In the Machazian context régulos were inevitably assisted in the resolution process by the group of advisers and elders known as madodas. A strong emphasis in these deliberations was placed on reaching consensus both among the aggrieved parties and among those sitting in judgment. Accordingly, the deliberations of madodas often had the tenor of counsel and wisdom sharing in support of mediation between the aggrieved parties.

On consulting with madodas, régulos would usually send one or more of the parties to a dispute to confer with other ritual specialists in order to determine what specific activities had provoked ancestral intervention, whether spiritual malfeasance had been intentionally or inadvertently triggered, and whether additional parties were implicated in the root cause of the problem. Nyangas and nyamusoros were possessed by particular forms of spirits that enabled them to intervene with the ancestors and diagnose solutions that would appease spirits, and church profetas increasingly were called upon to use the Holy Spirit to do the same. Often such specialists were also called upon to confirm a régulo's determinations, particularly if a party proved reluctant to accept such rulings.

Although dispute resolutions might be described as having been "made" by the régulo, it would be more accurate to say that a local régulo "pronounced" a decision that was the product of the interactions and deliberations of a rather large number of different agents. The number of agents involved and the extent of deliberation tended to increase with the complexity and perceived seriousness of the social conflict under consideration. Particularly complex cases could take many weeks or even months as different ritual specialists were consulted on the same matter and the progressive revelations of their divination were discussed by madodas and régulos and the parties involved.

The objective of this social dispute resolution process was not to determine who was right and who wrong, leaving one party feeling seriously aggrieved. The sentiments of ill will of all parties ought to be considered and addressed, and a successful resolution would be one that mollified all, thus reducing the degree of ill will. Once generated, ill will was viewed as residing in a person as a dangerous state that facilitated malevolent spiritual action toward anyone who came into contact with the aggrieved individual—in a manner akin to that of a contagious virus. Any continuation of animosity, especially if overt and public for all (including the spirits) to "see," was a significant threat not only to the other party but to their extended kin, and even to the community as a whole.

This sensibility bore significantly on the types of "punishments" determined for most cases. Corrective measures sought not merely to redress the grievances of those who suffered wrong but to account for the impact on broader social relations and the sociospiritual order. Rulings thus tended to have restorative and socially reparative objectives rather than punitive ones. More emphasis was placed on restoring the rights and addressing the losses of the aggrieved than on punishing the transgressor. A typical judgment might require a guilty individual to pay a fine or perform a service for the other party or for their extended kin, or both. Additional community service might also be required, such as working on the régulo's land.

Although punishment that did not address the consequences of the wrong committed for the victim was not generally seen as having achieved "justice" as most Machazians conceived of it, any resolution that did not address root spiritual causes or mitigate animosity was also seen as deficient and incomplete. It was akin to the treatment of a symptom without addressing the illness that caused it in the first place. As a whole, this complex and often incremental process of dispute resolution tended to

ensure that a broad variety of interests at stake within the community were taken into account with the goal of dampening both the present degree and future potential of social animosity writ large.

In the late colonial context, which was characterized by limited involvement of the state in local affairs, growing economic differentiation, and a rapid recalibration of social power, Machazian notions of legitimate social governance centered on the challenges of social-animosity management and the local institutions that provided that social service. If the Portuguese colonial state had largely abdicated from a role in this process, the postcolonial regime sought to insert the state into this system of local social governance and justice in an entirely unprecedented way . . . and with significant political consequences.

The Consequences of FRELIMO's Reengineering Local Justice

I have already described how FRELIMO banned those community leaders associated with the colonial era's traditional authority system (régulos, madodas, nyangas, nyamusoros, and church leaders) from occupying positions of authority in local government in 1977 and replaced them with secretarios (party secretaries). The secretarios were appointed as the principal authority in areas known as "*bairros*" (wards). In Machaze these *bairros* did not necessarily coincide with the jurisdictions that had operated under the régulado system. Several local FRELIMO officials reported that this measure was taken to directly challenge and subvert the old system. Within these *bairros* the newly appointed secretarios were responsible for communicating central-government policy to the local population and for mobilizing local residents to perform public service or to participate in the various campaigns (vaccination, public health, political education) organized by the government.

However, in Machaze they also took over the resolution of social disputes.[3] Under the secretarios the dynamics of local conflict resolution shifted in dramatic and unforeseen ways, creating far less socially negotiated and far more punitive solutions. More often than not these "solutions" heightened levels of social animosity rather than mitigating them, while the relationship between the spirits of the dead and the living—for most Machazians the core mission of social governance and a fundamental requisite for satisfactory social conflict resolution—was entirely neglected.

Conflict resolution as administered by the secretarios proved less responsive to local concerns and more responsive to the agenda of the state, which sought to infuse its own ideological precepts into the social dispute processes. The eradication of "obscurantist practices" (the term FRELIMO leaders frequently used to refer to all beliefs and institutions associated with traditional authorities and healers) was at the forefront of this government agenda. Social disputes became a particularly important arena in which low-level officials could publicly perform their allegiance to FRELIMO's social and political program. Consequently, many district residents reported witnessing cases of dispute resolution in which *both* parties were ordered beaten by secretarios if any mention of uloi was made in the deliberations. As one former secretario who later fled the country and returned after the war confided:

> We [the local secretarios] knew that not treating this thing of uloi would cause confusion. But the district administrator would beat anyone who even spoke of such things. At the meetings he would say we must all work to eliminate this talk of uloi because it was something that was only in the heads of reactionaries and bandits. Some [secretarios] believed him when he said these things . . . but others did what they did out of fear only. I know some [secretarios] who would beat those who came to them with talk of uloi so that the administrator would see they were with FRELIMO . . . but then these same ones would go secretly at a later time to consult with nyangas or [church] profetas.

The new government's rhetoric also encouraged officials to make public examples of those whose behavior was deemed "reactionary." Yet "reactionary behavior" was often defined by the FRELIMO leadership in the vaguest and most arbitrary of terms that easily lent themselves to unintentional misinterpretation as well as intentional abuse at the local level. Some memos circulated by top party officials even designated particular forms of speech, clothing, and hairstyle as symbols of "reactionary behavior" to be prohibited and punished (Hall and Young 1997, 74–86). Many Machazian residents described many of the social disputes brought for resolution to the secretarios as resulting in both parties being indicted and punished for "reactionary behavior" without further attention to, much less resolution of, the grievances between the parties.

Punishment under the new postcolonial dispensation was also described by many eyewitnesses as often particularly punitive. Some of the more common punishments included beatings with sticks on the soles of

the feet and forcing people to peel bark off tree trunks with their bare fingers. Other offenders were reportedly forced to stand for hours in merciless heat holding a rock or a heavy piece of wood over their heads. Although such punishments undoubtedly registered memorably in the public consciousness, they contrasted dramatically in their social effects with the prescriptions reached through the prewar conflict resolution system. Not only were restorative imperatives largely ignored but the harshness of punishments often fueled even greater ill will and resentment.

Local social animosity was further fed by the unchecked abuse of power by many of the government officials who presided over conflict resolution. Absent the involvement of madodas or nyangas, the deliberations of secretarios were less subject to the multiple local influences present under the régulos. At best this meant that the disputes tended to be framed as a matter of a narrow problem between two parties in which the primary objective became determining who was right and who was wrong—but with less weighing of the interests of a broader range of actors. At worst, with no social mechanisms to mitigate the arbitrariness of their rulings, many secretarios took advantage of their power to pursue personal gain or other agendas. As one man wryly put it, "When the secretarios resolved [a case] you could be sure that no matter who won the secretarios would always eat well!"

In overturning the local sociopolitical order FRELIMO had not only marginalized those who had been in power but also placed many who had been formerly marginalized into power. Throughout Machaze it was common belief that socially and economically successful individuals had availed themselves of supernatural means to achieve their status and it was frequently suspected that the spiritual power they appropriated came at the expense of others in the community. This view found a rough and ready resonance with the new government's simplified socialist pronouncements against inequality and individual profit, reinforcing the belief of at least some newly empowered secretarios and FRELIMO sympathizers that they had a right to redress wrongs committed by those who had once held power and achieved social or economic success through supernatural means. As one former secretario explained:

> Some [migrants] also had medicines [magical and empowering substances] that they brought from Joni. They would bury these at night in their maachambas. Then they would eat well from these fields, but maybe their neighbor would eat poorly from his own maachamba. Then he would know it was because of these

> medicines. . . . But with FRELIMO this came to an end because they said it could not be that some were working and some were just eating. . . . Everyone should work and eat the same. This is why the secretarios had to beat those who were using medicines, because they were stealing from the mouth of their neighbors for their own stomach.

Secretarios and other local FRELIMO officials took advantage of their power and authority in other ways as well. The scarcity of consumer goods and inflation had encouraged the growth of black market (*cadonga*) enterprise throughout the country. A government crackdown on this *cadonga* trade allowed secretarios and other petty party officials to arbitrarily appropriate the property of returning migrants on not always clear or justifiable grounds, especially given a long tradition of migrant-based petty trade in the district. Accounts of migrant's being dispossessed of their property abounded in the interviews I collected:

> I had been home from Mabopane [a township in South Africa] for some time when the secretario came by with a milicia. They said that I had brought back so many basins because I wanted to make money through *cadonga*. I had four wives [implying this was why he had brought back so many basins] . . . but they did not want to know about that. Later I learned that when I had come back that milicia had heard I had arrived and brought too many things back and had grown jealous so he told his kinsman [the secretario] so that they could come and take these things by saying it was *cadonga*. . . . It was not true, but what could I do? . . . They took all the basins, the cloth, a radio . . . too many things.

However, for most Machazians the most significant and detrimental consequence of the new system of local social governance and justice was that the sociospiritual factors believed by most district residents to lie at the root of social disputes remained unaddressed, leaving most with a sense of unfulfilled justice and a growing apprehension about the effects of festering social animosity. This sentiment was echoed in many comments like the following one by a district resident about the first few years of FRELIMO's governance:

> After FRELIMO arrived, the spirits of mambos became very hungry. Many people were dying because of this. This is why FRELIMO burnt the *campas* [graves] of the régulos. But this did not stop the killing. One day a man would be walking to his field and maybe he would see a snake . . . or maybe he would

> step on a thorn. Then later that day he would feel a weakness. In a few days maybe he would die because of this uloi. . . . This is how strong the mfukwa became, so that a grown man could be killed in one night with such a small thorn.

The perceived growth of spiritual malfeasance amplified a sense of mistrust and crisis, to which the deterioration of economic opportunity and the state's social engineering policies had already contributed. Armed violence between RENAMO and FRELIMO thus broke upon a social scene in which new mechanisms for addressing conflict were not only viewed as ineffective but had helped inflame local social animosity.

Local Infiltrations of War-time Violence

RENAMO's appearance in the district and the central government's subsequent efforts to force the local population into fortified villages opened the first cracks that allowed social and economic opportunism to gain leverage in shaping military violence. Milicias were among those most noted and first resented for their opportunistic abuse of power, particularly during the earliest stages of the conflict when they provided support for regular FRELIMO troops in the villagization campaign, often acting as advance scouts and informants. As local residents they served as the most effective guides for regular troops unfamiliar with the area. However, many took sides in local social strife, pursuing their interests in these social struggles under the guise of following government orders. Milicias were also believed to be particularly susceptible to envy; although they had guns, they received no wages. While facing most of the same dangers confronted by regular troops, milicias were never paid even the meager salaries that government soldiers (*tropas* in Portuguese or *masochas* in ChiNdau) received. As one man explained:

> Before FRELIMO, no man could enter another man's place without greeting him. No stranger would come into his house. Not even his brother would come past [the border of the homestead clearing] if he did not desire it. This one would live here and that one would live there and another one over there—each would know his own life. But when the milicia came he had the guts to enter because he had a gun. If he had no other possibility then he had to make

> the gun work for him. Sometimes the milicias would come on their own, and sometimes one would come with the masochas looking for bandidos. He would not even know the man, but he would see the life that person had and his heart would grow envious. He would think to himself, "I need this, I need that." So he would come back when the owner was in the maachamba and he would take these things and say, "It was the bandidos!" Some would come back with masochas to take you to the village. They would say, "Go! Go!" to make you go quickly. When you came back later you would find your pot, your chair, your chicken gone because the milicia knew where you were staying and would go back at night to take them. Sometimes they would even just kill someone to take what they wanted. Then they would say, "He was a bandido."

In turn, RENAMO's tactics of targeting anyone who held a government job soon provided many of those who felt most aggrieved by FRELIMO policies, or by secretarios and milicias, with their own opportunities to seek revenge. In several areas former régulos or their family members saw an opportunity to challenge what they felt had been an unjust and humiliating inversion of the social order by pointing out FRELIMO functionaries to inquiring RENAMO troops. Often these public officials were beaten and killed. Others, who were forewarned in time to flee before the Matsangaiisse arrived, experienced the abuse or loss of close family members, some of whom were tortured in an effort to make them reveal the whereabouts of their kin.

Thus, many of those who fled into the villages at the outset of the war harbored deep personal grievances not only against the Matsangaiisse but also against those who assisted them. Many suspected that long-time social rivals had assisted RENAMO in identifying and locating them and sought revenge by identifying these individuals and their relatives as RENAMO collaborators and by assisting FRELIMO troops in locating their homesteads. One Machazian migrant I interviewed in South Africa recounted his experience with such social dynamics:

> [In the past] I had "problems" with the secretario because of our mothers. . . . After the Matsangaiisse came he fled into the village. His mother died two days after arriving in the village so he believed I had "given him" [identified him] to the Matsangaiisse. When I heard he was saying this [from a friend] I left and went into the bush because I knew he would send the masochas. My first wife refused to come, and when they came they took her and two children and burnt the house. She later died in the village. . . . We [the man, his second

> wife, and the children] stayed in Usa [an area in the center of the district] for many years while the war was still hot. While we were there some people came from the aldeia [where the secretario had been staying] and one of them said, "I know you!" Then she said that the secretario was still looking for me . . . always, always looking. . . . Even now that I am in Joni he will still be looking for me if I go back.

However, as the war gained a more pervasive grip on the district, secretarios and other government functionaries were not the only ones who pursued personal revenge in the guise of partisan political action. Troops and commanders on both sides unfamiliar with the area relied heavily on local sympathizers and informants, particularly early on in the conflict. FRELIMO cadres provided government commanders with information about the recent presence of RENAMO troops in an area, while RENAMO troops would often inquire at the first local residence they encountered in an area in order to identify the local secretario and other public functionaries. Commanders on both sides thus relied heavily on local inhabitants to identify and locate "enemy sympathizers." Increasingly, many district residents exploited the dependence of military forces on local informants to prosecute social grievances that had nothing to do with the political struggle for national power. As the war progressed many district residents became adept at using accusations of "collaboration with the enemy" to settle long-standing social disputes that had nothing to do with the political agenda of either national party to the conflict.

Thus, for example, in one case a man and his wife who had moved into the village had been involved in a long dispute with a neighbor over some beehives bordering their two homesteads. The neighbor, who had also resettled in the village, procured a land mine through a family member who was a member of the government militia, and planted it near the honeycomb. The other man and his wife were both hit by the land mine when they visited the honeycomb. The man died instantly and the woman died later the same day after crawling back to the village.

Notably, in Machaze the lines of social conflict that tended to acquire such violent expression were more often than not intrafamilial, breaking along the forms of social cleavage that were already marked by significant social tension long before the war. One of the most common types of domestic conflicts that informed war-time violence in Machaze was that between co-wives. I collected many accounts similar to the following one by a resident of Chipudge:

> At that time I had three wives. . . . This mother [the oldest wife] and that one [the third wife] never had good understanding with the other one [middle wife]. Because of these problems I was always sending [my middle wife] back to her father's house. She was staying with her father when the Matsangaiisse came and took her brother and her son [as porters]. Later they sent the son back [but not the brother]. . . . When the masochas came to say everyone must go to the aldeia this [middle wife] did not go, but she stayed when the other two [wives] were in the village. Then the [older wife] told the soldiers that the son of the other one was helping the bandidos. Then they went to find him and they beat him and they beat her and they beat her father. They said to the father, "You gave one to the bandidos? How many more will you give?" Everyone was brought back to the village, but my son died soon after because of this beating.

The social logic that motivated such "intimate violence" also tended to be dictated by the cultural logic that had long informed the complex dynamics of Machazian social interaction before the conflict. In another notable case, I was told about the war-time fate of a man who had been a particularly successful migrant and consequently had started several grinding mills. His older brothers, who had not been as successful in their migratory careers, were intensely envious. He was a RENAMO sympathizer and had chosen to move to a remote area to be farther from the FRELIMO villages. However, his brothers convinced RENAMO troops that he was taking grain into the villages and giving it to government soldiers. As a consequence, he was shot by RENAMO troops, with whom he ironically sympathized. Such cases reveal how local social agendas—rooted in prewar social tensions and culturally specified logics—strongly influenced the deployment of violence by FRELIMO and RENAMO from the very outset of the conflict.[4]

Sociospiritual Disarray and the Evolving Spiral of War-time Violence

In an environment in which the social institutions that had served to resolve social disputes had been eviscerated, particular aspects of the cultural logic that informed local feuding behavior rendered every act of war-time violence generative of yet further violence. Machazians believed that those who suffered the particularly violent and unjust deaths that became

so common during wartime were likely to become mfukwas. The deaths of soldiers who were "outsiders," and of those who perished in the bush but remained unburied, were believed to contribute to the proliferation of mfukwas. Such mfukwas were dangerous, not only because they were motivated to kill to avenge their own deaths but also because as outsiders they were, in local terms, "unknown" and thus regarded as more difficult to "bargain with" because "their customs remained unknown."

However, an even more intimate threat was posed by relatives whose violent death was believed to provoke them to take on this mfukwa state. An irate mfukwa was believed likely to threaten the well-being and even the life of its own immediate family members if they did not seek redress for the spirit's violent or wrongful death. Some of Machaze's residents admitted to participating in violence in what amounted to a form of sociospiritual defense, believing that in the absence of any other possibility for redress, revenge would be regarded as the only justice capable of deflecting the wrath of violently slain relatives—as explained by an interviewee in Manasse:

> After my brother was killed I came and took his wife and [three] children to stay with me in Gwakwanye. But then the children started to get sick. At the profeta's my brother [that is, his spirit] said this wife was of his lobola.[5] After I went to pay lobola, the youngest child died. Then [through the profeta] my brother said that the oldest child must be kept for him. Then he asked who had sent the masochas to kill him. The profeta said [to my brother's spirit], "It was not this brother who killed you. It was that one and that other one who sent the masochas to kill you." When we told this to the commander he sent soldiers to wait near where one of these two assassins was staying. After the Matsangaisse killed the one [identified assassin] in his field my brother accepted [my] lobola [meaning he accepted the marriage of his brother to his former wife and his brother's claim on all children, save the eldest].

Machazians were often concerned with the potentially dire social consequences of the presence of a mfukwa in the family. Knowledge or suspicion of such a presence could place relationships in the broader community at risk, since it became part of the package of actors that a family brought into social interactions with other parties. Conflict with someone who had a family with a mfukwa was believed to be particularly dangerous, and thus families suspected of having mfukwas were likely to be shunned. Such concerns played a particularly important role

in determinations regarding key social relations, such as in the choice of marriage partners.

FRELIMO's public crackdown against nyangas, nyamusoros, and profetas before the war had left the culturally prescribed institutions for peacefully seeking resolution of such sociospiritual dilemmas thoroughly decimated, particularly within the aldeias communais. Although a number of these ritual specialists had either been forcibly relocated into the villages or had sought refuge of their own accord, few were willing to openly practice their craft for fear of being labeled "reactionary" or suspected of being an enemy sympathizer. The crippling of peaceful forms of conflict resolution and a growing sense of sociospiritual crisis also contributed to lowering the social barriers against violence as a form of redress in local conflicts that would have previously been solved through recourse to these institutions. Reflecting on the first years of the war one Machazian recalled how desperation could render neighbors and family members capable of doing things they would have never contemplated doing before:

> When so many people started to be killed the war became hot. It became too, too hot. Some were not in their right mind but did things because their grief was too much. Then all they could do was think of killing. Sometimes even your own family member would see you captured and would not speak for you. He would only say, "No, kill him! Kill him!!" I do not want to go back to that time.

Another aldeia resident described the dramatic effect of his father's death on his own outlook:

> After we had moved to the aldeia, my father kept going with my mother to work in the fields. One day when they were coming back they saw the Matsangaiisse and started to run toward the village because they were afraid. My mother escaped, but they caught my father and they killed him with a gun. It was very close to the aldeia because we heard the shots and then the following morning we found the body just over there. After that I wanted everyone that the masochas captured to be killed. Even when Carlos killed the old woman and the man with the bayonet it made us all glad, and everyone was yelling at them to be killed [they were accused of being spies who had facilitated a deadly attack on the aldeia]. . . . Even now Carlos has many troubles because those two are mfukwas to him. . . . We would not want those two old ones

> killed like that again because they will give no rest . . . but back then our hearts were too hot. We were too bitter because of so many killings like my father. . . . There were too many mfukwas made in those times.

Ultimately, in such an environment, each act of violence in Machaze became the motive cause for similar acts of retribution, generating an ever more socially inclusive spiral of escalating violence throughout the district as the war progressed.

Other factors also conspired in this escalation. Many local FRELIMO officials worked in an environment in which there were strong incentives to tally numbers as a mark of "revolutionary success." Many felt that any report of local failure of government policies would be attributed to their implementation rather than to the policies themselves, and that it might even invite suspicion about their own loyalty and dedication. As one district-level FRELIMO official commented to me:

> We had to say to the superiors in Chimoio that all the campaigns had gone well. If they did not, we had to say it was only because of the "bandits." . . . You could not disagree with the provincial directorate because then they would say that you were being difficult. Then maybe they would begin to think that you were also a reactionary or even a bandit.

Such pressures reduced incentives for local officials to verify whether ulterior motives informed accusations about collaboration with the enemy. Thus, although the intent of the FRELIMO leadership was certainly not to see the government's power abused, the pressure that it exerted on local cadres for antireactionary results and its failure to provide effective checks on the exercise of local power contributed to the proliferation of violence.

Social Agency in the Constitution of War-time Violence

More often than not actors in war zones are treated dichotomously, as either those whose weapons provide them with the agency to "do things" (not least of all to victimize others) or alternatively as those whose position at the other end of the gun strips them of virtually all agency and to whom things are done (that is, as victims). Even when noncombatants are viewed as agents, violence is more often than not used to demarcate

distinct populations of "perpetrators" and "resisters" (Nordstrom 1997). Yet the picture of war-time violence in Machaze is shaded in less distinct or emotionally appealing tones of gray, allowing few people to be placed unequivocally "outside of violence." Conflicted as their accounts may be in retrospect, Machazians emerge more often as participators in war-time violence than as its resisters. Far from being merely acted on by violence as a force from without, Machazians proved adept at diverting and using violence in the pursuit of their own social agendas. From this perspective violence was not so much a force that stripped individuals of agency but rather a mechanism by which many individuals exercised and even amplified their agency—often in ways that would have been far more difficult and less effective under other conditions. War-time violence did not eliminate local concern with other social or "micropolitical" projects but was itself shaped by the pursuit of those very projects. Machazian agency was thus a critical force in the constitution and configuration of war-time violence.

The war-time agency of Machazian residents was also evidenced in their strategies for coping with violence, particularly in their war-time migration decision making. Machazian residents were well aware that violence was not always a direct and unmediated expression of the political interests of one of the two politico-military factions, but that it was highly susceptible to being shaped and directed by local interests. Consequently, the logic of local social conflicts played a significant role in local strategies for coping with violence, most particularly in war-time migration decision making about when and where to go and with whom.

As war-time violence spread throughout Machaze most residents took careful stock of the choices and violent experiences of other important social actors in assessing their own exposure to danger and in formulating appropriate strategies for dealing with risk. Although many residents only fled their homes when violence crossed their threshold, many others sought to preempt violence by moving before it arrived. Often such preemptive moves were precipitated by news that a social rival had suffered violence. Many feared that such individuals would suspect they had played a role in their suffering and would seek revenge by identifying them to troops seeking "enemy collaborators"—as in the case of a Machazian woman who weathered the war in the aldeia in Chitobe:

> When we were staying in Mutondo the masochas came and burned many houses and they took many people with them to the aldeia. But they did not

> find my house so it was not burnt. I was hiding with my children. Then [the brother of a deceased co-wife] started to say, "How did this house not get burnt? She must be with FRELIMO." He said this out of envy because they had burnt his house and mine had not been burnt. After this I took my children and went to the aldeia because I was afraid. . . . This relative had many problems with my husband [a dispute over his deceased sister's children]. . . . I knew that if the Matsangaiisse came he would say, "This one, she is with FRELIMO." So it was better to go to the aldeia so they would not kill us.

Often on hearing that a social rival had been captured by one faction, individuals or households would move in exactly the opposite direction into areas controlled by the other faction. Those who had contentious relationships with FRELIMO officials or milicias before the war were among the earliest to recognize the need to react to RENAMO's campaign of terror against government officials. Many moved deeper into the bush on hearing that officials or their family members had suffered at the hands of the Matsangaiisse and had fled into the aldeias. In particular, the family members of individuals who were likely to be identified as enemy collaborators by one side or the other—such as régulos, secretarios, teachers, health clinic officials, nyangas, or pastors and other church officers—learned very early on that they were likely to become targets of violence when relatives who were the intended targets were absent or could not be found. The movement of régulos, pastors, and local government officials thus often precipitated the migration of their immediate family members or other extended relatives who feared they might become proxy targets.

The Mozambican Civil War as a Fragmented War

A brief comparison of the growing body of ethnographic work that addresses the dynamics of the civil war in Mozambique underscores how the means of war-time violence were marshaled to serve specific forms of local conflict in other areas of the country as well. For example, in his analysis of the conflict's development in the northern province of Nampula, Geffray (1991) reported on how forms of social tension very different from those that shaped violence in Machaze informed war-time political alignments among the Macuane and the Erati ethnic groups, which had a long history of antagonism that predated colonial conquest. The

more politically centralized Erati had been co-opted into the Portuguese system of indirect rule and had come to occupy an intermediary position of privilege between the Portuguese and the subordinate Macuane during the colonial era. When independence arrived in 1975, the Erati capitalized on their experience with centralized bureaucracy to occupy most local positions in the postcolonial government. Erati forms of social organization also proved more amenable to FRELIMO's program of reengineering the socioeconomic order through centralized planning than did those of the dispersed and decentralized Macuane. The Macuane had retained a generalized stance of distrust of and disengagement from central authority throughout the colonial period that was not dissimilar to the political sentiments in Machaze. Like the residents of Machaze many rural residents of Nampula were also particularly resentful of the postcolonial government's forced villagization campaign and greatly resented the divestment of traditional authorities. The Macuane proved the most readily receptive to the antigovernment insurgency when it arrived in Nampula in the mid-1980s, seeing in RENAMO not only relief against the government but also a way to remedy the resented ethnic dominance of the Erati.

Many Erati had their own misgivings about FRELIMO's rural reengineering policies, and some had hopes that RENAMO's arrival might spell some relief. However, once the Macuane aligned with RENAMO, the Erati generally reacted by seeking support from FRELIMO, resulting in an ethnic polarization of the local population. Thus, in Nampula the war took on ethnic characteristics quite different from those evidenced in Machaze, where there weren't two polarized ethnic groups. In Nampula ethnically defined communities tended to align as a whole with either FRELIMO or RENAMO. This pattern of community cohesion and interethnic violence contrasts sharply with the patterns in Machaze, where ethnicity was irrelevant to the shaping of war-time violence. Rather than violence occurring *between* communities as in Nampula, in Machaze violence primarily occurred *within* communities, quite often among extended kin, and even frequently among members of the same household.

In another area of the country—the southern province of Gaza—the historically constituted social tensions that played a role in shaping wartime violence were structured by yet another ethnic dynamic with its own particular history (Roesch 1991, 1992). The atrocities committed by RENAMO troops (who in this area were predominantly Ndau) against civilians (who were predominantly Shangaan) were particularly noteworthy

for their savagery (Gersony 1988; Roesch 1992; Human Rights Watch 1992; Hall 1990; Minter 1994).

There has been a long history of contention between Shangaan speakers and other ethnic groups north of the Save River. This rivalry predated colonial rule, extending as far back as the northward military expansion of the Gaza empire in the mid-nineteenth century (Newitt 1995, 348–52). As detailed in chapter 1, Gungunhana's rule was remembered ambivalently at best by the people of Machaze. Though many Ndau men pierced their ears to mark themselves as "Gungunhana's men" and thus associate themselves with his military prowess, oral accounts also emphasize resentment of harsh treatment and strong resistance to the efforts to forcibly relocate the local population when Gugunhanna moved to Bilene.

Colonial labor policies further cultivated this interethnic tension. Such policies had forced many Ndau speakers from the central provinces of Manica and Sofala to pretend to be Shangaans from the southern province in Gaza in order be eligible to participate in labor migration to South Africa. Machazian migrants often had to enter into subordinate relations with local Shangaan chiefs or individuals in Gaza that involved payoffs in order to succeed in this strategy. Many Ndau labor migrants resented this form of exploitation as well as what they perceived to be a Shangaan sense of superiority.

FRELIMO's closing of migrant recruitment centers in the rural north of Gaza that were most accessible to Ndau speakers soon after independence fed Ndau suspicions that FRELIMO was discriminating against Ndaus. After all, it was widely known that many of FRELIMO's most important leaders—including President Samora Machel—were from the Shangaan-speaking south. In contrast, RENAMO originated in the Ndau-speaking center of the country, and both its leadership and its early recruits were largely Ndau. Throughout the war a variant of Ndau became the operational lingua franca of the movement—so much so that it eventually became the source of schisms within the organization, as leaders from other ethnic groups felt increasingly excluded (Vines 1991, 84–85). It is thus not surprising that Ndau-speaking combatants in Gaza, many of whom might once have been Ndau labor migrants, may have sought revenge for perceived discrimination experienced before the war, more so than people in other Ndau-speaking areas, such as Machaze.

In another area of the country, in the Dedza-Angonia borderland with Malawi, anthropologist Harri Englund (2002) identified yet another important local dynamic at work in the shaping of war-time violence—

that of struggle for local village power between lineage rivals. Even before Mozambican independence, rival claimants to local chieftancy had aligned themselves in diametrically opposed ways with the Portuguese and with the emergent FRELIMO nationalist movement. After independence the disenfranchised former village leader (who had supported the Portuguese) was widely believed to have solicited RENAMO's intervention in the community, in part to reverse his own declining fortunes in local politics vis-à-vis his social rival (and brother) who had been appointed the village secretario. Englund notes how this particular contest for power exhibited important continuities with both immediate and more distant historical processes that had long shaped village formation through a continuous cycle of schism, resettlement, and political consolidation, and then renewed challenge leading to further schism.

What all these regional comparisons suggest when viewed together is the degree to which local social tensions, rather than only national political projects, shaped the deployment and understanding of violence in the Mozambican civil war as a whole. Elsewhere I have suggested that such conflicts might be described as fragmented wars—fragmented in that to a considerable degree war-time violence is likely to be harnessed to serve largely local agendas that may be highly variable across the national (or regional) theaters in which macropolitical actors militarily contest state power (Lubkemann 1998, 2000a, 2005a).[6] Certainly, from the perspective of those actors embroiled in the day-to-day violence of the Mozambican civil conflict, what the war was about in one area was often something entirely different from what the war was about elsewhere, as very different social antagonisms informed how local populations appropriated, assessed, and reacted to acute violence.

The notion of fragmented wars not only highlights social participation in war-time violence, but it is particularly significant to any social analysis of how people react to violence—and most particularly to the analysis of war-time migrancy. In fragmented war contexts such as in Mozambique, in which the violence of military actors was often deployed in the service of local-level social conflicts, reactions to violence, migratory or otherwise, tended to reflect the logic of those social conflicts. Highly localized patterns of migratory reaction to violence can be expected from the fragmentation of violence.

The proclivity for social conflict in Machaze to involve people within one's own community, extended kinship network, and even immediate family resulted in the dramatic social fragmentation of local communities

and even households, as individuals took into account the potential that local conflict would result in violence when formulating their responsive strategies. War-time migration decisions were as much about whom to avoid as they were about when, where, and with whom to move.

By contrast, in Nampula migration did not generally involve the fragmentation of households. Rather, migration tended to involve entire communities all moving together, or in movements of large factional groups. Thus, Erati villages moved primarily into FRELIMO areas and Macuane communities into RENAMO ones (Geffray 1991). In contrast, in Machaze, displacement typically involved the atomization of families, domestic units, and communities.

War-time migration patterns in Gaza also reflected how local ethnic tensions structured war-time violence. Whereas in Machaze, an ethnically Ndau area, most civilians fled from the government forces into RENAMO-controlled areas, throughout rural Gaza (a predominantly Shangaan area) the reverse pattern held true (Roesch 1992; Hall 1990). In Machaze RENAMO was primarily identified as an antigovernment force, whereas in Gaza it was perceived as an ethnically Ndau force. In each of these three cases very different patterns of war-time migration resulted from the ways local social struggles shaped the interpretation of war-time violence. Resulting differences in the social organization of war-time migration also reflected the highly differentiated dynamics of local social strife throughout war-torn Mozambique.

Ethnography and Multivocal War-time Violence

In 1998, over five years after the Mozambican peace accord had been signed, I sat in a small shack made of corrugated tin and wooden poles in a township near Vereeniging, South Africa, interviewing a man who had fled Machaze in the early 1980s at the height of the violence in the district. Like many others he was curious to find out what I could tell him as a recent arrival from Mozambique about the conditions back home. Like many others he also expressed considerable ambiguity about when, or whether, he would eventually return "home," and when asked the question directly, he answered: "When that thing of war [*hondo*] finally stops." Did he think the war would reignite? Did he believe that if RENAMO lost in the second elections that the movement would "return to the bush"? His answers to these questions both intrigued and enlightened:

> Those [RENAMO and FRELIMO] are all in Maputo now. They drink together, so why will they fight each other with AKs? The troops have all left Machaze, but it is still too, too hot. Who is in the administrator's office? The same ones are still sitting there that sat there during the war. Will they forget? If you walk to your field and you step on a mine will you forget? Will you see the one who killed your father and forget? No, you must remember. . . . You will sit in the tuck shop and drink, and you will see him and you will only think of revenge . . . of killing. . . . Then you will have problems . . . your family members may be sick . . . you will say that one is still hating me because of my father . . . and this one is speaking against me because of his relative.

Such narratives reveal how the residents of Machaze remained attuned to the ways in which war-time violence was constituted as much by local social antagonisms as by the contest for national political power, well after the war was officially over. Although the national peace negotiations of 1992 may have addressed the macropolitical dynamics of the war, they did little, if anything, to address the many micropolitical dramas that played such an important role in the staging and organization of war-time violence. Consequently, even those Mozambicans, such as the man quoted above, who were convinced that RENAMO and FRELIMO had made their peace did not necessarily understand that to mean the war was "really over." Many would remain hesitant to return until (and if) solutions were found to the local dimensions of war-time violence.

Throughout Mozambique different communities have been more or less successful in pursuing their own forms of local peace building (Igreja 2002, 2003; Honwana 2002; Nordstrom 1997). The strategies employed since the war have continued to reflect awareness of the multiple sources and local consequences of war-time violence.

The empirical evidence from Mozambique demonstrates that "violence" was problematized by the social formations and micropolitical matrixes in which it took place. Violence was not a singular phenomenon whose meaning was preestablished by larger forces and brought unaltered into local social contexts, but rather it was significantly reshaped by a highly differentiated terrain of local social tensions and cultural currencies. There was no singular war, no monolithic, much less homogenizing (Nordstrom 1997), experience or understanding of violence in Mozambique. In Machaze—as elsewhere throughout the country—the sources of violence were multiple, often highly local, and largely unrelated to national political ambitions or visions.

The profound complexity of contemporary conflicts throughout Africa has recently given rise to another view of war-time violence there—not as monopolized by political factions but as disorganized chaos and social contagion:

> For most commentators, "new war" is mindless mass action. It has become a behavioral phenomenon. War breaks out from time to time, like a midsummer riot in a jail. It spreads unaccountably like a fashion. People apparently become "infected" with the idea of war. "New war" is the hazard that has first to be contained before other more cultured and desirous developments can occur. (Richards 2004, 2–3)

Chaotic imagery and metaphors are particularly prevalent in descriptions of conflicts such as those in Mozambique in which violence was not rigorously disciplined by macropolitical narratives and narrators.

However, that the "master narrative" and its protagonists played only one role in the organization of Mozambican war-time violence should not lead to the conclusion that therefore war-time violence was disorganized, meaningless, or purely chaotic. It may be insufficient for ethnography to probe only the terms of war's macropolitical narrative, since war-time violence may be simultaneously implicated in, and organized by, multiple social projects.

Alternatively, to understand the dynamics and logic of war-time violence it may be useful for an ethnographic approach to register what can be termed the "multivocality" of war-time violence. Although multivocality is likely to be a fundamental characteristic of all war-time violence, its ethnographic highlighting may be of paramount importance in analyzing organized political action in contexts where histories of local engagement with the power of central state authority have forged the forms of "localist" political imagination discussed in chapter 4. Violence in such contexts is more likely than not to be thoroughly "fragmented" by the social problematics and cultural terms of expression of the various social formations.

What such fragmented wars require are parallel points of ethnographic entry: without neglecting the social production of master political narratives and their shaping of violence, analysis should also work its way back from the understandings of those who experience war-time violence in order to determine the causes and shaping forces of violence. In launching from these simultaneous points of departure ethnography has the potential to reveal and robustly explore the multivocality of war-time violence without mistaking it for cacophony.

SECTION III

The Social Condition in War

The previous three chapters explored how the political project of war can be conditioned by social relations (both at the local level and between the state and its citizens). The two chapters (6 and 7) in this section focus on social conditions during the war. Migration is once again the point of entry for examining warscape social existence. In chapter 6 I critically examine the relationship that is often presumed between war-time mobility and the social condition of displacement. In chapter 7 I extend that discussion to the broader theoretical question of the relationship between violence and warscape agency by examining how migration decision making was affected by social relations and the complex process of their renegotiation in a context of reconfigured opportunity structures.

Perhaps no condition is more readily associated with, and attributed to, war than that of displacement. Over the last fifty years a massive aid industry has developed that focuses almost exclusively on war-time migrants as "exemplary victims of war" (Malkki 1995b, 1997). Since its inception shortly after World War II, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has grown into one of the largest and most recognizable agencies in the United Nations, playing a lead role in coordinating the activities of hundreds of other international relief organizations in dozens of "complex emergencies" across the globe. Although technically mandated to assist only those war-time migrants who qualify as "statutory refugees," the UNHCR now often addresses the plight of many others who flee their homes in conflicts but do not technically qualify for that status, including internally displaced persons (IDPs) (Cohen and Deng 1998a, 1999b) and those who cross international borders but prefer to avoid official scrutiny by "self-settling" among local

populations rather than in official refugee camps (Hansen 1982, 1992; Sommers 2001; Lubkemann 2000a).[1]

However, regardless of whether or not they travel across international borders or achieve statutory status, it is the process of relocation under dire circumstances that typically qualifies people as "displaced" in the eyes of the international aid community—and that concomitantly identifies them as the "primary losers" in warscapes, who presumably most pressingly require humanitarian assistance. The concept of "displacement" implies that a multifaceted "package of losses"—of social networks and capital (Marx 1990; Utas 2005), of economic and material goods and means (Bascom 1998), of political and legal rights (Harrell-Bond 1986), of agentive power (Kunz 1973, 1981; Richmond 1988; Van Hear 1998), and even of cultural moorings (Scudder and Colson 1982)—is the inevitable by-product of war-time migration. Indeed "displacement," "forced migration," and "involuntary movement" have all become loosely interchangeable terms within the burgeoning interdisciplinary subfield most often designated as "refugee studies."

Scholars such as Hammond (1999, 2004) have argued that many of the common assumptions about the social effects of all kinds of mobility are ultimately wrapped up in the "sedentarist" biases of earlier, and now thoroughly discredited, structural-functionalist framings of social life that cast culture, language, people, and place as isomorphic. She argues that the notion that war-time migration or relocation inevitably implies loss rests on the assumption that people's life projects are all enacted within, and dependent on, the social and material resources of singular places, and thus that when they leave these places they lose those resources. Conversely, the same assumption also implies that the lives of those who never move are somehow less disrupted because they remain "in place," and thus presumably retain access to those resources.

In chapter 6 I compare differing Machazian experiences with war-time mobility to show that the relationship between movement and the conditions most often associated with the term "displacement"—sentiments of loss, disruption, and disorientation—was by no means a given. In fact, the extent to which war-time migration engendered such sentiments was socially differentiated: while relocation represented a significant disruption for many Machazian women whose socioeconomic status and power had been premised on the ability to pursue subsistence agriculture (a strategy premised on immobility), it represented far less discontinuity for their fathers, husbands, and sons who remained involved in labor migration

(a strategy premised on mobility). In short, relocation did not always, or for everyone, engender the sentiments and social conditions typically invoked by the term "displacement."

Ironically, it was war-time *immobility* that had such negative effects for at least some categories of social actors. In fact, those who experienced the most dramatic life disruptions were those who remained "in place" in the district throughout the fifteen years of the war. This population—predominantly made up of women, children, and the elderly—can be thought of as "forcibly immobilized" by military efforts to control the rural population and to "harden" both internal and international borders. The comparison of "war-time immobilized" with various "war-time migrants" provides the grounds for critically rethinking the apparently self-evident relationship between migration and war-time social conditions—and for redefining the very concept of "displacement" itself.

In chapter 7, I extend the discussion of the relationship between war-time mobility and "displacement" by examining in greater depth the case of Machazian men who sought refuge in the long-standing destinations for labor migration in South Africa throughout the war. Their war-time migration did not represent a significant disruption of life strategies that were already premised on mobility, and for many, war-time migration inadvertently generated new and socially empowering opportunities. Their experiences further problematize conventional understandings of the relationship between war-time mobility and "displacement."

Chapter 7 also demonstrates how the efforts by these men to capitalize on some of these new social opportunities, particularly those involving conjugality with South African women, played a critical role in the gendered patterns of war-time demographic distribution by motivating them to actively discourage their Machazian spouses and family members from joining them. The war-time migration decision making of all Machazians reflected concern with the preservation and renegotiation of social relations and the pursuit of key life projects such as marriage and childbearing and child rearing in a context in which social opportunity structures had been reconfigured in highly gender-differentiated ways. War-time migration was thus constituted as much by these "other struggles" as it was by the violent political and military dynamics of the war itself. Indeed, gendered, generational, and other micropolitical forms of social struggle continued to inform interests and orient behavior—migratory and otherwise—throughout the Mozambican conflict.

The picture of warscape social navigation that emerges from

Machazian accounts defies framings of war-time agency as either driven by a reductionist form of "survival utility" (Kunz 1973), recast in relation to a homogenizing experience of violence (Nordstrom 1997), or even as "tactically" inattentive to longer strategic social goals (Honwana 2000; Utas 2005). Rather, they reveal how established cultural frameworks continued to inform social interaction and behavior in even the most chaotic conditions—albeit as a source of meaningful social problematization (Hoffman and Lubkemann 2005) rather than as templates for cultural replication (Scudder and Colson 1982).

CHAPTER 6

Terrains of Displacement

War-time Mobility and Immobility

In contemporary humanist geography an important distinction is drawn between the concepts of "location" and "place." "Location" refers to a geographic coordinate—where people and things are physically situated. In contrast, "place" is more encompassing, referring at once to "the physical features and the social life which take place within a limited space, and the subjective images and values that this specific geographical place represents to people" (Malmberg 1997, 42–43).[1] In short, the notion of "place" that human geographers use emphasizes the definition and delimitation of space through a social process of assigning meaningful referents—both social (interpersonal) and material—to identify and differentiate between locations.[2]

Yet this more narrow definition of "place" is clearly not coequal with how many people conceptualize the worlds they inhabit. It does not capture the sum of social and material coordinates to which at least some people refer in conceptualizing and enacting their life strategies. In contrast to spatially bounded "places," such "lived environments" often transcend and even transact in spatial difference. They may even be socially constructed in ways that depend on the possibility of strategically maintaining a presence in a variety of very different places. By way of example, in earlier chapters I have described in detail how throughout the twentieth century Machazian men crafted life trajectories that depended on the ability to move back and forth between what they recognized as very different "places": Machaze and South Africa. The possibility of pursuing strategies that exploited the differences between these "places" was central to the way in which they imagined their lives—socially, economically, and conceptually—in the world.

Some anthropologists have opted to metaphorically extend the term "place" (or use the derived term "sense of place") to refer to the ways in which people and social groups constitute their "sense of being and belonging in the world" (Turton 2005),[3] while others theorists have cast about for alternative terms with which to denote how people constitute their "lived worlds" in social contexts that are space transcendent. Thus, for example, Emmanuel Marx has proposed the notion of "social world" as "the sum of all a [migrant's] social relationships and the forces impinging on them . . . [such that] social worlds are not confined to a particular place or limited by territorial boundaries" (1990, 189, 194). Yet, while "social worlds" can be made up of multiple places and even premised on their specific linkages, this concept nevertheless focuses solely on interpersonal factors while neglecting other aspects, such as characteristics of natural environments and of the material world, that people also often recognize as vital to sense of "being in the world" (Habermas 1992).

I want to introduce a different term to refer to the total environments in which people live—that of "lifescape." More specifically, I deploy this term to refer to the context of material (including ecological), social, and symbolic resources available to social actors for the realization of the life courses that they have been socialized to pursue. "Lifescapes" are thus distinct from "places," and the relationship between the two is an empirical question that must always be investigated from the perspective of historically situated and socially differentiated actors.

The lifescapes that enable individuals to live out the life courses they have been socialized to pursue may be coterminous with a single place in some cases and for some people. However, the life courses of others may presume lifescapes that span multiple places and depend on the social mechanisms and processes that link them—such as migration. By the time the Mozambican civil war arrived in the district, Machazian life strategies had long presumed lifescapes that were constituted by a socially systematic and syncopated interweaving of diverse "places" and of their specific resources (including at the very least Machaze, Joni, and the border areas of Rhodesia/Zimbabwe) that organized a complex (gendered and generational) division of labor.

I introduce this concept of "lifescape" as a tool for investigating the relationship between war-time mobility and displacement rather than assuming it. In the analysis of Machazian war-time behavior that follows I use the term "displacement" to refer to the process of lifescape reconfiguration rather than to the experience of war-time migration per se. More

specifically, I define displacement as the transformation of lifescapes in ways that render essential life projects harder to achieve and that, in the extreme, place life strategies at risk of ultimate failure. From this perspective, displacement occurs when people's lifescapes are reconfigured in ways that deprive them of the social, material, or symbolic resources once readily available and necessary for realizing common strategies of social reproduction. It is when people find that their best choice is to inhabit a lifescape in which normal—and vital—life projects are dramatically more difficult to realize that displacement occurs.

One of the more obvious ways that lifescapes can be transformed in this way during wartime is through physical relocation, in other words, through movement. To the extent that relocation from one place to another results in people losing access to certain critical social, material, and symbolic resources people do indeed experience displacement. Certain types of wartime migration—such as being crowded into refugee camps—profoundly transformed the lifescapes of Machazian women in highly problematic ways. In particular, the loss of cultivatable land fundamentally undermined the basis of their social power and independence. The accounts of such women show how lifescapes can clearly change in ways that make life strategies harder to realize because people move from one place that is endowed with a particular set of social, economic, ecological, and symbolic resources to another in which those resources are no longer available.

However, people may find themselves inhabiting dramatically reconfigured lifescapes for a variety of reasons other than migration. They may find themselves without access to vital resources because the places they inhabit qualitatively change under their very feet—without their having moved at all. Those who found themselves confined to the *aldeias communais* (communal villages) in Machaze District throughout the war—and were thus arguably the *least mobile* Machazians of all—actually suffered the most dramatic loss of access to the social and material resources necessary for carrying out their vital life projects. For many women, children, and elderly residents who remained in the district during the conflict the flight of relatives deprived them of vital forms of social support, often when they most needed it in order to survive. Similarly, long-established strategies for coping with ecological crisis were confounded by military and political policies that inhibited mobility for those who remained in the district throughout the war. For many Machazians it was paradoxically the *loss* of mobility that engendered the most acute deterioration and detrimental reconfiguration of their lifescapes.

In comparing the dilemmas of those who experience reduced life chances because of "migratory displacement" with those whose forced war-time immobility may be described as a process of "displacement in place" I question the assumptions that are often made about the social meanings and effects of war-time mobility. Moreover, by insisting that the relationship between war-time migration and war-time social conditions must be investigated rather than assumed, I lay the basis for the investigation of yet another possibility—that of migration without (or at least with minimal) displacement.

Gendered Migratory Responses to War-time Violence in Machaze

By 1981 the escalation of armed violence in Machaze had resulted in some form of migratory response by almost all the district's residents. Throughout much of Manica and neighboring Sofala a minority of the population could be found huddled in the government's aldeias communais. These militarized settlements were often surrounded by land mines, barbed wire, and entrenched positions manned by local milicias and growing numbers of regular troops garrisoned there. Although these settlements offered their residents a semblance of security it was the uneasy and uncertain safety of islands stranded in the middle of a rising flood. Located along the district's most significant roads, the aldeias grew increasingly isolated from one another and from the rest of the country as travel grew more perilous. The dirt roads that wound through the district's impenetrable brush were sown with a growing number of land mines and became the targets of increasingly frequent ambushes.

Many Machazians who had managed to avoid internment in the government villages attempted to furtively work the fields they had cultivated before the onset of hostilities. However, with time this became an untenable option as troops began to regularly patrol areas of former settlement because they suspected that some residents would attempt to work their former fields. Homes in these areas of former settlement were increasingly abandoned or destroyed and fields that had once been regularly cultivated lay fallow. A largely uninhabited no-man's-land emerged between the densely populated villages and the rest of the district's ever-more evasive and dispersed population.

As had been the case during periods of intensified colonial forced

labor recruitment, growing numbers of Machazian men reacted to the increasingly dire situation by reentering the international labor migration stream to South Africa. Although this male exodus accelerated with the onset of hostilities it had started even before RENAMO became active in the district, largely in response to the implementation of FRELIMO's intrusive social and economic policies. However, as the war intensified the tendency for troops from both sides to forcibly recruit those male captives they did not kill, an even greater number of men chose to pursue this strategy.[4] Meanwhile, those who heard of the growing difficulties back home while working in South Africa increasingly chose to delay their plans to return home, preferring instead to adopt a wait-and-see attitude.

In contrast to the international flight by Machazian men, most Machazian women initially tended to relocate within the district itself. Although some entered the aldeias communais, many more sought refuge in the densely vegetated interior of the district. Many found that they could cultivate improvised fields in relative safety in areas that were several days travel by foot from the government's communal villages. Small military patrols from the communal villages rarely were willing to risk venturing so far afield, and once the war intensified even larger columns of regular troops hesitated to stray far from the village defenses and the road network. Believing that they could weather what most expected would be only temporary turmoil, women sought to furtively pursue subsistence agriculture in these isolated areas. Rather than building permanent new homes, most constructed temporary lean-to structures that could be hidden in the bush and quickly rebuilt if they were perchance located and destroyed by marauding troops. Fields were intentionally kept small and cleared by hand (rather than through the more conventional and less labor-intensive method of burning) in an effort to conceal their existence from military patrols.

In many ways these engendered patterns of Machazian relocation at the outset of the war closely resembled the tactics that had so effectively frustrated the tax collection and forced labor efforts of Portuguese colonial administrators throughout much of the previous century. Such strategies may have also found inspiration in precolonial history. In at least one part of the district several residents recalled a local nyanga who, as the war grew "hot," began to claim to be the medium for an ancient warrior capable of directing people to "the safe places from the time of Gugunhanna." This innovator creatively drew direct parallels between historical

strategies of resistance employed against that precolonial ruler's efforts to forcibly relocate the local population to Bilene at the end of the nineteenth century and the current efforts by local residents to evade the postcolonial government's villagization campaign.

In short, engendered migratory patterns early in the war are best seen as attempts to continue ongoing subsistence strategies under conditions that, although novel in some respects, were in many ways seen by the district's residents as analogous to crises that had been periodically experienced in the past. Machazians thus responded to the emergent challenges of war by drawing on well-established coping mechanisms forged through a long history of crisis and political duress. In this sense war-time migration in Machaze did not—at least initially—represent a drastic break with the past.

Life in the Bush (under RENAMO)

Many of the remote areas in which growing numbers of the district's residents sought refuge were not under RENAMO's control when the first waves of resettlement occurred. However, as the war progressed RENAMO did establish varying degrees of influence throughout much of the district's expansive hinterland. In these areas RENAMO initially pursued less draconian policies toward the local population than it is reported to have instituted elsewhere in Mozambique. Thus, according to most eyewitnesses in Machaze, bases of the Matsangaiisse were not usually surrounded by a buffer of forcibly resettled civilians, as was the case, for example, in Nampula (Geffray 1991). RENAMO reportedly allowed most civilians to settle wherever they chose—providing they participated in the tributary system run by local régulos.[5] It also reportedly made little effort to restrict population movement, with the notable exception of harsh punitive action taken against civilians who attempted to resettle in the communal villages.

There are several possible explanations for why RENAMO adopted a less restrictive approach to population control in Machaze. One is that the vast majority of the population under RENAMO's control had strenuously tried to avoid relocation into the aldeias and there was little need to prevent people from seeking the protection of a state whose violence had induced their flight in the first place. Another reason RENAMO did not inhibit mobility in Machaze was that it benefited directly from it. The

steady trickle of petty trade back and forth between nearby Zimbabwe and RENAMO areas in Machaze not only provided an essential lifeline for many civilian residents but also an important source of sustenance for the RENAMO movement. Many eyewitnesses agree that the Matsangaiisse routinely manned "taxation stations" along the routes regularly traversed by the district's inhabitants and returning migrants. By most accounts these stations were at least initially relatively orderly and those who paid their dues were not unreasonably treated. On the other hand, those who attempted to evade these checkpoints and were caught were often subject to harsh treatment—almost always relieved of everything they were carrying and beaten, often pressed into porterage or other service, and occasionally killed.

The strategic importance of maintaining this taxation stream may explain the discipline RENAMO commanders exercised in this practice, perhaps even limiting harsh punishment to those who were caught trying to beat the system. One older man described how he had fared at the hands of a local RENAMO commander when he was caught trying to evade one of these checkpoints:

> I was coming back from Chipinge. I decided to go back to Gwakwanye by a different way. I was walking and then I heard noises so I hid in the bushes until a big group of Matsangaiisse had passed by. After awhile I started to walk again. But two of the Matsangaiisse had stayed behind in the bush because they believed that some were using this path but hiding from them. So they had stayed hidden behind while their comrades went ahead in order to catch the people who were hiding from them. They had jumped off the road into the bushes so you could not even see from the footprints in the sand that they had left their comrades and were hiding. That is how they caught me when I was walking by. They asked me where I was coming from, and when I said I was coming from Chipinge they began to beat me, saying that I was hiding from them. They took the salt and the food and a *catana* [machete] I was bringing with me, and then they tied me up and one of them began to beat me again while the other one went off. Later the other one came back with a woman. I did not know her but she had been walking the same road. They took her things and they beat and abused her as well. Then they took us both back to the others. I thought we were going to die. After we got to the camp they took the woman away and I did not see where. Another soldier came by and said, "I know this one! This old man came by us and was taking *pau preto* [a type of wood] to sell in Zimbabwe. Baba,[6] why did you not come back to greet us on your return? Do you

> not care to greet us?" Then they started to beat me very much with sticks and with the [flat part of the] *catana.* I thought I was surely going to die when their commander came by and told them to stop. He said, "Why do you want to kill this old man? Don't you know that if you kill the goat when it is thin and sick you will not be able to eat it when it is fat?" Then he ordered them to let me eat and let me go.

Such commanders appear to have been aware of the strategic usefulness of not "eating the population" on which RENAMO depended. By guaranteeing greater freedom of movement in and out of the district RENAMO hit on an important mechanism that helped ensure its sustainability in Machaze. In this respect RENAMO's administrative practices in Machaze seem to resemble those reported in some other borderland areas such as in Matutuine District along the Swaziland border in the far south (MacGregor 1998, 49–51) as well as in certain areas of the remote northern Niassa Province (Nordstrom 1997, 98–101). However, by many accounts the military discipline in this "taxation system" began to severely deteriorate during the devastating drought of the early 1980s.

Drought and War: The Political Ecology of War-time Displacement in Machaze

Starting in 1981 severe drought gripped the district, devastating agricultural production. Lasting through three agricultural cycles it made basic subsistence a life-and-death struggle throughout most of the district as well as in many other parts of the country. By some estimates over one hundred thousand Mozambicans from the south and center of the country died as a result (Human Rights Watch 1992, 102). As crops failed in the remote rural areas of Machaze the food that the population was able to provide for locally garrisoned RENAMO troops became scarcer. Although some residents reported that RENAMO troops sometimes took the situation into consideration and accepted smaller contributions, many others recalled growing levels of intimidation, violence, and coercion:

> Whenever they asked [for it] we would give them some of our food—*sadza* [boiled cornmeal] or a chicken. But when the rains failed we had nothing to give. When they came I said, "We are also hungry here." Then they would just go. But the ones that were too full of hunger—some of them might come back and beat you to see where you were hiding some small food.

The food shortages occasioned by the drought contributed to the further intensification of military action in the district. As the drought persisted armed relief columns were regularly dispatched by the government to bring food to the population and troops in the beleaguered aldeias communais. However, the growing food shortage also motivated RENAMO troops to intensify their raids on these truck convoys, to such a degree that by 1983 Machaze had become virtually inaccessible by road. A dirt landing strip in the district's administrative center (Chitobe) was extended to a length of two kilometers in order to accommodate Soviet-built cargo planes that could airlift food and other supplies into the district. Throughout the remainder of the war the survival of the populations in the communal villages depended primarily on this airlifted aid. RENAMO adapted accordingly, focusing more raids on the villages and often timing these shortly after the arrival of the huge cargo planes.

Many eyewitnesses agreed that the military actions by both sides increasingly targeted civilians rather than enemy combatants during the drought. FRELIMO and RENAMO soldiers had always focused more of their energy on locating and capturing—or sometimes killing—the population living "on the other side" than they had on engaging each other in direct combat. As the drought grew more dire troops on both sides intensified their opportunistic preying on those civilians conducting petty trade between the district and Zimbabwe and on migrants trying to bring back things for their families. Migrants were almost invariably robbed and beaten, and with increasing frequency killed. Some migrants were reportedly murdered by soldiers whose shakedowns may have been unauthorized by their commanders and who consequently didn't want to leave behind witnesses—as reflected in the account of the following fortuitous survivor:

> I was coming from Zimbabwe to bring some small comfort to my mothers[7] and brothers when the [FRELIMO] soldiers grabbed me. They beat me and robbed me of everything I was bringing—soap, clothes, money, oil. Then they commanded me to walk with them. After walking we stopped in the bush and one of them left. I thought, "This is where they will surely kill me." After some time he returned with some other soldiers. They were bringing three others who had been beaten and were walking with their hands tied. There was a militia [with the soldiers in the just-arrived group] who knew me. He told the other soldiers that he should take me with him to the aldeia. After this the soldiers that had grabbed me left with one of the other prisoners, and I went with the two remaining ones and the other soldiers to the aldeia. Before we reached

> the aldeia they separated me from the others and then I heard gunshots. When we got to the aldeia there was only me and the soldiers. They took me to the commander and said, "We found this one robbed by the Matsangaiisse." I told the commander this was true because I feared they would kill me.

Under these circumstances the trickle of remittances that had enabled at least some of the district's remaining residents to buy what they needed on the black market soon dried up. The starving population in the aldeias communais was increasingly forced to forage further and further afield for drought-resistant tubers and roots that grew in the bush—a fact that troops from both sides capitalized on in their efforts to capture, or often simply rob and kill, civilians. Although RENAMO's tactics required it to live off the land, the same imperative applied to many of those bearing weapons for FRELIMO in Machaze. Milicias were not paid salaries and did not receive the food or clothing rations that regular FRELIMO troops occasionally—if not consistently—enjoyed.[8] Consequently, many availed themselves of their weapons to improvise their own solutions. During prolonged food shortages, small groups would mount forays "in search of something to eat."

According to several accounts, during the throes of drought FRELIMO convoys could even become targets for ambush by milicia patrols from the government's own villages! One woman who had established a conjugal relationship with a milicia officer recalled how he had brought back food and clothing after participating in an attack against a government troop–escorted convoy of returning miners from South Africa. Masquerading as RENAMO fighters, he and his fellow milicias had captured one truck and killed its occupants while forcing the rest of the convoy to beat a retreat back in the direction of its point of origin in Sofala.[9]

By 1983 the relentless drought and growing military predation had rendered subsistence agriculture virtually untenable throughout most of the district. Many of the tubers and other food that grew wild and had historically served as the last line of sustenance during drought had grown exceedingly scarce. For those in RENAMO areas with little access to small wells—which were either in the aldeias held by the government or destroyed by military action—lack of water became a particularly deadly problem. The war's political dynamics amplified the drought's devastating effects by constraining long-established strategies for coping with environmental hardship. The region usually faced seasonal water shortages, even in years with normal rainfall amounts. Drought was far from a

new phenomenon in Machaze, and the population had developed effective strategies to cope with food shortages without the need for massive relocation outside of the district. The last multiyear drought (known as Sikkisiranye) that had occasioned massive out-migration had occurred in 1940–41, before the development of a rural trading network. During both of the post–World War II droughts of note (Chikapachoto and Pandomwanamuna) inhabitants purchased food from local stores through cash or credit arrangements, relying heavily on remittances from migrants working in South Africa.

Both the war-time collapse of the commercial shop network and the population-control policies pursued by both sides made such strategies inoperable during the war. FRELIMO sought to rigidly isolate the population in the aldeias communais to prevent it from fleeing, while RENAMO severely punished anyone who sought to enter the villages. Transit between the two areas was thus difficult and dangerous, and those who managed to cross from one area into another ran the risk of having their loyalties questioned on arrival—an outcome that could easily result in summary execution. It was thus virtually impossible for those outside the villages to obtain any of the humanitarian assistance that was occasionally if not consistently available in the aldeias, unless they were willing to undertake the doubly dangerous risk of trying to resettle within the aldeias permanently.

Faced with few alternatives, those living outside the aldeias communais began to leave the district in growing numbers. This wave of migration harked back to older historical strategies for coping with drought under the Companhia de Moçambique. Machazians moved westward into the Chimanimani foothills and highlands or north into the interior toward the Buzi River, areas that had historically proven more resistant to drought.

The highlands closest to the Zimbabwean border attracted the largest number of migrants. Machazians found land vacated by original residents who had already migrated across the international border years earlier during the border war with Rhodesia or in response to FRELIMO's first attempts to eradicate RENAMO. In these areas households developed new cross-border subsistence strategies. A growing number of adolescent Machazian males sought employment across the border in Zimbabwe. During the early 1980s the male children who had been left behind with their mothers when their fathers and elder brothers had migrated to South Africa were growing into young men. Adolescence in war-time Mozambique posed the problem of compulsory military service both in areas

under RENAMO's control and in the aldeias controlled by FRELIMO. Often lacking the knowledge, networks, or resources that would have allowed them to pursue the earlier wave of men who had left for South Africa, most of these teenagers instead sought employment on the tea and coffee plantations along the border in Zimbabwe, much as other young migrants from Machaze had for many decades during the colonial era.

However, most Machazian women still remained reluctant to follow their sons and brothers into Zimbabwe, preferring to remain in Mozambique where greater land availability permitted them to continue to pursue subsistence agriculture. Although the southern districts of Manica Province in Mozambique had witnessed negligible land speculation and little settler interest throughout the colonial period, land on the Rhodesian side of the border had been subject to extensive appropriation. European settlers had disenfranchised much of the African population, creating mounting population pressure on what little land was left. The failure of the new Zimbabwean government to address this question at independence meant that Zimbabwean land, especially in those areas closest to the Mozambican border, remained a limited and highly contested resource. Moreover, what little land was available for refuge seekers had been taken up by those Mozambicans who had crossed the international border years earlier.[10] In short, rural resettlement in many border areas of Zimbabwe had already surpassed the point of saturation by the time Machazians fleeing the drought arrived. Consequently, Machazian women who wanted access to agricultural land could only find it on the Mozambican side of the border.

Thus, throughout the mid-1980s, for many Machazian households the border between the countries became the crossroads for a furtive yet vigorous form of "commuter migration" carried out by young men who found occasional work in Zimbabwe, yet who maintained continuous contact with mothers and younger siblings living on the Mozambican side of the border, who were scratching out a difficult but still largely self-reliant and independent existence based on subsistence agriculture. Other families chose to sleep just inside the Zimbabwean border but maintained provisional accommodations inside Mozambique where they could continue to raise crops.

However, during the late 1980s new obstacles emerged that made these border strategies less viable and forced Machazians to choose between staying in Mozambique or resettling full-time in Zimbabwe. As the war progressed the growing Mozambican presence in Zimbabwe became

a highly politicized issue. Initial public sympathy for the plight of Mozambican refugees and a willingness to reciprocate for the assistance Mozambique had provided to Zimbabwean refugees during that country's own recent anticolonial struggle gradually gave way to both popular and official hostility toward the "Mozambican invasion." Over time, Zimbabwean policies toward self-settled Mozambicans began to reflect this ambiguity. On one hand, the Zimbabwean government continued to express solidarity with FRELIMO, stationing significant numbers of its troops in Mozambique to guard the economically vital corridor between Manica and Beira. However, it also took an increasingly intolerant position toward the growing numbers of self-settled Mozambicans inside Zimbabwe. Seeking to better control the growing number of Mozambicans within its territory and to share the burden of economically supporting this population, the Zimbabwean government allowed UNHCR to open Tongogara in 1984—the first and eventually the largest of five major refugee camps established in the country.

When many Mozambicans refused to move into these camps voluntarily the Zimbabweans began a massive police sweep of the border provinces in 1987, forcibly relocating Mozambicans into official UNHCR camps. This compulsory resettlement was part of a broader campaign by the Zimbabwean government to influence both the course of the Mozambican war and mitigate its effects on Zimbabwe. The Zimbabweans thus stepped up their military coordination with FRELIMO forces in adjacent provinces while tightening border security to control the refugee influx and in response to RENAMO incursions into its own territory. In June 1987 RENAMO had issued a declaration of war against Zimbabwe in reaction to the Zimbabwean troop presence in Mozambique and mounted a series of attacks on targets within Zimbabwe that eventually resulted in an estimated 450 deaths (Vines 1991, 60–63). By forcing self-settled Mozambicans into UNHCR camps the government hoped to protect them from attack (the official reason for internment), to deprive RENAMO of a potential source of recruits, and to have more effective surveillance over Mozambicans within its borders.

These measures intensified the militarization of the border areas and increasingly forced Machazians who had pursued cross-border strategies to choose between seeking a new refuge within Mozambique or relocating to Zimbabwean refugee camps. For many, yet another wave of drought in Mozambique resulted in their reluctant decision to resettle in the UNHCR camps. As a consequence, by the end of the war in 1992 the bulk of

the Machazian population in Zimbabwe—a population of just over forty thousand, overwhelmingly made up of women and children—had settled in one of two major refugee camps closest to the southern Manica border: Tongogara and Chambuta.[11]

Camp Internment in Zimbabwe

For many Machazians Tongogara and Chambuta were an option of last resort that was pursued only when other self-settlement options proved untenable or when they were coercively interned by Zimbabwean troops. Even though Tongogara was established in 1984, one survey of over three hundred households in the camp found that over 90 percent of the camp's population had arrived after 1986 and almost 30 percent had entered the camp after 1990. Just under half had been brought in by the first military sweep conducted in the border provinces by the Zimbabwean military in 1987. Half of all of the respondents said they had relocated at least once within Mozambique during the war, and over 60 percent stated that they lived elsewhere in Zimbabwe before arriving in the camp (Tandai 1992, 14).

Located near the banks of the Save River, Tongogara was established on the site of a former agricultural research station that had been abandoned during the Rhodesian civil war and later used for demobilization purposes after Zimbabwean independence in 1979. In this heavily crowded facility, over forty thousand Mozambicans lived on fewer than eight hundred hectares of land, with each household being assigned approximately fifty square meters of space (approximately fifteen by thirty feet). Tongogara's residents benefited from a small hospital (sixty beds) staffed by Zimbabwean professionals and over sixty Mozambican health-extension workers working for various international NGO programs, while a primary school (grades 1–6) run by over 140 unpaid Mozambican teachers provided basic education for eighty-five hundred students. Residents received regular food allotments that were distributed on a per household basis by the camp administration and supplied by the World Food Program, while water was piped into the camp through a filtered system that ran directly from the Save River or from small wells.

The reluctance of many Machazians to resettle in these camps stemmed in no small part from the parallels many of them drew between these camps and the much-despised aldeias communais:

> When we arrived there we saw that the differences between Tongogara and the aldeia were very small. When you arrived they told you where you must stay. Sometimes your family was on the other side of the camp. There are no maachambas [agricultural fields] because there was no space. . . . The food is only what the director gives each family—*sadza*, *nhemba* [beans], *mapira* [sorghum]. . . . What was better was the water, because we did not have to walk so far. Also it was OK to go [in and out of the camp] because there were no mines. The Zimbabweanos [Zimbabwean soldiers] would not shoot at you; you only had to pay some small money for their *doro* [local beer] and then you could pass.

Some of those interned during the Zimbabwean military and police sweeps in mid-1987 suspected that the camps were an extension of FRELIMO's earlier efforts to relocate them into the aldeias communais. In a number of different interviews, Machazians who had been interned in Tongogara pointed to what they regarded as clear signs of Zimbabwean collaboration with FRELIMO:

> Before the Zimbabweanos took us to Tongogara the children went to the school in Chipinge with other Zimbabwean children. Everything was taught in English and in ChiShona. But in the Tongogara school they spoke only in Portuguese. . . . When we asked the administrator why our children could not learn English he said our children needed to learn in Portuguese because this was the language of FRELIMO and the children must learn the language of their father [i.e., the national language chosen by FRELIMO]. All the teachers in Tongogara were Mozambican, and the lessons were in Portuguese. Some spoke only ChiShangaan and ChiChewa. The teachers were all from FRELIMO. Some were sent from Beira and Maputo. . . . When we did not stay in the aldeias [Mozambican president] Samora spoke with [the Zimbabwean president] Mugabe and asked him to send his soldiers to go and get us because they were very close. This is how we came to Tongogara.

Such suspicions were fed by the compulsory repatriation in 1989 of several hundred young Mozambican men who were rounded up in the southern border districts of Zimbabwe as "illegal labor migrants" and uncermoniously ushered back across the international border in Mossurize.[12] According to several oral accounts many of these young men were met by FRELIMO troops, accused of evading military service, and forcibly inducted into the army. In one of its more controversial (and little-known)

actions in the Mozambican theater, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees tacitly endorsed and provided minor logistical support to this effort, despite the misgivings of local UNHCR officials.

However, the greatest source of reluctance to resettle in camps among Machazians, and most particularly among women, was the inability to continue to practice independent subsistence agriculture as they had in Mozambique. Other than a number of small communal gardens used by international NGOs for agricultural training programs, no subsistence agriculture was possible within the camp's crowded confines. In interview after interview this was the most consistently identified reason that Machazian women avoided camp internment for as long as they could, and it was the greatest source of their discontent once they became camp residents.

Many women deeply resented the loss of decision-making power and independence that resulted from their inability to pursue subsistence agriculture:

> In Butiro I could have as much food as I was willing to work for.[13] If I decided I wanted to clear this one field and then rest I could have a little to eat. Then I could just sit. But if I wanted I could open maachambas on two or three fields if I wanted to work. If you had the strength sometimes you could even have four fields. Then if I wanted I could trade two bags [of grain] for *capulanas* [cloth wraps] or for oil if I needed it. In Tongogara it was always the same—you must just stay sitting and you will be given oil, beans, and mealies [cornmeal]. But if you want to garnish the sadza with some small meat then you must find money to buy it. In Machaze you will have your chickens and maybe a goat to kill, but here in the camp it will not last [i.e., it will be stolen].

In Tongogara food and other relief supplies were distributed to designated household heads; each was allocated an amount that corresponded to the reported number of "dependents" in the household. Many women who in Machaze had been largely self-sufficient were turned into "dependents" by this system. In Machaze any married woman controlled the use of everything she produced in the fields in which she worked. Women controlled the distribution of food, usually providing for her own and her children's subsistence and for the sustenance of husbands and in-laws. However, in Tongogara some women (such as the one quoted below) found that living in the same "household" with male relatives (husbands, brothers, fathers, or fathers-in-laws), or even with senior wives and

mothers-in-law, resulted in a loss of this power to the agency-authorized "household head," who received humanitarian aid for the household as a whole:

> In Machaze you will always have your field, your farming [*kurima*]. Not even your husband can take the crops from [your] field; he must only come to ask for something and then you will prepare him some food. Maybe if you have enough you will give him some to take. In Tongogara it was different. You had to ask your husband even for mapira and oil to cook some sadza.

The deleterious effects of humanitarian aid on women's social power and autonomy have been well documented in many other refugee camp contexts.[14] However, considerably less attention has been paid to the ways in which the balance of power between women differentiated by age and social status may also be reconfigured by aid practices. Many younger wives in Tongogara resettled with mothers-in-law and sometimes with senior co-wives. When senior women were designated by humanitarian agencies as the "household heads" they often gained unprecedented power over junior wives. Some of these junior women reacted strongly to the loss of social autonomy vis-à-vis their own senior female relatives:

> I first moved with my children and my mother-in-law to Mutanda after the Matsangaiisse took my husband. Later her other son's daughter [i.e., a sister-in-law] joined us with her three children when her husband went to Joni. Later he came to find us and took us to Chipinge before returning [to South Africa]. We each had a maachamba. When the Zimbabwean police found us they said, "These are Mozambicans." So they brought us to Tongogara. There were seven of us [i.e., her and her two children, her mother-in-law, her sister-in-law with her two children—one having died in Mozambique]. But we had "problems" because my mother-in-law was always favoring the other one [with rations]. When my son would visit [from working on the tea plantations in Chipinge] she would greet him and ask him for money. But then she would buy things for the other one even though he was coming to visit [me], his mother. We had many problems because of this. After this happened a number of times I told my son we had to move to our own place [in the camp]. Then we started to receive our own oil and fish. But my mother-in-law was angry because now my son would visit and leave his money with me.

Like the woman quoted above, some junior women reacted to their

loss of autonomy by leaving the camps and attempting to reenter as "new" households in order to receive aid unmediated by the control of other senior women. However, such tactics were usually resented by those left behind in the original household because the reduction in household membership could lead to a loss in the humanitarian aid received. Compromises were sometimes struck that allowed children to shuttle back and forth between households so that they could be counted twice. However, more often than not such schisms cultivated contention and amplified social tension among relatives—raising the dreaded specter of uloi. Uloi was highlighted by many as one of the biggest problems they confronted in Tongogara, a consequence of the social proximity enforced by the crowded conditions of the camps:

> In Tongogara one [family] would live there, then another there, then there—everyone had to know his neighbors' way of life even if they did not know that person's name. Because of this there were too many problems . . . I mean uloi. . . . Your neighbor would see that you still had oil when she had none left. Then she would grow envious and maybe say something against you. Then you could have words because of any little things. Your children could get sick and when you went to the nyanga he would say it was because of your neighbor's envy. In Tongogara there was too much sickness because of uloi. . . . It was a very big problem.

In the wake of such problems or household schisms many Machazians sought to settle at some remove from the relatives they left behind, living in other areas within the camp where their contact with contentious relatives could be minimized.

As their children grew up in Tongogara many Machazian parents worried about the effects of camp life on them, particularly on their daughters. One woman who had returned to Machaze after the war spoke of the difficulties she had already foreseen for her daughters while living in the camps and contemplating eventual return to the district:

> It was very hard for this one [gesturing toward her daughter] because in Tongogara she was not used to our way of life [here] in Tevere. In the camp we did not have to walk so far for water. Here you must be up early before the sun to walk a long way to get water. Also she had to learn *kurima* [to work the fields] because there were no maachambas there. Some of these [girls] have come back now and they do not know this life. They get called Zimbabweanas.

The reasons that most Machazians resisted resettlement in Tongogara stood in stark and ironic contrast to the international community's often-voiced concern that humanitarian assistance might foster an appetite for "dependence." Rather than eagerly seeking humanitarian aid most Machazians entered refugee camps either as an option of last resort or in the hands of Zimbabwean authorities. Most sought to preserve their social autonomy as long as possible, preferring self-sustenance over reliance on humanitarian assistance.[15] Women in particular sought resettlement options that allowed them to continue to raise crops even when this initially meant staying within the borders of their war-torn homeland or continuously navigating the uncertainties of the international border.

Displacement in Place: Surviving in the Aldeias Communais

The transformation of lifescapes for those Machazians who avoided the government's communal villages and eventually settled in the refugee camps in Zimbabwe took place over a considerable number of years. For many, initial success in reestablishing a semblance of normal life in remote areas of the district gave way to more desperate measures as drought and military action intensified. Although many were able to establish subsistence plots along the Zimbabwean border, most eventually found that camps such as Tongogara were the lesser evil of all their options—even though these camps were similar in many respects to the aldeias communais they had so strenuously tried to avoid.

However, the Machazians whose lifescapes suffered the most dramatically throughout the conflict were arguably those who moved the least of all: the war-time residents of the aldeias communais. Throughout the thirteen years that followed the establishment of the villages in 1979 and 1980, repeated cycles of intense military violence, chronic drought, and population-control policies reduced the life chances of aldeia inhabitants in the most drastic ways of all.

If subsistence agriculture was a significant challenge in the bush and impossible in refugee camps, it was in many ways more problematic in the government-held villages because in contrast to the refugee camps, farming was necessary for survival; and because farming near the villages involved far more risk of violence than deep in the bush. In most of the district's aldeias communais (such as in Chitobe, Chipudje, Bassane, Save, and Usa) the population was so dense within the perimeters protected

by FRELIMO troops that each household had only a small garden plot. Faced with the daunting challenge of feeding this population, and chronically cut off from reliable aid supplies from the outside, local government officials were forced to allow residents to try to farm plots outside the guarded perimeters during the day. These villagers were required to adhere to strict curfews and sometimes had armed escorts.

Although some residents opened new fields close to the aldeias, others initially tried to work the plots they had previously farmed, even though they were further away. Both strategies were dangerous. One of the favorite tactics of troops on both sides was to sow land mines along paths known or suspected of being used by enemy troops and the civilians under their control. RENAMO troops, in particular, often planted land mines along the paths to recently cleared fields in the proximity of the aldeias communais, often working at night after the civilians and their military escorts had returned to the villages in order to surprise them when they returned to these fields the following morning. These fields were also preferred sites for RENAMO ambushes, especially at crucial periods in the growing season, such as during the harvest when a significant civilian presence was virtually assured.

Those who opted to make their way to their own fields without military escorts could more easily avoid RENAMO troops. However, at the same time they were more vulnerable because they traveled alone and without military escort. Moreover, any failures to return by curfew were likely to rouse suspicion that they were collaborating with the enemy. One older man and his wife described to me how the measures they took to prevent contact with RENAMO while trying to cultivate their fields ironically placed them at even greater risk from FRELIMO troops—and ultimately led them to decide to not return to the aldeia:

> We had a longer way to come all the way from the aldeia [in Chitobe] to reach these fields . . . so when we were here one day we saw some Matsangaiisse. . . . They were coming to eat because it was close to the time to harvest. So we had to hide ourselves in the brush for some time before they left. Then when we were walking back to the village it was becoming dark and we were afraid the milicias would shoot us because it was dark and they would think we were bandits. So we went back to our homestead and stayed there for some days. . . . After that we stayed away from the village because they would kill us if we came back. . . . They would not have believed us if we had told them we were hiding from the Matsangaiisse; they would have said we did not come back because we were helping the Matsangaiisse.

Most Machazians who remained in the aldeias communais throughout the war lost many relatives and acquaintances, more often from sickness or starvation than from military violence. Many who succumbed to disease did so as a result of severe malnutrition, particularly during periods of sustained drought. The first wave of drought in the early 1980s was particularly devastating for village inhabitants. Whereas later in the war food aid was more abundantly supplied by airlift, outside assistance was far less regular during the first prolonged drought. Many inhabitants described this as the "hottest" period of the war, with continuous attacks on the aldeias.

It was only through the airborne provision of humanitarian assistance, irregular as it was, that anyone in these communities survived. Without airlifted provisions even the military probably would have been unable to maintain their position. What food did arrive in the aldeias went through a hierarchical chain—first to the regular troops garrisoned in the town, then to local party officials and milicias, and finally to the remainder of the population. In the following chapter I explore how this desperate situation affected social interaction and specifically how particular types of social relationships were forged as part of a strategy of gaining access to what limited food aid was available.

Unlike those in the bush who were generally able to seek refuge outside the district as the drought deepened, those interned in the communal villages could leave only if they chose to brave both the government troops stationed around the perimeters and the watchful Matsangaiisse outside of the villages. Unauthorized attempts by civilians to leave the villages were almost always interpreted as evidence of support for the other side and were regarded as a serious threat to military security—lest information about the village's defenses be extracted by RENAMO from these defectors. Although flight was not unknown, the harsh treatment meted out to those who were caught was powerfully dissuasive.

> When hunger was really squeezing everyone very hard in the aldeia my [paternal] uncle had this thought that it would be better to try to go to Zimbabwe because even if the Matsangaiisse killed him he would be dying anyway with nothing here to eat. He and the one mother [his wife] went at night, but they were too weak to run so the soldiers caught them. The commander in the aldeia at that time was a very hard man and because of this they beat the two old ones very badly. The old man was taken to Machaze and they executed him with bayonets because they said he was a milicia who was trying to pass secrets to the Matsangaiisse. No one even would speak up for him because everyone

was frightened of being called a friend of the Matsangaiisse. His wife stopped talking afterward because [of the severity] of the beating. . . . Because of this many [i.e., in her extended family] resolved to just stay here in the aldeia and die of hunger.

The isolation of the villages during the war disrupted Machazian lives in other significant ways. Although there were relatively few civilian men in the villages—either because they migrated to South Africa and Zimbabwe or were conscripted into the military—some did remain, usually because they were either elderly or minors, or because they were serving as milicias or in some other government capacity (such as teachers or secretaries). Younger men who remained in the villages throughout the entire war faced particularly bleak social prospects. Prevented by the war from pursuing established strategies of labor migration, these men often found themselves unable to establish sustainable marriages. As one young man who had become a local officer in the Organization of Mozambican Youth explained:

When you saw you were a man and a little bit stronger maybe you would want to find a wife—but there was no money for you to pay lobola—not even to give a capulana to your wife or her mother. All you could do was be together with her. But then even if you had children—two or three—the relatives would say that you could not give them names because you were just together [i.e., not married]. Nobody had money because even if your salary was very small it would not be paid. Sometimes even the soldiers were not paid but only received food.

For many men the only viable option was to become a milicia or a soldier (and that often occurred as a result of conscription rather than by choice). After the war many of the young men who had remained in the villages or in the military, deferring marriage, found themselves at a considerable social disadvantage to those men who had left the district and continued to engage in wage labor. A man who had served as a milicia in Chitobe during the war explained why his marriage had failed soon after the conflict ended:

After [the war] those who stayed in Joni came back with money, and the relatives would take their lobola. Even the woman who had shared your bed would be chasing after these Jonis. There was nothing you could do because you had just been sitting here in the village during the war.

Displacement without Migration . . . and Migration without Displacement?

Most of those who remained in Mozambique as well as those who made their way to Zimbabwe suffered displacement, experiencing lifescape reconfiguration that made vital social projects—and survival itself—difficult. However, forced immobility was as often the cause of their deteriorating social condition as was migration. Ironically, for many of Machaze's residents, displacement was a process of increasing *immobilization* rather than accentuated mobility. Some of the most detrimental reconfigurations of Machazian lifescapes were thus the product of novel impediments to mobility that rendered many of the strategies used to deal with crisis in the past inoperable. These restrictions emerged gradually and in different places and forms throughout the war: first, in the militarized perimeters that isolated the government-held villages and the hinterland from each other; then, through the pervasively mined roads and Matsangaiisse-monitored side routes that discouraged the flow of commercial activity, humanitarian aid, and migrant remittances; later, in the militarization of the international border that constrained transnational commuting strategies; finally, in the camp internments that prevented women from pursuing the subsistence strategies on which their social power and autonomy depended. Indeed, those Machazians who moved the least arguably experienced the most dramatically consequential displacement of all.

Rather than equating displacement with forced migration, I propose that displacement occurs when lifescapes are transformed in a way that introduces and accentuates extreme forms of structural violence. People become displaced when changes in structural conditions (such as those produced by war) deprive them of the vital social, economic, ecological, and symbolic resources required for social reproduction—and in the extreme for mere survival. Such outcomes often occur as a result of wartime movement, but for some the resource whose loss is most damaging may be mobility itself. In this sense displacement has less to do with movement per se and much more to do with the dramatic growth of structural violence that results from the place-specific effects of war, not least the effects on the possibilities for the mobility around which "normal" life strategies may be organized.

In bringing movers and nonmovers into the same analytical frame I take as a point of departure the notion that the relationship between mobility and crisis must be investigated rather than assumed. Structural

violence can result from both mobility and from immobility—producing both "migratory displacement" and "displacement in place"—depending on the extent to which life strategies depend on access to place-specific resources or alternatively on mobility. This view offers a critical alternative to analytical perspectives that automatically associate migration with change and sedentarism with stasis by demonstrating the potential for continuity—and dramatic change—in both.

In the following chapter I pick up another strand of the Machazian war-time story—that of the men who left for South Africa early in the war—in an effort to further problematize the relationship between migration and "displacement," in particular by questioning the seemingly self-evident relationship between war-time mobility and social loss. War-time migration has almost without exception been thought of as a process that generates various forms of disempowerment—social, economic, political, economic, cultural, and even psychic. Consequently, the analysis of refugee experiences focuses overwhelmingly on inventorying, comparing, contrasting, and tracing the effects of such losses. Yet are loss and disempowerment the only possible form of change that can result from war-time migration? What if war-time movement does not represent a major disruption of life strategies that may already be premised on movement?

My fieldwork provided some intriguing evidence that in a small number of cases war-time migration provided new opportunities to women. Although the vast majority of Machazian women ultimately settled in either the aldeias communais or in the refugee camps in Zimbabwe, some found refuge in areas of the Mozambican interior that remained virtually unscathed by either drought or military action during the war. One area in particular—Mabudo—provided such favorable conditions for agriculture that most of the women who relocated there during the war refused to return to Machaze after it was over. I interviewed several husbands who had returned to the Gwakwanye area of the district from South Africa after the war and had been unable to persuade wives who had relocated to Mabudo to rejoin them. In at least one case the husband decided that his best option was to follow his wife in relocating permanently to Mabudo.

More generally, the war-time migration of men from Machaze to distant South Africa was not a disruption of the same order of magnitude as that experienced by most Machazian women who moved within the district or just across the nearby border into Zimbabwe. In fact, war-time migration inadvertently generated new opportunities for many Machazian

men and significantly e*nhanced* their ability to realize key life projects and vital social goals. In suggesting that war-time migration was actually *empowering* for some categories of social actors in the following chapter I further problematize the often assumed relationship between mobility and war-time social conditions. I suggest that it is equally important to consider whether there are circumstances and ways in which war-time migration may result in important social and material gains for some social actors even as it results in losses for others. In short, the effects of mobility and immobility alike—and whether either results in "displacement"—should be posed as empirical questions to be openly investigated in terms of the experience of socially situated and differentiated actors in historically and culturally specific contexts.

CHAPTER 7

Tambem Aqui Fazemos Amor

Living in War

The image on the cover of this book is one of the most striking visual interpretations of Mozambique's civil war. It was painted in 1986—almost a decade into the conflict—by the renowned Mozambican artist V. N. Malangatana and images of the grotesque and terrifying dominate.[1] A melee of people—some faceless and some with cowering eyes—intermingle frantically with strange rapacious birds of prey and prostrate cadavers. Pitch-black figures lurk against a vivid blood-red background—images, according to the artist, meant to invoke the shadowy militants whose violence ravaged the lives of so many Mozambicans.

Yet if images of the nightmarish chaos and horror of war-time violence predominate in this work, the artist took care to draw his viewers' attention to other aspects of the piece when he was questioned about this painting in a 2004 documentary. As Malangatana explained in that interview, it is the figure of a pale oversized child at the top of the canvas, hands raised in defiance and outraged exclamation, that gives the painting its name, *Onde Está a Minha Mãe, os Meus Irmãos, e Todos os Outros?* (*Where Are My Mother, My Brothers, and All the Others?*)

> What I tried to show was how bad the war was—images of the dying and the not quite dying . . . but in the middle of the bush people found a child. And this child was stronger than everybody—even in the midst of the killers and dark figures of terror the child refused to flee. He insisted on staying put and sought for his brothers and sisters and mother. His clamoring for them was like a clamor against the war. (Malangatana in Lubkemann and Esteves 2004)

Scattered among the ghoulish scenes that dominate this tapestry other

figures quietly insist on living life: the mother tending to her three children in the lower left of the painting, and just above her and to the left a couple making love. The artist explained how this image of lovers was inspired by his war-time encounter with a displaced friend who had just become a mother:

> [A]lthough the bloodshed was all around then, you could still find some lovers. They would say all is gone, but let's at least love one another to create the future. . . . Look, this came when I was joking around one day with a friend as I often do. I saw she was pregnant and said, "You are pregnant, but we are in the middle of war!" And my friend responded, "Yes, it is war, but even here on the street we still make love [*ainda fazemos amor*]"! (Malangatana in Lubkemann and Esteves 2004)

Such storied images mingled with those marking terror and violence vividly convey how, in the throes of war, Mozambicans still lived everyday lives, remained social beings, and pursued key life projects, such as marrying and bearing children.

Most often the questions posed by anthropologists and other social scientists about war are about popular engagement with and reaction to state policies (chapter 2 in this book), the social construction of political outlooks or agendas (chapter 3), or the dynamics of organized violence (chapter 4). However, in this chapter my objective is to more fully explore war as a social condition rather than as merely a political contestation. Thus I examine how Machazians carried out social projects that were key to their life-course strategies throughout the long civil war. I focus in particular on how marriage and childbearing were realized under the trying circumstances of war. I ask questions such as, What does it mean to try to be a wife, or a co-wife, or mother, or husband in a war-time environment? How do war-time conditions affect "marriage markets" and the meaning of conjugality? Do they do so in ways that are significantly differentiated in terms of gender, age, or other forms of social difference? I also detail how the strategies devised for undertaking these social projects and for negotiating social relations specifically informed war-time migration decision making.

Two broader sets of questions are the point of departure for this analysis of war-time social interaction and its relationship to migration decision making. First, in what ways does war restructure the "conditions of sociation" (Wells 1990) by changing the possibilities for, and the consequences of, social interaction? Derivatively, what kinds of social relations

are subject to being systematically severed and which are potentially reinforced by the new challenges and problems afforded by war? Conversely, what new social possibilities emerge throughout the creative course of war-time "social navigation"?

Second, how is it that warscape inhabitants "learn to function effectively under circumstances in which familiar hegemonic relations have been suspended, visibly deconstructed, and circulated as parts?" (Greenhouse 2002, 5). Derivatively, what sorts of social problematics factor into their plotting out their everyday existence? What is the source of the terms of reference with which such individuals constitute their projects of social existence? And even more specifically, do such terms originate in the conditions of war itself or in social processes that precede it? Machazian accounts of war-time social interaction and migration decision making provide answers to these questions that suggest strong grounds for critiquing at least the following four influential theoretical framings of behavior and social interaction in the midst of conflict.

Kinetic Reactivity

People in the dramatically violent setting of war are often portrayed as having no life projects other than survival itself. The "kinetic" models of forced migration critically reviewed in the introduction epitomize this approach. The sheer terror of war-time conditions is believed to render all other concerns related to already ongoing, locally meaningful, or "normal" social life projects insignificant in shaping the decisions (migratory or otherwise) that people make. In this view, whatever patterns of sociation result from violent circumstances and displacement are seen as little more than the inadvertent by-product of people's reactions to violence rather than the product of agency exercised in the pursuit of culturally scripted social projects.

The Machazian accounts in this chapter provide ample evidence that those exposed to war-time violence cannot so easily be reduced to a universally generalizable "survival utility." Far from acting as socially atomized individuals or "loose molecules" (Kaplan 1994) only attentive to basic survival, Machazians during the war were concerned with how to realize established life-course strategies in and through the maintenance, constitution, and renegotiation of culturally meaningful social relations. Far from being driven by a singular drive to minimize their exposure to violence, Machazians often exposed themselves to considerable risks in

order to maintain key social connections, in some cases even risking a return to active war zones, crossing enemy lines to do so.

Tactic Agency and Immediacy

Other theorists (Honwana 2000; Utas 2005) accept that war-zone inhabitants remain attuned to social relations and culturally scripted projects but posit that the many uncertainties and perils that characterize warscapes tend to deprive social actors of the capacity to forecast their longer-term future in any meaningful way. Consequently, while warscape inhabitants may pursue social projects other than mere survival, these tend to be circumscribed by assessments of only the most immediate social possibilities and problems at hand and dictated by a concern with the short-term impact of decisions. Thus, while recognizing that war-zone inhabitants exercise a form of "tactic agency," these theorists argue that their behavior remains largely unattuned to any consideration of the longer-term goals or strategic life-course objectives that typically shape decision making under less dire circumstances. Anthropologist Mats Utas draws on a term coined by Henrik Vigh (2003, 136) to describe this mode of social interaction as "social navigation"—"the way in which agents guide their lives through troublesome social and political circumstances" (Utas 2005, 408). However, as others have observed, this is navigation of a very particular sort, "more akin to the improvisational and desperately reactive navigation of the unforeseen gale or the unknown rapids than of the chartable sea" (Hoffman and Lubkemann 2005, 318).

In this chapter I document how the war restructured options for investing in social relations and how Machazians reacted to the unforeseen new problems and opportunities that resulted. In navigating these social dilemmas, the relations that Machazians often strove hardest to preserve were those that under "normal" conditions would have been vital to their long-term future life-course. Inasmuch as Machazians remained attuned to longer-term social goals I suggest the need to consider the strategic as well as tactical dimensions of war-time social agency.

Tabula Rasa and "Sheer Creativity"

In her anthropology of the Mozambican conflict, Carolyn Nordstrom (1997) offers a third framework for explaining social behavior and interaction in warscapes. In Nordstrom's view war-time violence generates

a common framework of reference for social organization and action for the inhabitants of war zones, even when these include groups with very different histories, cultural repertoires, and forms of social organization. Nordstrom argues that common experiences with violence have an overwhelmingly powerful resocialization effect that can cross-cut and overwrite historically constituted social and cultural differences and forge a new "warzone culture" in common. This new "warzone culture" emerges as people from disparate cultural backgrounds share experiences with violence and learn from one another about how to cope with and resist it.

Nordstrom contends that social life in warscapes is of necessity constituted through acts of "sheer creativity" (1997, 198) in which worlds are forged not in the image of what they once may have been but are created "entirely anew" (1997, 190, 200):

> People cannot simply recreate what has been there before. If they refashion their lives as they knew them they create conditions as vulnerable to attack as existed previously. But worse, much of what occupied their previous world is gone: communities ruined by attacks; family members and friends lost or killed; possessions looted or destroyed; rituals rendered ineffective. (Nordstrom 1997, 190–91)

Although people must and do imagine themselves in "new and vital ways," in this chapter I draw on Machazian accounts to challenge her view of war-time violence as a desocializing force somehow capable of rendering the cultural models of the past irrelevant to the imagination of the future. In fact, Machazians tried to reconfigure their life strategies and to renegotiate social relations with reference to locally defined social projects and the terms of gendered and generational forms of social struggle whose genesis long predated the war. The terms of the social relations and projects they sought to realize were not simply reimagined anew, ex nihilo, or even primarily with reference to any homogenizing experience of war-time violence. Rather, Machazian social relations and social struggles continued to be negotiated in terms that remained as locally specific as the understandings of war-time violence itself. In short, it is impossible to understand the social objectives, interactions, and life strategies of these warscape inhabitants by focusing solely or even primarily on their war-time experiences, violent or otherwise, without reference to the specific history of *preconflict* social relations and local social

organization that continued to actively inform the Machazian war-time imagination.

Cultural Conservatism

Although the Machazian experiences in this chapter challenge a view of war-time sociation as culturally disembedded, they also provide a basis for critiquing frameworks that portray behavior in crisis as culturally overdetermined. Anthropologists who pioneered the study of displacement (Scudder and Colson 1982) argued that forced migrants usually cope with the traumatic loss of vital resources (such as social networks and leaders, material goods and economic possibilities, institutions, and even cultural symbols) by pursuing "culturally conservative strategies," characterized by an effort to minimize the extent of change in social practice:

> Following removal, the majority of relocatees, including refugees, can be expected to follow a conservative strategy. They cope with the stress of removal to an unfamiliar habitat by clinging to the familiar and changing no more than is necessary. . . . [O]ne major strategy is the transfer of old skills and farming practices to the new habitat. Another is to attempt to relocate with kin, neighbors, and co-ethnics so as to recreate the security of an encompassing community with familiar institutions and symbols. . . . Post-relocation conservatism in economic activities is also apparent . . . In clinging to the familiar, relocatees attempt to move the shortest distance, not only in space, to remain in contact with a familiar habitat, but also in terms of the psychological and socio-cultural contexts of their lives. Scudder (1973b) has labeled this stance a process of cultural involution. As a coping strategy it appears analogous to strategies used for dealing with grief after the death of a loved one. . . . So long as this strategy predominates the majority of those relocated will avoid both old and new activities that involve risk and hence might increase still further levels of stress. . . . [P]eople tend to behave as if during transition a socio-cultural system were a closed system. (Scudder and Colson 1982, 272–74)

Although the war-time relocation choices made by district residents often reflected a strong interest in pursuing established strategies of subsistence and a concern with preserving social relations, a full investigation of Machazian war-time social dynamics must also address those who embraced the many new social opportunities that were inadvertently afforded by the war. Far from seeking to simply reconstitute social

relations in the exact image of what they had been before the war, many Machazians availed themselves of war-time opportunities to renegotiate the rights and obligations that defined the particular social relations in which they were enmeshed. Thus, much as had been the case before the war, the primary forms of relatedness along which social power was configured in Machazian society—most particularly gender and generation—continued to be sites of intense contestation and renegotiation throughout the conflict.

Rather than being suspended during the conflict, these social struggles were infused with new dynamism as a result of the gender-differentiated ways in which the terms and possibilities of sociation were restructured during the war. These "other struggles" and the course of their war-time development played as much or more of a role than did the conflict's macropolitical narrative in shaping the dynamics of war-time movement.

Social relations thus informed Machazian social behavior and imagination in more complex ways than those suggested by Scudder and Colson's classic theories of cultural involution, by functioning as sites of continued contestation rather than merely templates for replication. In tracing these processes of social struggle throughout the war I argue that both efforts to effect change *and* to maintain continuity in social relations were less motivated by a psychological need for familiarity than by varied and often conflicting social interests operating in an environment in which social opportunity structures and social power were being redistributed in gender-differentiated ways.

The Central Importance of Social Relations in Machazian Life Strategies

As I described in earlier chapters, Machazian subsistence and social reproduction had long been organized primarily through gendered and generational divisions of labor. The extent and quality of an individual's local social relations provided the primary referents for one's identity, defined one's status within the larger community, and had crucial bearing on an individual's security throughout his or her entire life course. Machazians thought of their life course largely as a progression through changing social roles, defined in terms of rights and obligations vis-à-vis intimate social others.

Thus, for example, a young girl would begin her social life defined,

both by self and others, primarily as a "daughter." Along with her gender, her relationship to her paternal lineage and to her mother as an individual defined her as a social being at this life-course stage. Eventually, however, the prospect of marriage and the initial payment of lobola would initiate a social repositioning, defining her in terms of a broader array of social relations that would now come to include—and increasingly center on—her husband and members of his lineage, among whom her in-laws would begin to factor prominently. Over time further payments of lobola, the bearing and raising of children, and provision of labor to in-laws would gradually consolidate her marriage and her status as "wife."

As this process progressed, the emphasis would shift in terms of which roles factored more prominently in framing her social interactions and life chances—from her relationship with parents and siblings to that with her husband and his kin. It was through her husband that a woman initially gained title to land of her own to cultivate after he had cleared it for her. Setbacks in childbearing or trouble in the marriage occasioned by quarrels with husbands, co-wives, or in-laws might result in a reversal in emphasis at particular times or be a prelude to a divorce. However, it was primarily through childbearing and in their roles as mothers that most Machazian women gained status within their husbands' lineages, greater autonomy from mothers-in-law or senior co-wives, community recognition as "adult women," and domestic assistance from older children.

The marriages of a woman's adult children, most particularly sons, would usually signal another shift in her identity, status, and life chances. As mothers-in-law, women managed the wives and interests of migrant sons and often gained virtual independence from their husbands. Over time sons (and their wives) would usually become far more important sources of assistance and resources than husbands. In old age a husband might be largely irrelevant, but a woman would depend heavily on the labor of daughters-in-law and grandchildren to cultivate her fields and that of her sons to maintain her homestead.

In the Machazian worldview even death was only a transition rather than a break in sociation, transforming the person who died into an ancestor with whom social interaction was still continuously maintained. Ancestral spirits remained vital and active members of their descendants' social networks and were believed to have direct and deeply consequential influence on their life chances and well-being. Relationships with ancestors required and received significant investments of resources and time, and consultation with ancestors was considered integral to any significant

decision making. Machazians believed that ancestors protected their descendants from harm and also monitored the moral quality of the relationships among their descendants and between their descendants and others. In short, all aspects of the life strategies and self-concept of social actors in Machaze depended on the successive cultivation and maintenance of an array of local social relationships centered on kin and making up a sociospiritual world (Lubkemann 2002b).

Schism and Continuity in Machazian War-time Social Relations

The importance that Machazians continued to attribute to their social relations during the war was evidenced by the considerable dangers many braved to preserve key relationships, particularly the risks undertaken by Machazian women to ensure that they remained with their children. Remarkably, of the thirty-one Machazian women I interviewed who had children before the war and were once again living in the district in 1997 all but one had maintained coresidence with one or more of their children—or with one or more of their child's spouses—throughout the various migrations they had undertaken during the war.

Some undertook risky trips across battle lines to seek out and reunite with children from whom they had become separated by happenstance. One woman described how three of her children had been taken (with a co-wife and their half-siblings) by a FRELIMO patrol to a nearby communal village while she had been working in the field with two of her other children. Finding her hut burned to the ground and unsure of what had transpired she first took her remaining children further into the bush where she resettled in a RENAMO-controlled area. Shortly thereafter a woman who had recently fled the village informed her that her captured children were now living there with her co-wife. This woman opted to brave the considerable risks involved in entering the communal village in order to locate them. Claiming that her other two children had been killed by RENAMO soldiers she pretended that she wished to resettle permanently in the aldeia communais and was successfully reunited with the three children who had been captured with her co-wife. Seeking to reunite her family, she then managed to furtively steal her children away from the village by night and rejoin the two children she had left behind in the bush.

Such extraordinarily dangerous ventures by women were not particu-

larly exceptional, although the outcomes could be tragically unsuccessful. Crossing back and forth between RENAMO- and FRELIMO-held zones could lead to accusations of spying by either side, often resulting in dramatic public executions. The woman who had informed the first woman of her captured children's whereabouts reportedly attempted to later return to the village in order to bring out a child she had left behind. Using a path that she had once known to be safe, this woman stepped on a land mine and died.

Three older women whom I interviewed in Chimoio had also been willing to undergo grave hardships to maintain or reestablish ties with sons who had been dispersed by war. Having fled from Machaze to Zimbabwe early in the conflict these women had all later resettled in Tongogara refugee camp. Yet each (at different times) chose to return to Mozambique during the war on learning that a son was living in the city of Chimoio (one serving as a policeman, one as a teacher, and one in the military). Leaving the relative safety and guaranteed rations in Tongogara, each traveled alone along the heavily guarded yet frequently ambushed "Manica corridor" before locating and resettling with their respective sons in Chimoio. In all three cases these women had not only entered an active war zone but chose to remain with their sons and families in Chimoio throughout the rest of the war, despite the considerable dangers of living in a besieged provincial capital. Beleaguered by RENAMO's periodic nightly incursions deep within the defensive perimeter, the swollen population of Chimoio would gather every night in the most central areas to sleep on the sidewalks.

Although individuals often went to great lengths to preserve certain social ties, they were much less ardent in maintaining others. Machazian kinship relations had long been charged with contradictory qualities—mutual dependence, the potential for assistance, and the possibility of harm were all simultaneously embodied in the same relationship and seen as the inevitable products of social intimacy. Co-wives might thus provide one another with domestic assistance and yet at the same time perceive one another as the most likely source of mutual misfortune in the form of uloi. Similarly, a man who could count on the assistance of an older brother to finance a first migratory trip to South Africa would at the same time attentively monitor any sign of sibling envy that might open the door to spiritual malfeasance. Even the ancestors could both assist and reproach.

Some social relationships were culturally defined in ways that con-

tained a particularly heightened potential for conflict. Social rivalry between co-wives had long provided one of the most common sources of uloi accusations. Wives constantly competed for their husband's affection and access to migrant remittances; they quarreled over perceptions of unequal treatment and monitored disparate fortunes in childbearing. Even the most harmonious polygynous prewar households in Machaze tended to be characterized by low-intensity conflict between co-wives.[2] Relationships between mothers-in-law and daughters-in-law were also often strained, especially once young wives began to strive for greater autonomy and sought to establish their own homesteads.

Such tensions constituted centrifugal forces in Machazian households that served as eventual sources of schism at particular points in the course of the typical "domestic life-cycle" (Goody 1956, 1976). Thus women often progressed from coresidence with the husband's parents (or at least his mother) to coresidence in a compound organized around the husband's residence. If he married additional wives that compound would eventually grow to include separate huts for each wife and her younger children. However, over time contention between co-wives was likely to result in a new arrangement of multiple separate compounds, each with an older wife and her children and organized around her residence. At this stage a husband might have to continuously circulate among the different compounds of his wives, which were sometimes located many miles apart.

Almost from its outset, the war significantly amplified the tendency for conflict and division to emerge along such already existent social fault lines. The extent to which military violence was appropriated and deployed in local social conflicts (see chapter 5) motivated many Machazians to make migratory decisions that would sever relationships characterized by conflict and competition. The social relations that proved most vulnerable to rupture were thus generally those that had been most susceptible to schism in the course of everyday life under *non–war-time* conditions. The war was not the source of these schismatic tendencies, but it arguably amplified many of the tensions that informed them while often disabling countervailing forces that might have mitigated social fission.[3]

Thus, for example, many husbands, who maintained a vested interest in avoiding schisms between co-wives, had left for South Africa early in the war and were not present to advocate for continued household unity later in the conflict. Fewer than 30 percent of those men I interviewed who had been involved in polygynous marriages before the war reported

that these unions survived fully intact throughout the conflict.[4] For the majority, their polygynous households disintegrated at least in part as co-wives went their separate ways.[5] One woman described how social rivalry among co-wives led to the war-time fragmentation of her paternal uncle's household:

> He had three wives. . . . It was difficult because the first and the third were always together against the second one. . . . The one who was always on her own [middle wife] was caught early on in the conflict by FRELIMO soldiers and stayed in the village. Then after some time they let her go back to get her two children. But her husband would not come back with her. Sometimes her husband would come by the field where she worked outside the village and she would ask him to come into the village. But he did not come. So she thought, "No, it is because of the others [two wives] that he will not join me." Then she told the masochas [FRELIMO soldiers] that the other wives were feeding Matsangaiisse and that they should come and ask her husband where those women stayed. The soldiers caught him and put him in prison one day, but they did not kill him. Then they found the [eldest] wife's house and they burned it and killed her when she was running away. The [third wife] was warned by this that she would be killed if she went to the village. She went to stay with her [paternal kin] with her children. Even now she refuses to return.

New Dilemmas: Dispersion and Social Investment

If war-time conditions provided an external shock that often amplified and accelerated many of the schismatic tendencies already structured into Machazian social relations, they also generated novel social dilemmas. In particular, the massive population movements that occurred during the conflict forced many people to confront unprecedented choices about their social investment. Since almost everyone in Machaze eventually relocated, it became highly likely that individuals would find themselves in a situation in which members of their primary social networks had been dispersed. This fragmentation of social networks presented many with zero-sum-game choices about which relations to prioritize (by accompanying them through migration) and which to neglect (by leaving them behind).

These social dilemmas had not been experienced before the war by many Machazians, most particularly by women. Although migrancy and

prolonged absence had been incorporated into men's life strategies and the expectations that governed their vital social relationships, women's social roles and relationships implicitly presumed greater sociogeographic contiguity. Before the war a wife's move at the time of marriage to her husband's compound would not typically preclude her from fulfilling her obligations and exercising her corresponding rights as a daughter. In fact, ties with nearby paternal kin were particularly important for a woman to maintain, so that she could find the necessary social support in case tensions with a husband, mother-in-law, or co-wife resulted in accusations of uloi or blame for misfortune in her husband's household. In such cases women often returned (or were sent back) to their father's house until the conflict could be resolved. When such situations continued to deteriorate women usually required the cooperation and assistance of paternal kin to secure reasonable terms of divorce, and most specifically to negotiate a repayment of lobola that would ensure her rights to children from the failed marriage.

Under normal conditions sociogeographic proximity allowed women to fulfill their multiple social roles simultaneously, for example, by supervising a son's wives as a mother-in-law, caring for a husband's elderly parent as a daughter-in-law, and maintaining ties to one's own father and mother through regular visits as a daughter. However, the war-time dispersion of these people deprived many women of the social proximity that would have enabled them to continue to maintain all of these relationships simultaneously. War-time population dispersal fundamentally changed the choices many women had to make about how to invest in social relations. Many now confronted a choice between maintaining one set of relationships *or* another. Indeed, when deciding who to migrate with and who to leave behind many individuals were in effect deciding which social relations to neglect in order to fulfill and protect others.

Gender and stage in the life cycle were often particularly important in shaping how individuals determined which relationships to preserve when they faced such decisions. For many women one of the most difficult choices was whether to move with her husband's kin (sometimes with her husband, although more often with her in-laws) or to follow her paternal kin. One woman I interviewed in Machaze had only recently been married when she was confronted with this decision:

> After my husband left for Joni the war became hot and [I, my mother-in-law, and father-in-law] had to go to Gwakwanye. At first I stayed with them, but

> then when I heard that my mother and brothers were leaving [for Zimbabwe] I told [my mother-in-law] to come too [the father-in-law had died meanwhile]. She did not want to leave because she wanted her son to be able to find her. I went with my brother first to Mabudo and then to Chipinge [Zimbabwe]. . . . It was difficult because [my husband] was in Joni a long time. When we were in Chipinge I met another man and begin to stay with him. . . . After I had [my first child] he paid lobola to my brother. . . . When my brother-in-law came to Tongogara then my brother gave him some small lobola because he saw I now had children with another.

In many ways the more recent marriages of younger women like this one, who had yet to bear many or even any children, were far less consolidated than those of women in which a number of children had been born and multiple lobola payments had been made. The processual nature of marriage has been frequently noted as a feature of many African societies (e.g., Goody 1982; Parkin and Nyamwaya 1987; Bledsoe 2002; Townsend 1997). In contrast to European societies where marriage is usually conceptualized as an "event" in which one passes from one social status (unmarried) to another (married) at a particular time, marriage in many African societies (including Machaze) is viewed as a process of transformation in social status realized over time.

Thus, with the progressive fulfillment of culturally prescribed rights and obligations over time the marital relationship was viewed as gaining greater social endorsement and came to be recognized as more solidified. In this sense, each child born to a Machazian woman signified a shift in the balance of her investments in particular social relationships—from greater reliance on her parental kin to stronger attachment to her husband and his lineage kin. Conversely, a woman's continued fertility justified a husband's continued investment in lobola and solidified his and his kin's interests in maintaining ties to his wife. Through this process a woman's interest in safeguarding her marital relationship also increased, inasmuch as she would grow increasingly dependent on the children who "belonged" to her husband's lineage because they had "paid" lobola.

From this perspective the more informative question about how women navigated the war-time choice between maintaining marital relations or severing them in favor of others is not "Was she married?" but rather "To *what degree* was she married?" Marriages such as the one just described represented an early and still relatively vulnerable stage in what was a still largely unrealized conjugal process. Even under "normal"

(i.e., non–war-time) circumstances such "young marriages" often failed for a whole host of reasons that could include a woman's failure to bear healthy children, a husband's failure to pay lobola or adequately provide for his wife, or personal disputes between co-wives or with in-laws. Thus, during the war women who had yet to realize their fertility or for whom lobola had only begun to be paid had to carefully consider whether the marriages they had just embarked on building were likely to be realized under the uncertain conditions imposed by the conflict. When important paternal kin relocated to areas different from those of their husbands and in-laws such women had to decide whether they were willing to forgo access to the social relations they would need to call on if their young marriages faltered. Unsurprisingly, many women in these circumstances pursued the same strategically sensible course of action as that pursued by the women described above.

At the other end of the life cycle, women faced very different social choices and were responsive to a different constellation of social interests. They were often most concerned with maintaining their ties to the adult children who would be the source of their old-age security and status—far more so than with staying with their husbands. Thus, when forced to decide such women frequently opted to follow sons or even daughters-in-law, even when this course of action meant they had to part ways with their husbands:

> When the war arrived in Butiro I was staying with my daughter-in-law and her [two] children. [At that time] my son was working in Joni. . . . My husband stayed with us some of the time but he also stayed some of the time with another [wife]. When the masochas came they took my husband [and his other wife] to Chipudje [a nearby communal village] but they did not find us because we were a little far away. After this we had to go into the bush. . . . This is where we were staying. We were living just like guinea fowl. . . . My husband wanted us to come into the aldeia, but my daughter-in-law would not go because she was afraid. [Her father was a nyanga who had been accused of being pro-RENAMO; he was shot earlier in the war.] After some time my son called for his wife to come to Zimbabwe. After we arrived we went and stayed with him in Tongogara. We stayed in Tongogara until the end of the war when he came from Joni to bring us back to where we are now [Butiro]. . . . My husband stayed in Chipudje for the whole war. He is also staying here now.

The social conditions of war presented many Machazians, and women in particular, with social investment decisions that were dramatically

different from those that governed "normal" social interaction. War-time social schisms in Machaze resulted both from the ways in which violence magnified the structural tensions that already existed in local social relations and from the novel choices that social dispersion imposed on local residents. Machazian descriptions of the social logic that governed their war-time migration decision making highlight that at particular moments in the life cycle some relationships were more important than others to individual life projects. Moreover, the reasoning that Machazians offered for their decisions reveal them as social strategists attentive to the longer-term implications of their choices, rather than as tactical agents whose decisions were dominated by their most pressing concerns.

Social Consequences of Prolonged War

The question of how social relations are negotiated and life projects are carried forward under war-time conditions may be particularly crucial for understanding social interaction in societies plagued by the prolonged or chronically resurgent organized violence that many Mozambicans experienced. The fifteen years of armed political struggle between FRELIMO and RENAMO not only claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of Mozambicans but spanned much of the lifetime of those who survived. While the war provided the only backdrop for social interaction that an entire generation of Mozambicans raised after 1975 had ever known, it profoundly affected the key social projects of all those whose life courses traversed its fifteen-year span. As the war became a prolonged affair it not only placed immediate survival in question but increasingly placed entire life-course strategies at risk—in highly gender-differentiated ways.

From an agent-centered perspective, life-course progression can be seen as a process of exchanging and renegotiating reliance on and investment in successive social relationships. Throughout the life cycle, particular social relationships vary in their importance to the current or future realization of the critical social projects that make up culturally prescribed life-course strategies. All social relations are therefore endowed with an important temporal dimension that sometimes remains neglected in social analysis.

Many critical life projects that are realized through social relations also have particular temporal dimensions, some of which are flexible, and some of which are far less so. When wars begin to span life-course stages, some social projects are often postponed. Others may have to be realized

under the new social conditions of war because they are not temporally flexible. Both the postponement of vital social projects and their realization under novel social conditions can have profound implications for the life chances of social actors during war. Ultimately, the configuration of social relations can be dramatically transformed as actors attempt to creatively experiment with new social possibilities or attempt to realize important life goals without access to those on whom they would usually depend for realizing those projects.

The duration of Mozambique's fifteen-year civil war played a critical role in reconfiguring Machazian social relations in ways that were initially unforeseeable and eventually dramatic, as one Machazian woman I interviewed in Machaze in 1997 a little over a year after she had returned from one of the refugee camps in Zimbabwe remarked:

> When I returned to Tevere I could not even remember where to go for water. Other women had to show me where to go. They would say "walk here and here, but stay away from there" . . . because of the mines. I was only a child when I left with my mother because of the war. I had not even known a man then and my breasts were still firm. I was with my mother. Now my children have children. . . . Look at this one [indicating a child of four or five]—he is my grandchild. . . . For those who stayed it was more difficult . . . but only the very old can remember a life without war.

Sustained warfare had last been seen in the Machaze region during the late nineteenth-century conflicts between Gugunhanna and the Portuguese. Unlike populations in the north of Mozambique where the anticolonial struggle had been waged for over a decade before independence, Machazians had no experience to draw on to help them predict how long the civil war might last. The suddenness of the transition from colonialism to independence also was misleading about how the insurgent challenge to FRELIMO might play itself out. Thus the vast majority of Machazians who witnessed the onset of the conflict expected that the war would be brief and their own relocation temporary, "*só uma temporada*" ("just an agricultural cycle") as one man recalled in our interview. Propaganda on both sides generally encouraged such views. The first Matsangaiisse contingents in the district proclaimed that the war against FRELIMO would result in quick triumph—a message that encouraged some young Machazian men who were frustrated by diminishing migratory and economic opportunities in the immediate postcolonial aftermath to join RENA-

MO's ranks. FRELIMO's initial dismissal of the Matsangaiisse as "mere bandits" also conveyed no hint of how the troubles that initially plagued only a handful of districts in the country's center would develop into a devastating nationwide conflagration that would last for a decade and a half and result in the death of hundreds of thousands and the displacement of millions.

As the war dragged on year after year it became less possible for people to treat the new social challenges and opportunities that the conflict presented as temporary aberrations when calculating, imagining, and implementing their life strategies. By the mid-1980s, when the war was aggressively spreading into other areas of the country (such as Cabo Delgado and parts of Zambezia and Niassa), it had already raged in Machaze for over half a decade. By this time most local residents had stopped forecasting the war's end and had begun to treat the conditions of the conflict as the new backdrop for social life.

The Patriarchal Politics of Assisting Families in Mozambique and Zimbabwe

Early in the war many men who had left for South Africa continued to send remittances to family members they had left behind in Mozambique. Others returned to the district to help family members move into safer areas within Mozambique:

> I came to Chitobe [an area of Machaze District] through Maputo and then Beira, Chimoio, and then on a military transport [airplane] to Machaze. I came with other workers returning from South Africa. When I arrived there I saw that I could not stay there so I told my [first] wife that she should come and bring our two children and we would go to Chimoio. She did not know where her parents were and had only a brother who was a milicia so she came. . . . My other wife did not come. . . . She wanted to come but she had her parents there in the village and had been living with them. . . . She had no children. I did not take her because she would not leave without her parents and brothers. [To bring them] would have been more expense than I had the money for . . . [since] for each person you had to pay [a bribe] to get on the plane. I left some clothing and money for her and her parents.

Eventually, as the situation in the district deteriorated even further a growing number of migrant men in South Africa sought to assist wives,

children, parents, and other family members to relocate outside of Mozambique. A number of these men went to extraordinary lengths, returning repeatedly to the war-torn country to help wives and children relocate across the border in the relative safety of Zimbabwe:

> When I arrived in Machaze [in late 1981] the war was getting very hot. I came by Chipinge [Zimbabwe] but was very careful and came by the bush because I heard that if the masochas found you they would take you to the aldeia, and if the Matsangaiisse found you they would take you to the base and make you a bandit. Sometimes they would just kill you. I had heard from a relative that my oldest wife had moved to Gwakwanye when the soldiers started to bring everyone into the aldeias. In Gwakwanye I was greeted by some people who knew my family and told me, "Your relatives are staying over there." I was too happy when I found all of my wives and children living there. I decided to take [the youngest of three wives] to Mabudo because it was safer there. The other [two wives] already had grown children and followed them. [In the past] I had many problems with these two. . . . The youngest was my favorite. . . . She stayed in Mabudo while I returned to South Africa. When I came back to visit [in two years] I found our son was now working on the tea plantations in Chipinge. So that she would not stay alone, I found a place in Chipinge where we lived for two years. When the Zimbabweans put all Mozambicans in camps she went to Tongogara with our two [youngest] children [by now there were four; the two oldest worked outside the camps in Zimbabwe] and I went back to South Africa to work.

After the establishment of the official UNHCR camp in Zimbabwe in 1984 a growing number of men encouraged spouses and other family members to relocate into one of these camps. Some sent money and others returned to help in the move before going back to their jobs in South Africa. After returning to South Africa many of these men continued to send money or other forms of support and to maintain communication with their family members in these surrogate home bases:

> I learned that my family [a wife, three children, mother and father, and a niece] was staying near Chipinge. Their life was very, very hard because they had no maachamba. This little brother [in South Africa] was just sitting [i.e., unemployed] so I told him to take forty rand and some tea and sugar back to my father and to take them to Tongogara [the younger brother had been in the camp before]. Then he should send word so I could send for him again. . . . I

> could not go because of my job so I sent him. This is what he did three times again before he opened this tuck shop. . . . On the last trip he brought back my sister's son.

Despite their concern for, and prolonged separations from, family members in Mozambique and Zimbabwe very few men brought their families to live with them in the townships of South Africa. Although older sons were sometimes sent for by their fathers in South Africa, the vast majority of these men were highly resistant to the idea of others—especially their spouses—joining them in South Africa.

Many men argued that Machazian wives would become dependent and drain their husbands' earnings because they would be unable to practice subsistence agriculture as they had back in Machaze. The townships in the Vaal region in which many of these men were resettled consisted of small houses and shacks sprawling from horizon to horizon, each with tiny yards generally covering less than ten square meters. Even small garden plots and the domestic animals such as chickens that were so ubiquitous in Machaze were rarely seen in these townships, since these were likely to be stolen. As one man remarked:

> What could [my Machazian wife] do here except eat my money? There is nowhere [here in the township] to plant a maachamba. She could not sell fruit because she does not know the language or the rand . . . and these South African women are too clever and would deceive her so she would lose everything. Even to cook here you must have money. You must buy charcoal and kerosene. . . . It is not like Machaze where she can go and find firewood, snap, snap. . . . She would not want to eat only sadza anymore because the South African women also want to eat [corn] flakes and cakes. . . . [If she were here] she would eat my money because she would stay at home all day just sitting.

The notion that Machazian women would inevitably become an economic burden in South Africa is somewhat questionable. Migrant South African women in the townships have been shown by a considerable body of research to be quite successful participants in the flourishing informal economy in these areas (Bozzoli 1991a, 1991b; Friedman and Hambridge 1991; Preston-Whyte 1991). In my own fieldwork in the townships in 1997, I found that the few Machazian women who had joined their husbands in South Africa had become successful entrepreneurs. In 1997 I conducted a small survey of the economic situation of thirty-one

households in the townships in which wives from Machaze were present. On average these women earned 44 percent of the reported monthly household budget, and all but three—less than 10 percent—generated income for the household. In illustrative contrast, 30 percent of these same households contained one or more male adults who were unemployed and contributed nothing to the household expenses (Lubkemann 2000a, 417–19).[6]

The effect of a wife's presence in Zimbabwe in deterring other family members from coming to South Africa was probably more economically significant. Whereas a wife might in fact contribute to household income (the claims of Machazian men aside), other dependents—such as children and aged parents—would have been a significant drain on migrant income. Therefore, wives who remained in the refugee camps played a crucial role in supporting an array of dependents and in preventing them from going to South Africa. By accepting the humanitarian aid in the camps as a substitute for much of what subsistence agriculture in Machaze had provided, Machazian men thus adapted household subsistence strategies instead of undertaking the more dramatic (and costly) reorganization of domestic socioeconomic relations that would have resulted if their wives joined them in South Africa.

Machazian men had other reasons for not wanting their wives to join them in South Africa. In our many discussions, Machazian men in South Africa frequently expressed longing for aspects of their life in Machaze that they missed in South Africa, such as not having to pay for cooking or heating fuel, having food that was locally produced rather than paid for, being able to "live with little money." Yet the ability of men to pursue these life strategies was (and even today remains) dependent on two factors: (1) control over the labor of wives who provided all these "free" services, and (2) women's willingness to accept the culturally sanctioned gendered division of labor, power, and authority that defines social roles in Machazian marriages and households.

Women have historically provided virtually all of the labor for subsistence agriculture in Machaze. In Machaze poor land quality and acute water scarcity have made domestic and agricultural tasks highly labor intensive, and women performed most of these labor-intensive tasks. For example, during my fieldwork I noted that on average women walked over eight kilometers to get water—usually once a day. Although men might participate in all parts of the agricultural cycle, they were usually only expected to participate in the initial clearing of fields—a labor-

intensive but fairly short task that occurred every two to five years. The rest of the agricultural activities were culturally prescribed as primarily "women's work."

Throughout the twentieth century Machazian men's life strategies had depended on acute culturally prescribed gender asymmetries that allowed them to exploit women's labor for their own benefit. Historically, the immobility of women served as a major mechanism for preserving this asymmetry. In particular, men's gendered monopoly on (migration-based) sources of cash played an important role in securing their control over women by fostering women's dependency on men for obtaining cash.

Some of the very same men who in one instance claimed their wives would have been an economic burden often at others expressed fears that if Machazian women came to South Africa they might gain too much independence as a result of economic success. One Machazian migrant in Evaton drew the following contrast:

> Here [in the townships] it is not like Machaze, because to live you must have money. Everyone must find some way to earn some small money to buy some mealies [cornmeal], some oil, some kerosene. . . . When the woman from Machaze comes she does not know about money but she must learn with the other women selling some fruits on the street. At first she will give this money to her husband. But then she will see that the other women are wearing dresses instead of capulanas and eating cakes. They will show her how to spend money. Then maybe she will start to eat the money she earns [instead of giving it to her husband]. He will have to ask—even for ten rand. Maybe she will not give it to him because she will say, "This [money] is my maachamba."

Many of these men argued that preventing Machazian women from spending time in South Africa was vital to keep them unaware of "customs" that might prompt them to question the patriarchal privileges to which most Machazian men continued to aspire. As another man put it:

> In South Africa the custom of the women is different than in Machaze. Look, they have water not so far away. A woman [from Machaze] who comes here will lose her custom because the ways are different. When she goes back to Machaze then how will she walk so far for water? She will be too tired. She will want mealies [cornmeal] that are [finely ground]. When the husband comes

> home they know which pocket his rands are hiding in. Then your pockets may always be empty.

Yet another man who participated in the same interview put it even more bluntly: "In Machaze there must always be suffering to live. Women must always suffer. If the women from Machaze come to South Africa they will become corrupt like the South African women are. They will always spend money. Once you feed a dog from a plate it will never again eat off the floor."[7]

If Machazian men were concerned with protecting gendered prerogatives, many also avoided bringing their Mozambican wives and families to join them during the war in order to take advantage of new social opportunities that were emerging in South Africa. As explained in chapters 1 and 2, during the two decades before the Mozambican civil war, important regulatory, labor-market, and sociodemographic changes in South Africa had generated new reasons for migrant Machazian men to establish more permanent residential arrangements in South Africa and conjugal ties with South African women.

As the war in Mozambique dragged on for years on end, such permanent residential and conjugal options became attractive to a growing number of Machazian men in South Africa as they began to consider the possibility that they might never be able to resume their lives back in Mozambique. One migrant who had left for South Africa early in the conflict recalled:

> At first I did not think about the war so much. I did not visit Machaze because it was too "hot" there. Some went back but never returned, so I was afraid to go because I could be killed. Later I heard that my father had been killed, but I did not hear about my mother or my wife so I thought they were dead too. I started to think that the situation in Mozambique would be too hot because FRELIMO and RENAMO never wanted to stop fighting even after President Samora was killed. So I said this war will not stop—I must stay in this place.

For many men the war had disrupted their contact with some or even all their family members back in Mozambique. Even among those who maintained contact with wives and other relatives relocated in UNHCR camps or other safe areas, there was growing recognition that life strategies that continued to count heavily on Mozambican social options were less than secure. Consequently, the possibility of developing alter-

native ways for realizing their own life-course goals through conjugal relationships with South African women proved an increasingly attractive possibility.

The presence of a Machazian spouse in South Africa would have made such strategies less viable. Machazian men were well aware that most South African women were not receptive to polygyny, and were adamantly opposed in particular to the presence of a Mozambican wife in their homes. Consequently, the realization of successful marriages with South African women depended on maintaining secrecy about marital partners elsewhere. Many men even sought to conceal their Mozambican identity from South African partners, often claiming to be Shangaanas from the Giyani area in South Africa (much as they did with South African authorities). To pull off this strategy of "passing," Machazian men generally chose non-Shangaana spouses, especially Xhosa women, precisely because they were not knowledgeable enough about the Shangaana language or cultural practices to be able to detect their husband's foreign origin. Such identity-management strategies would be virtually impossible should a Machazian wife be allowed to join them in South Africa.

Many men also feared that their Machazian wives would become discontented at the discovery of South African counterparts and that contention might result from disputes over which wife had more authority in the household. One interviewee in South Africa pointedly noted:

> If my [Machazian] wife came to live here she would have to live in the same house as the [South African wife] I have here. It is not so easy here as it is in Machaze where every wife can have her own house and maachamba. Here we all live like so—here, here, here. Then the one from Machaze would say, "No, I am the first [senior wife] so I must say this or that." But the one who is already here cannot accept it because she was already living here when the other arrived so the house is already following her custom. Then you will have no end to your problems because they each have their own custom.

In an interview in Vereeniging, two Machazian men discussed the problems daily proximity between Machazian and South Africa co-wives would inevitably generate:

> FIRST MAN: If [a Machazian wife] comes here [to South Africa] then there can be big problems with uloi because the [South African] woman does not want her to be in her house. Everyone will suffer then.

INTERVIEWER: Do you mean that the South African woman will cause uloi that will harm the Machazian woman?

FIRST MAN: No, that cannot be the case. The South African woman cannot cause the uloi. But she will suffer because the Machazian woman will cause uloi. Then the husband can suffer too. This is what happened with Moniba [another Machazian migrant they both knew].

SECOND MAN: The two children died and then his [South African] wife went to the police and reported him because she did not want more of her children to die. So he had to take his [Machazian] wife to live in Evaton [another township]. This way they live apart. Now he must visit with each so he is always back and forth, back and forth.

FIRST MAN: The taxi [local bus] eats that one's money!

Consequently, many Machazian men went to considerable lengths to prevent Machazian wives from joining them in South Africa. Some men refused to respond to letters from spouses who requested money to pay for the trip to South Africa, often under the pretext that they had never received these letters. Others provided misleading reasons why spouses should not join them, or else promised what eventually became indefinitely delayed assistance for bringing them to South Africa—a more passive and yet nevertheless effective form of preventing women from joining them. One of these men described his strategy of communication with his wife: "Initially I wrote back [to my wife in the UNHCR camp] that it was not possible for her to come here because I was living in a hostel and women were not allowed. After I bought this house I continued to say I was living in the hostel so she would not come."

Some exceptional women managed to make their way to South Africa even in the face of such resistance from husbands by availing themselves of the services of *hoomuchas,* a profession that experienced spectacular growth during the war. Hoomuchas were professionals who smuggled people, messages, and sometimes goods across international borders. Sometimes they would be paid by a Machazian in South Africa to bring a specific family member to South Africa—almost always a male relative. However, at times these hoomuchas would drum up business in the UNHCR camps or among self-settled Machazians in Zimbabwe or Mozambique, by claiming to know where a person's family members were in South Africa (sometimes truthfully and sometimes not) and offering for a fee to take the person to that family member even if the relative in South Africa had not solicited this service. However, in several cases men

reportedly sent wives back to the camps in Zimbabwe or even into the war zone in Mozambique itself!

Gendered Temporalities: Prolonged War and "Social Fertility"

The very strategies that allowed Machazian men to guard, and in some ways even enhance, their security and long-term social options had the opposite effect for many Machazian women who remained in Mozambique and Zimbabwe. The gender-differentiated effects of prolonged spousal separation were particularly pronounced on the social project of having children.

In Machaze fertility—that is, having children—was one of the most important social projects for both Machazian men and women in pursuing culturally prescribed life courses. Yet, while both Machazian men and women benefited from the status and assistance that children provided, women were far more dependent than men on children for their old-age security. Unlike women, older men did not have to rely solely on children because the social practice of polygyny allowed them to obtain the social and domestic support they needed by marrying additional, and often much younger, wives.[8] Machazian women had no such options and consequently had to rely solely on children for old-age support.[9] In short, in Machaze a woman's fertility was much more critical to her old-age security than it was for most men.

However, fertility was gender-differentiated not only in its importance to and role in Machazian life strategies but also in its temporality. Social projects whose success depends on their realization at a particular moment or within a particular time period are described by social geographers as "time embedded" (Malmberg 1997). The longer biological time frame over which men could reproduce, combined with cultural prescriptions that allowed Machazian men to have multiple wives, meant that men's fertility could span several decades—in fact, virtually their whole lives.[10] In contrast, Machazian women relied solely on their own fertility to secure culturally prescribed rights in children. Women's own biology thus defined a window of opportunity for the social project of fertility that was far more temporally circumscribed than it was for men.

Over time the spousal separation occasioned by the war (and reinforced by the strategies pursued by Machazian men based in South Africa) presented ever more serious challenges and dilemmas for many Machazian women who sought to realize their fertility in culturally sanctioned terms.

As spousal separations became more prolonged a growing number of Machazian wives confronted novel contradictions between culturally prescribed life goals. Women could remain faithful to long-absent or missing husbands with the long-term consequence of having fewer or no children. Alternatively, wives could have sex with men other than their long-absent husbands, which allowed them to bear the children that would be so essential to securing their future security. However, the latter option also required a violation of cultural prescriptions that made divorce more likely and paradoxically placed their future claims on the children born through such illicit unions at risk—since the payment of lobola ensured the husband's (and his kin's) right to the woman's offspring.

Prolonged spousal separation thus created novel contradictions for women by restricting options for the realization of their biological fertility to forms of sexual union that could potentially jeopardize their social fertility (their culturally defined rights in their biological offspring). Machazian men did not face the same dilemma. Cultural prescriptions that allowed for polygyny and new conjugal options in South African marriages shielded them from such contradictions.

This dilemma grew more acute for more women over the course of the war's fifteen years, much of the time span within which many Machazian women needed to realize their own fertility in order to secure their future well-being and security. The duration of the war was even more significant when we consider the fertility work that most Machazian women aimed to accomplish in their lifetime. Most women whom I interviewed expressed a desire for at least six children, and they were particularly concerned with having more than one son:

> Three and three is good [three boys and three girls] because then you will know that at least one will have concern for you in his heart when you grow old. If you have daughters then you will have son-in-laws who can fix the [thatch] roof of your palhota [hut] and help clear your maachamba. If you have sons then you will have daughters-in-law who can help you in the saacha [weeding] when you are tired. Maybe some of [your children] will not have the same feeling for you. It is good to have as many [children] as God will give you so you can hope some of them will remember you. If you have only two or three then pray for sons!

The duration of the war affected women of different ages and in different circumstances in different ways. Two women, for instance, who

had fled to UNHCR camps in Zimbabwe during the war, had become childless by the time they arrived in Tongogara—but for different reasons. The first woman's three children had died while she was still in Mozambique, while the other woman had been married but had never had children. Both of these women engaged in culturally illicit unions with men in the camps in an attempt to have children. High levels of infant mortality in the war zones and refugee camps during the conflict amplified the effects of prolonged spousal separation in ways that further jeopardized the life chances of many women who had already substantially realized their fertility. The long-term life chances of such women were much more gravely threatened than were those of women who had a longer span of their biological fertility still ahead of them.

The threat that infant mortality and spousal separation posed to the most life-course consequential of social projects, such as fertility, placed entire culturally prescribed life strategies at risk for many women. In Machaze, as in most societies, the possibility of carrying out social projects at a later life-course stage remained highly dependent on the successful realization of other projects at previous stages. For example, to become a mother-in-law in old age, a Machazian woman needed to first become a mother. The possibility of establishing certain types of social relations thus depended on accomplishing certain projects within a culturally prescribed time period in the life cycle. In this sense life-course strategies in Machaze were constituted by social projects that were successively—and thus temporally—interdependent.

The effect of the war on such life projects was driven home to me in one of the most heartbreaking interviews I have ever conducted, held in Chimoio with a relatively young woman whose husband and two children had died during the war, after which she had contracted a disease that made her sterile. She lived with her older brother, his wife, and their children. When asked about how she would cope when she was older, she responded quietly and tearfully: "I will die. No one will be able to take care of me when [my brother] is gone. I will die of hunger, because I will have no strength to work and no one to feed me. There will be no one for me to rest upon."

Yet, far from remaining passive in the face of such developments, most Machazian women responded to such dilemmas through a variety of socially inventive, if also socially precarious, strategies as the war wore on. For the vast majority of these women, having children remained the single

overriding concern in the decisions they made about how to manage social relations. As one woman I interviewed in Chimoio stated quite bluntly:

> What matters is not the man. What matters are the children. One or two are not enough, because what if one dies or is not well-behaved? Yes, I would want a man because he could help. But we can live without a man—aren't we doing that now right here? But without children we die in misery.

Some women sought rights in children through means other than their own fertility—such as the adoption of war orphans. Thus, one 1992 survey of over three hundred Mozambican households in Tongogara (a camp in which over 85 percent of the residents came from Machaze) found that 25 percent of the households had one or more children whose parents had died or whose whereabouts were unknown. Some women in the aldeias communais were also able to pursue this type of strategy, as described by one interviewee:

> My mother was my father's first wife [of two]. When the war arrived he was in Joni and we fled into Chitobe [one of the communal villages under FRELIMO's control]. My mother died [from sickness] in the first year we lived in the aldeia. . . . That is when my two brothers and I began to live with this other mother [my father's second wife]. There were six of us, but now there are only four . . . two died in war—one boy, and one girl. . . . All three by my mother survived, along with one girl who was born from this other mother. . . . Since that time she has been our mother. During the war she stayed with us. Because I was a bit grown I was given a job with the party [Organization of Mozambican Youth]. Now she is living with my father [who returned after the war].

However, the rights of women to adopted children were not always secure, as another woman recalled:

> When we were in Gwakwanye my [husband's sister] died. Since there was no one else I took her two children with my three so then we were five with me and my mother-in-law. After that we were in Mabudo and then we were in Chipinge. In Chipinge is where my mother-in-law died. . . . When the children were a bit grown we were taken by Zimbabwean police to Tongogara. There the paternal relative ["uncle"] of my sister-in-law's husband came and took these two from me because he said they were the children of his "son's" lobola.

No more than a handful of the women who spoke with me seemed to have been willing to forgo their own biological fertility during the war. A strategy that became common among the women who remained in the communal villages in Machaze—who were the most likely to be isolated from spouses for the longest periods throughout the war—was to establish conjugal relationships with government soldiers. Women explained that they favored such relationships for several reasons. Women in such unions found they were less likely to be subjected to sanctions by their husband's kin because the military was feared:

> These [soldiers] were only for making children. When one of the masochas began to notice and greet you, what could you do? Maybe your husband's mother and father do not like to see this, but they know you must be quiet because they must be quiet too. Everyone must just accept because he has a gun, because of the fear. They know that you must wait until the soldier's unit is called away to its service.

Some women acknowledged that not only were they able to have children through such liaisons but that they also often benefited from privileged access to some of the rations and spoils that soldiers could obtain. Other women sought to escape the social vigilance, pressure, and disapproval that might hinder their attempts to engage in extramarital child-producing relationships by relocating. One woman whom I interviewed on the outskirts of Chimoio described her own efforts to contend with familial disapproval:

> When I was in Tongogara I was living with my [father and mother] and my child. That is where I had this second child. . . . It was not my husband [because he was in South Africa] but another from Save [who was the biologival father]. . . . That is when my husband's relatives began looking to take my first [child]. . . . My father could not pay [back] the lobola because his pockets were empty, so he was in agreement. That is why after Tongogara I followed with this man [the biological father of the second child] to Chimoio when my relatives returned to Machaze. Now he is speaking with my husband's relatives to pay lobola. But because this situation had not yet been resolved we have troubles with the health of these two children [implying that the poor health of her children could be attributed to uloi caused by her husband's relatives].

Ultimately Machazian war-time displacement was socially differenti-

ated, temporally emergent, and to a considerable extent socially mediated. Displacement was socially differentiated in that women experienced much more profound disruption and disempowerment than men. Displacement was also temporally emergent in that the threat to long-term life strategies increased significantly—for all Machazians, but most of all for women—as the war began to span the shelf life of vital life projects such as fertility. Finally, displacement was, at least in part, socially mediated inasmuch as the adaptive strategies and opportunities pursued by some actors (men) played a significant role in generating new difficulties and obstacles to life projects of others (women). The long-term spousal separation that placed women's life strategies at greater risk was ultimately as much or more a product of men's efforts to protect patriarchal privilege and pursue South African conjugality as it was of war-time violence itself.

Sociality in a Condition of War

Local social struggles that had long characterized and continuously reshaped Machazian life before the conflict were neither suspended nor eclipsed by the civil war. Rather, Machazian accounts reveal that war-time migration was as significantly shaped by gendered and other locally defined power struggles as it was by the course of military violence.

Although certain sociodemographic patterns of war-time social schism and solidarity are suggestive of how social actors pursued their interests in such "other struggles" throughout the war (such as the tendency for mothers to successfully remain with their children, or of men to invest in South African conjugality), social outcomes were always affected by many intervening factors beyond the efforts and intentions of the agents themselves. Not least among these confounding factors was the power of social others—of men who misinformed wives of their whereabouts in South Africa; of mothers-in-law who pressed claims to illegitimate children born from the unions between daughters-in-law and soldiers; of women who opted to follow their parents rather than their new husbands.

Moreover, how exactly individuals decided which relations to preserve and which to risk losing was often subject to highly complex and personalized circumstances. As often as not, personal affinity and the strength of specific emotional bonds played as least as much of a role as culturally prescribed norms in shaping such decisions. Machazians often described

decisions based on personal bonds of affection: mothers who left sons and daughters-in-law to flee with daughters, co-wives who made every effort to stay together, and exceptional men who sent for their wives to join them in South Africa.

It is not merely in the pattern of sociodemographic outcomes that the social agency of war-zone inhabitants is evident but in the patterns that characterize their narratives. It is in their own accounts that Machazians continuously revealed themselves as more than either socially undifferentiated masses, responsive to no other social projects than mere survival, or as cultural automatons striving to restore exactly what they had lost. Far from being singularly responsive to violence (Kunz 1973) or "tactical" social opportunists (Honwana 2000; Utas 2005), Machazians consistently made decisions about how to move and with whom to move that reflected a concern with longer-term, strategic life outcomes. That not all war-time decisions were predictable on the basis of a standard social logic cannot be read as evidence of behavior being guided by "kinetic reactivity" or "tactical agency" that simply sought to work with what was at hand. To the contrary, these narratives consistently evidence a desire to pursue strategic social objectives. In fact, those who broke with social prescriptions arguably evidenced a redoubled form of agency characterized by their willingness to brave war-time risks as well as social sanctions.

As the Mozambican war grew from being an event to a condition that spanned lifetimes Machazians had to rethink and replot their long-term life strategies. Their behavior was thus shaped by more than a tactical reaction to immediate conditions. It was also shaped by strategic concerns about how to reach more distant social horizons in a world of reconfigured social opportunities. This is not to deny that Machazians reconstituted social relationships in inventive ways in order to survive but rather it is to affirm that in doing so they still tried to prioritize, protect, and preserve social relations that had long proven essential to their culturally defined life strategies.

However, the war-time social calculus of Machazians cannot be simply reduced to fulfilling cultural norms. War-time social, political, and economic developments placed interests at stake and reconfigured social power in gender-differentiated ways. Rather than seeking to preserve social relations or practices simply because they were familiar (Scudder and Colson 1982), Machazians pursued interests that often placed them directly at odds with one another. War-time social outcomes were thus not the product of people merely replicating the familiar but of the struggle

between actors pursuing contrasting and often contradictory interests in an environment of shifting social power and opportunity. Culturally defined social relations informed war-time sociality problematically rather than merely prescriptively.

The new social opportunity structures that emerged in war were not forged by shared experiences with violence (Nordstrom 1997) but primarily by the ongoing conduct of "other struggles"—over the configuration of gendered, generational, and other social relations—and by socially differentiated experiences with displacement. In the Machazian case gender politics played a significant role, entirely apart from the conflict's macropolitical narrative, in shaping the organization of war-time migration and reconfiguring social opportunity structures in highly gender-differentiated ways.

The social projects to which Machazians aspired (fertility, marriage), the social relations they sought to preserve, and the strategies they devised to realize their objectives were neither invented ex nihilo nor can they be explained solely by common experiences with war-time violence. They were culturally imagined. Whether their social-investment choices realized established social logics or sought to reformulate some of the terms of that logic, Machazians were continuously and creatively engaged in reworking the culturally provided narratives that already gave their lives meaning. Machazian war-time social innovation is thus more accurately depicted as the outcome of a struggle to find new means for fulfilling old ends than as a process of reinventing those ends. It is more akin to the improvisational patching of a frayed and damaged quilt than the weaving of a whole new cloth.

The Machazian case suggests that violence has neither the capacity to produce a social tabula rasa by wiping the past clean nor to constitute a new social frame of reference capable of overwriting historically constituted social and cultural differences (Nordstrom 1997). War-time violence fails to wipe clean the cultural imagination in part because it never looms so large as to fully occupy and solely shape experiences of warzone living. Consequently, it is vital to understand the historically constituted dynamics of these "other struggles" (and the culturally specific terms of their narration) *before* the conflict in order to understand their conduct and development *throughout* the conflict.

At the very heart of the theories of warscape agency and sociality that I take to task in this analysis is an implicit depiction of violence as not merely a central but as a hegemonic force, socially totalizing in the

shaping of warscape social interaction and behavior. To both those who see warscape agency as "kinetic" and as "tactical" it is the incessant pervasiveness of violence that sustains a certain indeterminacy of action: a choice that saves the social navigator in one instance may be the source of his or her downfall or demise in the next. The inability to reliably predict effects "constrains the ability of social actors in warscapes to string together individual acts into strategies with cumulative effects—rendering each moment and occasion as its own full reckoning" (Hoffman and Lubkemann 2005, 318). In the face of unrelenting violence the only certainty is the "certainty of uncertainty," and horizons of predictability no longer extend beyond the immediate present.

Although such depictions may adequately model the "reactivity" that governs much behavior during those brief periods of most intense violence and greatest distress, they are less than satisfactory descriptions of war-time behavior as a whole because they fail to account for the sum of experiences that together make up war as a social condition. Although acute violence plays a central, and in many ways defining, role in shaping the experience of war-zone inhabitants, extremes of violence usually periodically punctuate their lives rather than continuously scripting them, especially in prolonged wars that drag on for decades and span generations (such as Mozambique and a growing number of other persistent conflicts worldwide).[11]

Machazian experience with a decade and a half of war was not a matter of all terror all of the time, nor were all Machazians equally exposed to the acute violence that did sweep the district. Even those who experienced the most dramatic and intense violence of the war—such as residents of the aldeias communais—found that weeks or months of intense danger and frequent attack were followed by months or even years in which armed assaults became a rarity as fighting shifted elsewhere and an uneasy status quo prevailed that enabled some semblance of normal everyday life. Although awareness of the potential for violence lay in the back of everyone's minds throughout the war, during the long uneasy lulls that consumed most of their time over the course of fifteen years, the war-zone inhabitants of Machaze were not singularly consumed by a concern with violence.

More of their time was spent on the challenges of everyday social and material existence. Thus, throughout most of the war maachambas were tended, albeit more watchfully; firewood was gathered, albeit on paths walked more carefully; and children were raised, albeit more

cautiously. For most of the district's residents their war-time experience overwhelmingly was not about dramatic episodes of physical violence but rather about the constant struggle with ever more gripping structural violence—chronic drought and famine, the looming threat of being conscripted, uncertainties about the fate and whereabouts of loved ones or how one should socially adjust in the face of not knowing, and the struggle to eke out a subsistence secretively in the bush.

If we want to understand the behavior and experience of warscape inhabitants it is vitally important not to depict war as simply the sum of experiences of acute violence. To construct depictions of war as a condition by merely stringing together episodes of acute violence is to misrepresent the actual conditions that warscape inhabitants confront through analytical omission and misplaced emphasis—a distortion akin to that of the typical movie trailer that artfully misrepresents the pace and scope of a drama by stringing together the moments of most garish action while neglecting the more mundane bulk of the narrative. The social condition of war is constituted more by the complex intersections of acute and structural violence and often by the conduct of "other struggles" than by the dynamics of political conflict, more by lives that insist on being lived in their full social complexity rather than being suspended or recast in reductionist terms.

SECTION 4

War as a Socially Transformative Condition

In 1997, over five years after October 4, 1992—when FRELIMO and RENAMO officially ended the civil war by signing the Mozambican General Peace Accord in Rome—I interviewed a Machazian man living in Sebokeng township, near Vereeniging, South Africa:

> Some who are here have already seen Machaze with their own eyes and come back here to tell us of the things they know. Some are always coming and going, coming and going—even now. But if you want to travel [to Machaze] it is still too difficult. There is the problem of transport and the problem of land mines. . . . In Machaze it is still too hot.

A year later I interviewed a Machazian woman living in the provincial capital of Chimoio:

> During the time of the hondo I always stayed in the aldeia. When my mother and sister died I was left alone with these children. . . . My husband had abandoned me to hunger and I had no one to lean on. After the war my husband returned and wanted to divorce me because he said I had been used by the soldiers in the aldeias. In the divorce he wanted to take these children as his lobola. My father and brothers and relatives were all eaten by the war so I had to flee the aldeia to come and stay here in Chimoio hiding with my children.

These interviews highlight the complexities and dilemmas that many Machazians confronted when considering the possibility of return to the district after a decade and a half of conflict. If nothing else, they reveal

that the signing of the peace accord and the demobilization of troops that followed did not necessarily bring an end to the social condition of war as many Machazians experienced and understood it.

For many Machazians the end of fighting between RENAMO and FRELIMO did *not* mean an end to the social and economic dilemmas of the war. Speaking to me in South Africa in 1997–98, and even later, many Machazians continued to express a reluctance to return to the district because it was still "too hot." In part such views may be attributed to the uncertainty among many Machazians as to whether the peace accord would stick, a concern that not a few in the international humanitarian and policy-making communities shared, at least until the first general elections were held successfully in 1994.[1] For some the end of the war paradoxically amplified many of the social challenges and dilemmas originally introduced during the conflict. Thus to individuals such as the woman quoted above, who fled to Chimoio at least three years *after* the signing of the peace accord "because of the conflict" (her own words), war as a "social condition" persisted and generated new and dramatic difficulties for many years after the hostilities had officially ended.

Following the example of Sharon Hutchinson (1996) in her ethnohistorical revisitation and updating of Evans-Pritchard's classic study of the Nuer, I argue that it is vital for anthropologists who work in warscapes to trace the development of social processes throughout and beyond the course of the conflict, rather than treating war as a temporary interruption in the "normal" flow of these processes. Thus, much as gendered, generational, and other micropolitical struggles in Machaze developed throughout precolonial and colonial dispensations, so too did they continue to unfold in, and throughout, Mozambique's decade and a half of armed conflict. It is vital to not only examine how novel strategies emerge for the conduct of everyday life but also to explore how the life to be conducted is transformed as a result.

As Carol Greenhouse suggests in her introduction to *The Ethnography of Unstable Places,* "[C]risis involves conditions in which people . . . must improvise with the elements of their social and political technologies and cope with a variety of unexpected disruptions and opportunities. *Some of these crises alter the very conditions central to the constitution of social identities*—the contingencies bound up in the way people know themselves and others as members of communities, groups, families, or even as individual women, men, and selves" (2002, 9). Accordingly, I suggest that approaching war as a social condition implies supplementing

investigations of how everyday social struggles and relations factor into the constitution of political agency (chapters 3, 4), war-time violence (chapter 5), and the navigation of warscapes (chapters 6, 7) with an analysis of how the very terms of those social struggles and relations are reconstituted in the course of their deployment in war-time conditions.

This is an indispensable analytical task for any anthropology conducted among people who have suffered organized political violence for decades and for whom displacement has become a transgenerational phenomenon persisting throughout one or more life cycles of social reproduction. In contexts such as Machaze, where societies have been subject to long-term warfare, anthropological investigation should be framed by the *expectation* that social networks, economic strategies, expectations, kinship relations, and the very identities of the war-affected will have been profoundly transformed in complex ways.

In chapter 8 I demonstrate how the transformation of Machazian social relations during the war informed projects of postconflict return. I focus in particular on how the war-time development of transnational polygyny transformed the life strategies of Machazians in ways that placed them at odds with the international community's postconflict repatriation agenda. While international humanitarian agency officials assumed that return and nonreturn were mutually exclusive options, Machazian men sought to pursue new transnational life strategies that presumed continued social connections and investment in *both* Mozambique and South Africa.

War-time social innovations such as transnational polygyny not only confounded the assumptions and repatriation plans of the international community but also had ambiguous and far-reaching consequences for other social actors in Machaze. In chapters 8 and 9 I detail how the extension and expansion of transnational polygyny after the war transformed the meaning of particular relations and practices by restructuring social power, rights and obligations, and forms of interdependence between migrants and those who remained behind in Machaze. Although advantageous to the men who eagerly sought to adopt transnational polygyny, this innovation also engendered significant resistance and innovative reactions from those whose social interests and life chances were detrimentally affected. Chapter 8 also explores the paradoxical phenomenon that I term "postconflict displacement" by detailing how some Machazian women reacted to these developments, with some choosing not to return to the district and others leaving Machaze for the first time *after* the war.

In chapters 9 and 10 I focus even more specifically on the course of postconflict struggle and debate within Machazian society over how domestic social relations should be configured and what postconflict migrancy should mean. In chapter 9 I explore migrancy as not only the key mechanism for enacting a range of new transnational life strategies but also as a form of moral performance implicated in the negotiation of these strategies' social legitimacy. I focus on the narratives that migrants used to explain migratory behavior (their own and others) in a social environment in which mutually exclusive interests were at stake. Migration and its public narration are thus explored as forms of "presentation of self" (Goffman 1959) that seek to justify innovative social models and behavior in the face of significant resistance.

In chapter 10, I conclude with a theoretical framework for explaining the specific direction of war-time and postconflict transformation in Machazian social relations. I seek to exemplify how an anthropology of the social condition in war might contribute to questions of broader theoretical importance to the discipline as a whole. Sociocultural anthropology has entered an era in which the weight of its theoretical concerns has shifted toward understanding social dynamics rather than documenting social structure. Both the "historical turn" and the rise of variants of "practice theory" reflect—and embody—this shift. Rather than framing anthropological inquiry as a search for more fundamental social continuities, we are more likely to inquire into how social actors navigate or effect change.

The concept of "agency" and the task of its theorization is at the very center of anthropology's ongoing reimagination of itself as a discipline that strives to study and theorize social change. Anthony Giddens's formulation (1979, 1984, 1993) of the mutually constitutive relationship between "agency" and "structure" has become an influential conceptual currency in this new disciplinary task. Some of his ideas serve as my own point of departure for critically developing a framework for understanding and analyzing social innovation and transformation in warscapes, and more broadly for reflecting on how the study of social change in warscapes may speak to core debates shaping the discipline as a whole.

For Giddens structure is not to be seen merely—or even primarily—as an array of "external" forces that exercise constraint on agency (in the sense of preventing actors from doing what they would prefer to do) but rather as the essential medium through which agency is realized. This is embodied in his notion of the "duality of structure," by which he means

"that the structural properties of social systems are both the medium and the outcome of the practices that constitute those systems" (Giddens 1993, 122). Structure exercises determinative force on agents first and foremost by virtue of its capacity as a medium that enables them to realize meaningful action.

An apt, if rough, analogy might be drawn in the relationship between language and communication. To be effective, communication requires a language of expression. Yet any language that provides the medium that enables a communicative act does so in particular ways that inevitably cut off possibilities, which other specific languages might provide. It is in this sense that any one language inevitably constrains the same communicative act it enables. Analogously, in Giddens's view, social structure provides a medium that both enables and exercises considerable determining weight on effective social interaction.

Giddens argues that agency in turn affects structure through the cumulative and inadvertent effects of specific instances of practice. On the one hand, it is in the commonality between prior and following instances of practice that structural continuity is reproduced. On the other, it is in the inevitable differences between earlier and later performances of particular individuals—and in the idiosyncrasies among the performances of many individuals—that the seeds of structural change are inadvertently, imperceptibly, and, for the most part, unintentionally sown. Giddens uses the term "structuration" to define this dialectical process of mutually constitutive interaction between structure and agency in which "rules and resources are drawn upon by actors in the production of interaction, but [in which these rules and resources] are thereby also reconstituted through such interaction" (Giddens 1993, 123).

Although Giddens's formulation admits to two general types of effects of agency on structure (the reproduction of continuity or the effecting of change), he does not develop an explicit theory of why different actions or agents vary in the degree or type of their effect on structure. He remains largely silent on questions that are arguably key to the analysis of the relationship of agency to social change, including: Why is change effected in one way and not another? Why do particular agents and acts effect more change than others? How and why does social drift follow particular idiosyncratic performances but not others? What differentiates social experiments that succeed in gaining social traction from those that ultimately fail to spread or persist? Why are the innovative practices of some agents socially legitimized while those of others remain marginalized?

These questions are particularly important for an anthropology that seeks to trace the development of social relations *through war as a social condition.* As many theorists have noted (Nordstrom 1997; Greenhouse 2002; Whitehead 2004), in warscapes the hegemonic status of many relations are often subverted and challenged and established models of social navigation may be—at least partially—stripped of their predictive power and reliability (Utas 2005). Survival in such settings demands creative social navigation, making warscapes unusually abundant sites of social innovation. Thus, arguably more so than in contexts where the configurations of power that underwrite hegemony remain relatively undisturbed, the analysis of social process in violently unsettled places should pay particularly close attention to the identification of counterhegemonic discourses and focus on tracing the course of their contention for social preeminence. After all, not many such experimental discourses and social innovations persist, nor do they ultimately all bear the same weight in the transformative reconstitution of social relations and interaction.

It is perhaps the sheer abundance of innovative experimentation and the intensity of discursive contestation that renders the social condition in warscapes most theoretically relevant to broader disciplinary efforts to theorize social change, signaling them as what Robert K. Merton once called "strategic research sites" or "areas of research in which processes (and concepts) of more general import can be manifested with an unusual amount of clarity" (1987). In an effort to articulate a broader framework for analyzing the relationship between culture, agency, and social change—in warscapes and beyond—the chapters in this final section document the struggle between, and analyze the relative success of, competing innovative propositions about how postconflict Machazian social relations should be configured—a process in which hegemony is being unmade then remade.

Gramsci (1971) depicts hegemony as "naturalized ideology," naturalized precisely because it does not present itself as a possibility for which alternatives exist. Hegemony thus does not present itself as propositional—something to be argued over or about—or as one moral view (among others) about the way the world should be. The "hegemonic" presents itself simply as the way the world is—self-evident and unquestioned. By contrast I offer the term "social imagination" to refer to those corners and pockets of social discourse in which the "unrest of hegemony" is found. These are areas of understanding and worldview where once taken-for-granted notions have been cast into doubt and are

being redefined through argumentation and contestation among social agents with divergent interests and ideas—and where some framings have lost hegemonic force and reverted to being merely contested ideologies.

However, if the social imagination consists of those pockets of the discursive fabric where notions that were once hegemonic are now contested, I contend that there is still a form of "pre-hegemonic hegemony" that operates within, and defines, such spaces of social argumentation. Arguments, after all, are never mere chaos since they can only be meaningfully conducted through the deployment of other already legitimized terms. Moreover, experimental social discourses must secure a particular degree of general social endorsement to even become legitimately arguable propositions—rather than being dismissed or sanctioned outright.

More specifically, the propositions that "qualify" for the social imagination can be identified by the "negative legitimacy" they are afforded, by which I mean the legitimacy implicitly granted when those who oppose a proposition nevertheless accept that it is at least sensible and believable enough to merit argument and engagement. To agree to argue is thus to at least concede the right of presence in the social contestation game. The framework for analyzing social transformation in warscapes that I seek to develop in this section (and most specifically articulate in the final chapter) thus focuses on identifying both factors that determine the very "arguability" of innovative propositions about social relations, and those that enable their proponents to secure greater social endorsement than that afforded to competing social visions.

CHAPTER 8

Postconflict Displacements

The Social Problematics of Refugee Return

In her critical deconstruction of what she calls the "discourse of repatriation" prevalent in humanitarian policy, anthropologist Laura Hammond notes:

> Terms to be found in the discourse of repatriation include: *reintegration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, rebuilding, readjustment, readaptation, reacculturation, reassimilation, reinsertion, reintroduction, recovery,* and *re-establishment* (Gmelch 1980; Allen and Morsink 1994; Allen 1996). Among the most problematic terms of the repatriation canon are the words *return* and *returnee,* which imply that by reentering one's native country a person is necessarily returning to something familiar. These terms are riddled with value judgments that reflect a segmentary, sedentary idea of how people ought to live, what their relation to the homeland should be, and ultimately how they should go about constructing their lives once the period of exile ends. The implication of these terms is that returnees should seek to move backward in time, to recapture a quality of life that they are assumed to have enjoyed before becoming refugees or that those who remained behind currently enjoy. [Moreover] because postrepatriation life, or "home" in the discourse of repatriation, is rooted in the country of origin it is considered by outsiders to be necessarily better than the life in exile. (1999, 230)

As Liisa Malkki (1995a) has noted, assumptions about refugees are often rooted in official discourses that "territorialize national identity." These discourses implicitly posit that people who flee their countries of origin lose their social and cultural moorings along with their identities, but they fail to consider the capacity of refugees to adapt and constitute

new social identities and life strategies. Hammond notes that these same assumptions also tend to inform the notion that postconflict refugee return is natural, inevitable, and unproblematic:

> If we take "back across the border" the challenge of the assumed natural link between person and place and culture and geography we can see that the sedentarist bias is equally influential in prescribing "cures" for refugees. One of the reasons that repatriation has not been problematized is that its goal has been defined primarily as the need to put people back into their "place," defined in most cases as their birthplace. It is assumed by practitioners involved in repatriation programs . . . that once returnees are back in their native county their roots will be re-established. Like seedlings replanted in the earth they will grow and thrive with a minimum of maintenance or attention. Once the natural tie between person and place is re-established, it is expected that other challenges (attaining economic self-sufficiency, building social networks, and becoming active and valued citizens of the community, region, nation) will be met ipso facto. (1999, 23)

A growing body of recent scholarship has debunked the notion that return is the most "natural" or self-evident postconflict outcome for refugees. Many of these studies (Rogge 1987; Malkki 1992, 1995b; McSpadden 1999; Dolan 1999; Hammond 1999, 2004; Lubkemann 2002b, 2005b; Janzen 2004; Stefansson 2004) have shown that wars, particularly prolonged ones, more often than not dramatically alter the social, economic, and political profiles of the places from which refugees originally fled, rendering the "homes" to which policymakers expect them to return more alien and alienating than familiar and comforting. Moreover, experiences of prolonged resettlement often bring about profound transformations in social identities and organization, in socioeconomic practices and expectations, and in social life strategies, all of which in turn modify refugees' own notions of where and what is "home."

Scholars have found the widest possible range of variation in how ideas of "home" are understood and propositions of "return" are acted on by different social groups in different postconflict contexts. As Khalid Koser and Richard Black note: "[A]lthough the removal of the 'root causes' of flight is usually considered the single most important requisite condition for return by the international community . . . refugees themselves may develop in exile a new set of priorities for return which are essentially unrelated to their motives for flight" (Koser and Black 1999, 10). Thus,

while many refugees do return to their specific areas of origin, this is not always the case.[1]

Moreover, those who do cross the border back into their homelands do not necessarily return to their communities of origin but relocate elsewhere within their nation of original citizenship. Such decisions may reflect how refugees prioritize a whole variety of social or economic criteria over attachment to specific places in their decision making. Thus, for example, refugees who have spent decades in urban exile and become deeply involved in petty commerce may prefer urban centers in their homelands to their areas of rural origin, where they once survived primarily by practicing subsistence agriculture (Sommers 2001). Alternatively, the notions of home that guide postconflict migration decisions may be moored in purely social rather than geopolitical or economic referents. Thus, in his study of Mozambican Jehovah's Witnesses, Ken Wilson (1994) demonstrates that their priority in postconflict return was to reunite the congregation of the faithful. In this sense, the "home" to which these believers sought to return to was an aggregate of people, that is, a "social world" (Marx 1990), rather than any specific place per se.

Although for some the goal of return may be to reestablish a semblance of what was before, in some cases there is either acknowledgment that this is impossible or a strong feeling that such an objective would no longer be desirable even if it were possible. Unsurprisingly, analysts of postconflict migration decision making in societies wracked by genocidal violence (such as Rwanda, Cambodia, and Kosovo) have found that experiences such as ethnic cleansing do not readily lend themselves to the proposition that prewar patterns of interethnic social interaction and coresidence should be reestablished (Uvin 1998; Janzen 2004; Stefansson 2004).

New social and economic investments made over many years of exile can bind refugees to their areas of war-time resettlement and lead to reluctance or outright refusal to return (Allen and Turton 1996; Bascom 1998; Dolan 1999). Similarly, shifts in social mores (McSpadden 1999) or in economic opportunities (Kuhlman 1991; Malkki 1995b; Sommers 2001; McSpadden 2004; Jacobsen 2005; Eastmond 2005) may make some community members far less eager to return than others. As Koser and Black note: "[The] implicit assumption that at the end of the conflict, a return to a 'place' called 'home' is both possible and desirable . . . can be questioned in both its aspects: return 'home' may (in fact) be impossible" (1999, 7). In short, both the war-time transformations of former homelands and of notions of home may profoundly affect how

war-time migrants contemplate and carry out (or not) projects of post-conflict return. Rather than reproducing the sedentarist bias that assumes postconflict return should and will occur, it is crucial to investigate how war-time social transformations potentially problematize "refugees own meanings of repatriation and their perceptions and expectations of 'home'" (Koser and Black 1999, 10).

International Humanitarian Understandings of Postconflict Return

In 1993–95 the UNHCR, in conjunction with various humanitarian relief and assistance organizations, carried out in Mozambique what has been widely regarded as one of its most successful repatriation efforts ever. Over 1.6 million Mozambican refugees were estimated to have returned from neighboring countries, either spontaneously or through the organized efforts of the humanitarian community. UNHCR assisted in the organized return of 320,000 people (UNHCR 1995a), including repatriations from Zimbabwe and South Africa where many of the residents of Machaze had gone.

Although the repatriation was viewed as a model of humanitarian planning and execution in Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Tanzania, the repatriation of Mozambicans from South Africa was considered a rather frustrating exception to this success, with results falling far short of expectations. UNHCR originally estimated that over 200,000 (of an estimated 250,000) self-settled Mozambicans in South Africa would return by the end of 1995. However, only a fraction of the returnees expected (31,589) ever did so, at least with the assistance of official humanitarian efforts (UNHCR 1996).

Throughout 1994 and into 1995 the problem of distinguishing between "economic" migrants and "genuine refugees" also came to be seen as a major problem by the UNHCR. Numerous internal reports during this period noted that the vast majority of those Mozambicans whose return was being assisted by UNHCR and its implementing partners were single males. In two convoys from South Africa in November 1994, out of 183 returnees 78.6 percent were single males (UNHCR 1994d). Officials suspected these were "labor migrants," rather than "genuine refugees," who were taking advantage of the opportunity for a free trip home. These suspicions were fed by their observations that the returnee population from

South Africa was bringing back a volume of luggage far greater that of the other Mozambican refugee populations being assisted by UNHCR (such as those returning from the camps in Zimbabwe):

> The luggage per family is great and may be greater with future movements. In some [possibly extreme] cases it could be one 10 MT [metric ton] truck per family. HCR RSA [High Commissioner for Refugees in the Republic of South Africa] indicated that it would be impossible to limit luggage except saying we wouldn't move animals. . . . [W]hat we need to know is how much luggage there is—the people are just a minor addition to the luggage. (UNHCR 1994a)

The UNHCR, its implementing partners, and its Mozambican counterpart, NAR (Nucleo de Apoio ao Refugiado), reacted by attempting to distinguish between "economic migrants" and "genuine refugees" in order to focus assistance on the latter—with limited success. As noted in one 1994 report:

> There was considerable discussion on how to deal with "economic migrants" compared to the more deserving "refugees" in South Africa. It was suggested that these two groups can be separated based on their stated reason for leaving, what they did in the RSA [Republic of South Africa], and where they lived in the RSA. It seems unlikely that anyone will say they went to the RSA for work once the benefits of being a "refugee" are known. (UNHCR 1994a)

UNHCR officials on the ground believed that most of these economic migrants were returning to South Africa after receiving transportation for their baggage and that this procedure was, in many cases, repeated multiple times by the same individuals. This so-called revolving-door syndrome was regarded as undermining UNHCR's ability to channel its assistance to those they regarded as genuinely needy. UNHCR's concern with this problem increased once the media began to take note, as stated in a 1994 UNHCR (South Africa office) report, *Migrant Labour and the UNHCR Repatriation Operation (RSA/MOZ):*

> [M]easures to tackle the revolving-door syndrome are being taken. . . . However, and despite our best efforts, it has become evident during the last few months that the revolving door is close to spinning! Our own observations at the transit facilities, through field-level contact with the local "network" of community knowledge and from comments and questions directed to us by

> organizations, agencies and general observers, suggest that the number of single young males traveling with convoys across the border has increased significantly . . . [O]f particular concern is the number of journalists and TV crews who follow the repatriation operation with keen interest. We know that some journalists have actually focused on the issue of migrant labor movement. . . . We are concerned that what has been a slow yet tremendously well organized repatriation may become subject to a series of bad press for the UNHCR (a Dutch TV crew producer in his words mentioned "the waste of the Dutch taxpayers money")! This kind of press although isolated, and with the cumulative costs that are not indicated yet being borne by our organization, should lead us to question or review what can be done to address the matter. Our office would like to open serious discussion on the issue and see what measures can immediately be taken to combat the flow of migrant labor (legal and illegal) who are clearly taking advantage of the UNHCR operation. (UNHCR 1994b)

A barrage of reports and assessments produced an array of different—and sometimes contradictory—explanations for the unexpected problems that plagued the South African repatriation effort. These assessments reveal the premises that structured the international humanitarian community's understanding of return, premises that ultimately undermined the effectiveness of their efforts.

As UNHCR prepared for a massive wave of Mozambican return it never questioned its premise that Mozambique was self-evidently the "home" to which most Mozambican refugees in South Africa wanted to return. This assumption was only cast into doubt when the expected numbers of returnees failed to materialize. Even then the tendency was to attribute low rates of return to internal organizational failures and faulty provision of information to refugees. Thus several reports highlighted a lack of refugee knowledge about how to go about registering for repatriation assistance or even of the existence of these services. One major retrospective assessment noted that UNHCR had been denied a presence in South Africa until 1991 and had only created a field presence in some refugee areas in 1994. However, it diagnosed the weakness and inexperience of South African-based implementing partners as the major cause of poor dissemination of information, implying that if most Mozambicans had been adequately informed of repatriation opportunities they would have availed themselves of that assistance. Another report identified South African farmers and industries as the source of a misinformation campaign about the state of political and economic affairs

back in Mozambique, apparently to protect an important source of inexpensive labor (UNHCR 1994e). Many of these reports saw better public education and information as the solution, but none questioned the underlying premise that most Mozambicans desired to definitively return to their country of origin.

Even late in the effort, after numerous public information campaigns, the power of sedentarist assumptions remained evident in the tendency to explain the low levels of participation in the repatriation effort as "really" only a "delay" in return. Thus, in mid-1994 a UNHCR official in South Africa concluded that the low rate of Mozambican participation in UNHCR repatriation efforts was mostly a matter of timing. Mozambicans were struggling, under the adversity of their illegal status, to earn enough in South Africa to reestablish their homesteads when they finally did return to Mozambique. Those who returned before being "fully prepared" by having sufficient resources to reestablish their homesteads reportedly returned to South Africa highly discouraged. This report speculated that these individuals influenced others to delay their own plans to return.

The possibility that those who had resettled in South Africa during the war might not want to return at all was primarily contemplated only in retrospect, after the organized repatriation effort ended. In one report that reflected on "lessons learnt" from the failed repatriation effort, the UNHCR's South Africa office attributed low rates of return to the "much stronger socio-economic situation in South Africa" and asked, "Why leave a country where there are plenty of job opportunities, health care and schools?" (UNHCR 1995b).

A second premise that remained unquestioned throughout the repatriation effort was that return to Mozambique and continued participation in South African society were (or at least should be) mutually exclusive options. To the humanitarian community those Mozambicans who were implicated in the revolving-door syndrome could not be genuine refugees but only labor migrants who were using the repatriation system to the detriment of "real refugees." The authenticity of refugees was thus assessed not only in terms of their willingness to return but to do so definitively—to go back to Mozambique *and* stay put.

When Mozambicans in South Africa did not react to the advent of "peace" by returning in the same numbers as their compatriots who had sought refuge in Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Tanzania, the international community looked for explanations in differences ranging from the organizational structure of intervening institutions, to the machinations of

interested third parties, to economic and living conditions that were seen as far more favorable in South Africa than in other countries of asylum. When these organizational, political, and economic explanations proved insufficient, the international community resigned itself to frustrated bewilderment:

> The refugee communities are 100 percent fully aware of the end date for the repatriation operation. . . . [T]hroughout the whole mission *none of the old reasons* (political uncertainty in Mozambique, physical security, mines, banditry, food security, elections in the RSA and in Mozambique, the planting season and harvest etc . . . etc . . .) were presented by the refugees as to why they couldn't return to their places of origin. (UNHCR 1995b)

The overall degree of confusion and uncertainty over "what went wrong" in the South African repatriation effort was perhaps most revealingly articulated in the final report on the UNHCR Reintegration Program's Evaluation Mission for Mozambique's Southern Region:

> The operation in the South was geared for an expected high number of refugees returning from South Africa. This did not happen. However, the reasons for the "no show" of an estimated 200,000 plus Mozambicans expected to return from the RSA have been well documented and debated long into the night! The question that comes out in the end is, how did the UNHCR get its estimates so wrong? Perhaps not a question for this evaluation team? (UNHCR 1996)

In the grip of the sedentarist assumptions that so powerfully structure "repatriation discourse" (Hammond 1999), the humanitarian community failed to consider whether years of exile had transformed Mozambican social organization in South Africa and, consequently, whether any such transformations might have reinformed notions of what "home" was, and what "return" implied, to these refugees.

Machazian Men's Understandings of Postconflict "Return"

In sharp contrast to the humanitarian community's belief that Mozambicans in South Africa would—and should—return "home" permanently, most Machazian men living in the periurban townships of South Africa at the end of the war did not see the reestablishment of a home in Mozam-

bique as an option that precluded them from also maintaining households in South Africa. As described in chapter 7, fifteen years of armed conflict in Mozambique had led many men to make social and economic investments in South Africa that they now were loath to forsake for the uncertain promises of a seemingly fragile peace in a devastated homeland.

A great many of these men seriously doubted that the peace would "stick" and few had any confidence in either of the political parties. Although most Machazians in South Africa were highly mistrustful of FRELIMO, many were equally reluctant to see RENAMO gain power. The general distrust for all forms of central-state authority was captured succinctly in one man's comment on why he paradoxically preferred to see the local FRELIMO administrator in Machaze remain in power, even though he personally had greater sympathy for RENAMO:

> A goat eats where it is tied, and this one has already eaten. . . . If RENAMO puts another in his place then that one will also have to eat his part. . . . This is not so good if you are the grass. . . . [Also], FRELIMO has been the chief for a long time. . . . If RENAMO wins then it will be complicated. . . . How can FRELIMO stop being chief after it has already been chief and accept that RENAMO is chief so that it gives it orders? . . . Then FRELIMO will have to fight. . . . It could get very "hot" again very quickly. . . . These things must be watched for carefully if you do not want to suffer that "heat."

Moreover, the economic situation in Mozambique—particularly in Machaze—seemed particularly unpromising. During my initial fieldwork in the Vaal-area townships tales of failed efforts to successfully return and invest "back home" circulated widely within the Machazian community, continuing unabated throughout my subsequent annual shorter-term visits over the five years that followed. One man recounted how his attempt to establish a bread-baking business in the district had failed because the price of flour was too high and supplies of fuel were uncertain. Not only did fuel have to be trucked in over roads that were virtually impassable in the rainy season but a variety of district officials imposed "informal taxes" that made the costs prohibitive. He knew of two local grinding mills that had closed down for similar reasons.

Throughout the decade that followed the peace accords I encountered few Machazian men who were interested in making investments in the district, at least not in fixed-capital assets that could not be quickly liquidated. Most were far more interested in engaging in petty trade, reselling items brought from South Africa and Zimbabwe in Machaze, than

in making the types of more permanent (and taxable) investments, such as in the grinding mills and small wells that had become the model during the last decade of the colonial period.

Although Machaze enjoyed some infrastructural improvements after the war (two health clinics, several schools, rehabilitation of wells in some of the former aldeias communais) the bulk of reconstruction assistance in Manica Province went to the provincial capital, Chimoio, far to the north and along the corridor between the Zimbabwean border and the coastal city of Beira. The rehabilitation of the two major roads running through the district undertaken in the first five years after the war proved ineffectual as the rainy season continued to make them virtually impassable for months at a time. Some of these roads also had uncleared land mines, which emerged during heavy downpours.

The first postwar decade also generated very few employment options in Machaze. Although some jobs were created by the surge of international NGO activity in the district between 1993 and 1998, these possibilities for earning cash soon faded as all but one of these international NGOs ceased activities by 2000. Thus, even those men who did return and reestablish home ties in Mozambique soon realized that migration to South Africa for employment was still their best—and perhaps only—earning option. As one man who had recently returned to South Africa from Machaze explained in 1999:

> I went back to Tevere [in Machaze] three years ago to find my wife and to rest [retire] . . . but after some time the money was all "eaten up." . . . I paid for grinding flour, cooking oil, and medicine. The police took my bicycle because the tax had not been paid so I had to pay to get it back. There is no work in Machaze. . . . The lumber company only hired five men even though the road was full of men [looking to be hired]. . . . Unless you work for the administrator or the NGO there is no money here. After you eat it all, you must go back to Joni.

With very few exceptions most of the Machazian men I interviewed during the first postwar decade believed that employment in South Africa would continue to play a central role in their life strategies and in the economic subsistence of their family members in Machaze. This attitude put them at odds with the international community, which had little understanding of the role that international migration had already played in Machaze even before the war and which saw repatriation as a matter of permanent return to Mozambique.

If a permanent return to Machaze was seen by many Machazian men as too risky, at the same time political and economic developments in South Africa also left them increasingly apprehensive about their future possibilities in the townships. Throughout the 1990s South Africa suffered from growing rates of unemployment as it emerged from over a decade of isolation, which had paradoxically protected many of its industries from international competition. Jobs became much harder for Machazians to find. The Vaal area—long the destination for most Machazian labor migrants—underwent a particularly profound recession throughout the 1990s. The large industries, such as Iscor, that had dominated the economic landscape for decades began to cut jobs. Some of the largest employers, such as Vecor and Stewart & Lloyds, closed their doors in the early 1990s. Whereas tales of unemployment were rare when discussing migratory careers before the war, by 1997 a majority of Machazian men of all ages in South Africa were unemployed—some for months or even years at a time.

Increasingly, these men turned to the same informal-sector activities that many South Africans pursued in order to survive. By the late 1990s hundreds of small tuck shops dotted the sprawling Vaal townships in which Machazians lived, often located a mere three or four houses apart. Many were no more than an additional room built onto a small house or shack equipped with a latch-and-lock window. Everyday items such as oil, bread, canned goods, matches, cookies, kerosene, and eggs were bought at the supermarkets in town and then resold in the townships for miniscule gains. Although relatively easy to start because of the small amount of capital required, low profit margins and stiff competition led many if not most of these ventures to eventually fail.

Many of these tuck shops were easy to spot because of the strong welded bars and padlocks that fastened their windows as owners struggled to combat a rising tide of violent crime. Mozambicans were particularly vulnerable to crime, because criminals favored establishments owned by foreigners on the theory that they were far less likely to seek out the police. Indeed, Mozambicans were reluctant to report crimes to the police, both because they feared deportation and because of the tendency of South African law enforcement officials to extort stiff bribes from illegal immigrants. Thus, of two hundred Machazian men that I surveyed in 1997, 88 percent reported having paid at least one bribe to a South African police officer in order to hide their "foreign identity," and 74 percent reported paying two or more.[2]

Accordingly, some migrants began to take more extreme measures to protect themselves. I interviewed one Machazian man who was on the verge of opening what by local standards was a fairly large and well-equipped grocery store in one of the Vaal townships. Not only was it far larger than the average tuck shop but it stood out in at least one other notable way: a one-way mirror window overlooked the entrance, and behind it the owner's son sat with a pistol . . . similar to the one I later noticed the man carried himself.

In short, postwar Mozambique and postapartheid South Africa each presented Machazian men with a different set of challenges, uncertainties, and opportunities. More and more Machazian men reacted to these risks by pursuing a strategy of social and economic investment in both countries simultaneously, thus diversifying their risks. There were important contrasts between these postwar strategies and those that Machazian migrants had pursued throughout the century preceding Mozambique's descent into civil strife. Perhaps most significantly, a growing number of men no longer saw Machaze as the only place in which to constitute families and establish a permanent residence. Rather than viewing South Africa as a place for temporary employment, the townships increasingly became a site of social investment equal in importance to Machaze, where a "total social life" (Lubkemann 2000b) could be constituted that paralleled and complemented, rather than simply contributed to, the social lives they pursued back in Machaze.

Thus, while 89 percent of the two hundred Machazian men that I surveyed in South Africa in 1997 planned to eventually "return" to Machaze, 79 percent also planned to keep a house in South Africa. Many had strong economic motives for maintaining a presence in South Africa: 47 percent of the men reported that they were enrolled in a pension plan (through their employers) that could only be collected in South Africa. Nearly three quarters of these men (72 percent) planned to maintain some form of business venture in South Africa even if they resettled in Mozambique. Most had secured the identity documents that allowed them to "pass" as South Africans. Just under 65 percent had "legal" South African identity documents, which they had obtained either through bribing officials or misrepresenting themselves as South Africans. Another 19 percent had forged South African identity documents.

For many of these men maintaining spouses in both Mozambique and South Africa created the ideal way to simultaneously pursue and protect

socioeconomic options in both countries. As one man with two wives in Machaze and another in South Africa explained:

> It is not more difficult to have two places. One is in Joni and the other in Mozambique. It is only necessary to show judgment [to be "sensible"]. Then you will not have problems because one [wife] is here and one [wife] is there. If the harvest is poor [in Machaze] then you must send some more money so that your children [in Mozambique] can have something to eat. When you are just sitting [i.e., unemployed] a long time [in South Africa] then you can go to Machaze so that you do not "eat the house." When you come back [to South Africa] you can bring some chickens and mealies [cornmeal]. Also, if you have problems with the police and they take you to the border then you will have somewhere to go.

Another Machazian migrant, interviewed in 1999 in the home he shared with his South African wife in the township of Evaton, explained how he continued to support his family in Machaze while living in South Africa:

> After the war I visited my relatives in Tevere twice. . . . The first time I went with my mother, father, wife, and two young children. We all went together from Tongogara. . . . After that I returned here to where I stay [in South Africa]. . . . The second time I went back [to Tevere] with my [oldest] son. . . . We were not just sitting; we cleared fields [for my mother and wife] and we built new palhotas. One was for me and one for my son. Then we built a tuck shop so he could sell things. . . . I have been in Joni for over a year now, but I am always sending things back for my son to sell. . . . During the *festas* [Christmas holidays] I will take more things back for the shop. . . . After the *caju* [season, usually in February and March, for making fermented fruit juice] I will come back. . . . When I am here I stay with this [my South African wife]. . . . No, she cannot think of going to Machaze. She stays here and [my other wife] stays in Machaze. It is only I who must stay sometimes here, sometimes there.

Interest and involvement in this strategy of "transnational polygyny" (Lubkemann 2000a, 2000b) gained traction throughout the first postwar decade. In our 1997 survey we found that 23 percent of the respondents had spouses who lived only in Mozambique, while another 26 percent had spouses who lived only in South Africa. However, 37 percent had spouses in both South Africa and Mozambique. Another 2 percent had spouses in three countries (South Africa, Mozambique, and Zimbabwe) (Lubkemann 2000a, 448–49).

Some of these social entrepreneurs developed the transnational polygyny strategy to an extreme. I first met "Felipe" in 1996, and over several years he became a close friend. As I discovered in the course of our many conversations, he had been married to three wives before the war, all resident in the Butiro area of Machaze District. A successful migrant to the Vaal area since 1964, Felipe had returned to Machaze in early 1981 after a three-year stint working for the Dairyboard in Vereeniging. He walked into a war that by then was in full swing. Arriving by convoy from the provincial capital of Chimoio he found his two junior wives had been forcibly relocated to the aldeia communal in Chipudje. Unable to locate his senior wife, who was hiding in the Butiro area, Felipe eventually relocated both of his junior wives to Chimoio before he returned to South Africa to work once again for the Dairyboard. Meanwhile, in South Africa Felipe also took up residence with a Xhosa woman, whom he eventually "married by the church" after she bore him two children.

Two years after he helped them relocate to Chimoio he sent money to his two junior wives so that they could move along with his mother to a refugee camp in Zimbabwe (Tongogara), where he could more easily visit them and send assistance. However, only one of his wives complied with these instructions, the other preferring to stay in Chimoio, where her son was stationed as a government soldier. During his second visit to Tongogara he discovered that his wife living in the camp was very ill and she died soon after. Consequently, he resolved to marry another woman in the refugee camp so his mother "would have comfort." During one of several subsequent visits to the camp from South Africa late in the war he came to know some of the staff of one of the local NGOs working in the camp—a connection that eventually generated opportunities for several temporary jobs, including employment as a driver during the repatriation from Tongogara in 1994 and later with an NGO in Machaze.

His mother and youngest wife were among those he helped bring back to Machaze in 1994, where they were reunited with his senior wife, who had been living throughout the entire war in the remote area of Hode. During the repatriation effort he had also initiated a relationship with a Machazian woman whose husband had died while living in Tongogara. She had decided to stay in Zimbabwe after the camp was closed, and Felipe was able to help her. By 2000 he had two children with this woman, and she continued to live, now with his eldest son and his wife, on the outskirts of the city of Mutare in Zimbabwe.

Thus, when I met Felipe in 1996 he had four wives living in three

countries. Two of his wives lived in Machaze, another lived in South Africa, and a fourth lived in Zimbabwe. His fifth wife in Chimoio had died earlier in the year before realizing her own planned return to Machaze. In Machaze his two wives each tended maachambas, and one son ran a small tuck shop with products Felipe occasionally sent back from South Africa. Although Felipe continued to do occasional odd jobs for the international NGO he had worked with during the repatriation, he had passed this opportunity on to this son, while he continued to circulate back and forth between Machaze and South Africa, where he now worked in construction. In Zimbabwe his third wife traded in the market while living with another of his sons who made and sold stone carvings to tourists. In South Africa, he continued to share his house with the Xhosa woman (and by now their three children), who had never been to Mozambique and was employed as a part-time domestic worker. Two other sons also lived in South Africa, the younger one with Felipe. He was in charge of tending their small tuck shop in Sebokeng.

Men such as Felipe clearly reconfigured their lives throughout the war and in its aftermath in ways that envisioned continued social investment in both Machaze and South Africa. Their postwar life strategies were based on premises diametrically opposed to those of the international humanitarian community. To these men South African and Mozambican options were *not* mutually exclusive. To "return" to Machaze for men such as Felipe was not a matter of "leaving" South Africa. Another long-term migrant with whom I became closely acquainted while doing fieldwork in Machaze explained the war-time shift from his perspective:

> Before the war I had two stores here [in South Africa], but I always was thinking of going back to Machaze. . . . I would have taken my [South African] wife with me or else she would have stayed behind if she refused to come when I went. . . . Now I must also go back [to Machaze] because that is my place of origin. . . . I want to set up a tuck shop there. I will still have this tuck shop and house here [in South Africa] and must come back also because I must collect my pension. . . . In Machaze food and firewood are free. [But] my children [two sons and a daughter] are married here, and so I must have a house here too and this [South African] wife who must stay here.

The ways in which such Machazian men sought to plot their lives after the war clearly failed to conform with the hegemonic pretensions of an international political system that privileged the idea that citizens should

"belong" to only one nation-state (Young 1994). As historian Terence Ranger has noted:

> The concept of "repatriation" derives from the idea of a "patria" and this in turn implies that an individual's primary identity, rights and obligations derive from the membership in a "nation." The nation encapsulates "home" in terms of language, culture, rights to citizenship and land. Yet this is precisely what is at stake in many countries which generate refugees and returnees. . . . Even where the idea of return to one's "country" is a national as well as a local sentiment, that idea co-exists and sometimes conflicts with many other senses of identity and entitlement. . . . Any study of return needs, therefore, to look closely at such multiple ideas of identity and entitlement. (1993, 289)

An international policy community that posited "return" and "non-return" as mutually exclusive options clearly failed to capture the reality to which transnationally polygynous men increasingly aspired in the aftermath of the Mozambican conflict.

For a growing number of such Machazian men, migration was no longer a strategy for procuring resources in one place in order to pursue social reproduction in another—as it had been before the war—but rather was a mechanism for enacting a new form of social lifescape. The capacity for mobility was the defining characteristic of these new transnational life strategies. Accordingly, Machazian men resisted any imposition of state-level notions of "return" that threatened to undermine this capacity. This resistance was evidenced in the low rate of participation in official UNHCR return efforts, in the preference for self-organized return apart from official scrutiny, and in the revolving-door syndrome as men continuously crossed back into South Africa (Lubkemann 2000d). Their postconflict strategies confounded a repatriation discourse that reflexively strove to map one national citizenship onto the residence, social lives, and economic activity of war-time migrants.

Transnational Polygyny and the Transformed Meanings of Marriage

The growing popularity of transnational polygyny among Machazian men in South Africa not only generated projects of postconflict return that placed them at odds with the international community's repatriation efforts but also engendered new struggles with other members of

Machazian society—most notably spouses—over the meaning of marriage and migration. Before the war, marriage had been vital to the success of those aspects of men's life strategies that were realized exclusively in Machaze. Marriage ensured social reproduction, the (female) labor for subsistence agriculture and care of aging parents, as well as comfort and security in old age. Marriage before the war primarily took care of men's Machaze-specific needs.

However, once polygyny was transnationalized, marriage also increasingly played a role in the strategies that men used for coping with a broader range of challenges, including economic volatility, rising social and safety risks, and the unwelcome attention of both the Mozambican and the South African states. A district official in Machaze interviewed in 2000 reflected on how the growth of transnational polygyny had recalibrated the relationship between local government administrators and migrants in the district:

> If we were to try to make a man pay taxes on what he brings back from South Africa like the Portuguese did he would simply leave for South Africa because he has a house and a family [there]. Sometimes if he does not want to pay the bicycle tax he will leave, or because of anything that the administrator tells him and he does not like he will go to South Africa. He will leave for years even with his wife and father and mother still here because he does not like something.

Transnationally polygynous marriages thus allowed migrant men to more effectively hedge against the risks of economic and political insecurity and to negotiate with larger political entities from a position of enhanced leverage.

However, transnational polygyny also reconfigured the balance of gendered power within marriages in ways that had profoundly disempowering implications for other social actors, most notably spouses. In particular, the development of more permanent relationships between Machazian men and South African women eroded what benefits women in Machaze had once experienced from polygyny, while accentuating many of its potential problems.

Before the war, a husband's marriage to a co-wife represented an ambiguous combination of potential gains and losses for a Machazian wife. Although co-wives were often regarded as social rivals and the most likely source of uloi, they also could help ease heavy domestic labor requirements. Consequently, before the war it was not uncommon for a senior

wife to consent to the idea—or even suggest—that her husband take a co-wife, and to play a role in the vetting process. A junior wife often provided labor to a mother-in-law that released a senior wife from these responsibilities and thus afforded her greater independence and enhanced social status. However, all such benefits were only possible if a co-wife lived in relative proximity.

In contrast, transnational polygyny afforded no relief from domestic labor, nor did it enhance the autonomy of Machazian women because transnational co-wives lived in South Africa. Furthermore, Machazian wives in these marriages often complained that they received a reduced share of their husband's earnings because South African wives had the advantage in pressing their claims in South Africa where the money was earned. Machazian wives had no way to monitor the distribution of such benefits in the way they could with coresident co-wives.

While Machazian women remained dependent on migrant husbands for cash, husbands who had other wives, children, and homes in South Africa were increasingly less dependent on their Mozambican wives for the successful realization of key social projects and their long-term security. In this sense transnational polygyny increasingly redistributed gendered power within marriage to men's advantage. Whereas Machazian women still had to fulfill the obligations required of them by marriage (such as assisting mothers-in-law), transnational polygyny robbed them of much of the leverage they had once had to ensure that husbands fulfilled reciprocal obligations.

Women whose husbands returned from South Africa after the war often found themselves involuntarily involved in transnationally polygynous marriages in which they unexpectedly confronted these new dilemmas. Many of these women felt profoundly disempowered as these marriages failed to live up to their expectations of what the marital relationship should be. Yet few saw many viable alternatives. In the postwar context divorce carried potentially high social and economic costs. Not only did women who sought divorce require financial means to repay lobola, but many feared that in such an event they might well lose some or all of the children they had fought so hard to keep during the war. One interviewee wryly noted:

> Being with a man is always difficult [laughs]. . . . Sometimes they stay too long in Joni. . . . When they have other women [there] they can forget that their children in Machaze are hungry too . . . but it is better to be waiting and praying that they will remember. . . . If you leave him, then if he comes back he will

say, "Where were you when my mother was sick? Are these not the children of lobola?"

Engendered Projects of Nonreturn and Postconflict Flight

As was the case during the war, this concern with maintaining their rights to children was at the very heart of many of the postconflict decisions made by Machazian women. This was a particularly prominent concern for those married women who, during the prolonged war-time absence of husbands, had given birth to children as a result of liaisons with soldiers in the villages or other men in the refugee camps. After the war the rights of such women to these children were often questioned by a returning husband or his relatives, who often claimed that even if a husband had died, or his whereabouts was unknown, that the payment of lobola vested the husband's family with ultimate rights to the child.

Contingencies such as particularly prolonged husband absences were often considered by the local authorities who arbitrated most cases where rights to multiple children were at stake. One frequent resolution was that the children should be divided between the family of the husband and the wife. However, even this type of resolution generally required that at least some portion of the lobola be repaid, which meant acquiring money that many women could not easily obtain on their own in war-torn Machaze.

Some women confronted this threat with drastic measures, choosing to migrate out of the district after the war to avoid the anticipated claims on children of returning husbands or his relatives. In the course of my fieldwork I located an enclave of dozens of such Machazian women who had migrated to the provincial capital of Chimoio after the end of the war. One woman who had an extramarital relationship throughout the war with a soldier described her experience as follows:

I thought that [my husband] was dead because I heard nothing from him during the war. Even his relatives did not think he was alive. I stayed in Chitobe [a communal village] after [my soldier consort] left. When my husband came back he said these children were his. I had no one to speak for me there. I came here to Chimoio with these children to find [the soldier] so he could pay lobola. I cannot find him. I would like to go back to Machaze because here my maachamba is too small. It is very far away. I sometimes walk there and stay two days because if I go by *machibombo* [public transport] I must pay one

thousand *meticais* there and one thousand *meticais* to return. I cannot go back to Machaze. If I go back to Machaze then the régulo[3] will say that these children are [my husband's]—he has paid lobola.

Other women who fled from the district during the war chose not to return to Machaze after the conflict was over because of the same fear. Several of the women I encountered in Chimoio had arrived there from Tongogara refugee camp in Zimbabwe. They had requested that the UNHCR transport them to this provincial capital rather than to Machaze and had chosen to resettle there permanently:

My husband's family has already called me back to Machaze, but I do not want to go. Now he [my deceased husband's brother] wants my [two] children to come back because they are his brother's [referring to the claim the children were the result of her union with a soldier and the brother had already died]. If I return he will take the children and I will be left with nothing. This is why I stay here even though I have nothing. Even this roof is falling down.

If some women chose not to return to Machaze—or to even leave the district for the first time—after the war because they feared that marital dissolution could place their rights to children in question, other women made similar resettlement decisions but for different reasons. In Chimoio I also encountered several widows who refused to return to Machaze after the war because they feared they would be pressured into marriages with relatives (usually brothers) of their deceased husbands:

Those of us who are staying in this place all left Machaze because of the war. . . . I left after the "organizations" [UNHCR, CARE, Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit, or GTZ] were already in the district [that is, after 1993] . . . because my [dead] husband's brother wanted to "speak for me" and these children [that is, get married]. It was difficult [when I left Machaze] because I did not have a *cartão* [refugee card]. The organizations were only giving seeds and tarps and water containers to those who were coming from Zimbabwe with the card. . . . After this I decided to take these three [children] and go to Zimbabwe to get a card so we could get something to eat too. We did not go back to Machaze because in Tongogara I told them that we were from Chimoio. . . . Then [UNHCR] brought us here [to Chimoio] in trucks. We received some small things from the organizations. . . . It was two years ago that we came to Chimoio, and this is where we have been staying. . . . I will not go

back to Machaze. I only have to stay here with my children where I will not be bothered.

Such remarriages could easily produce disputes with co-wives who had seniority. Moreover, many found the junior status that they would likely have to assume in these marriages particularly onerous. This would be especially so for any woman who had already established a significant degree of independence and perhaps been a senior wife herself. As new and threatening "outsiders" in any household into which they might remarry, many of these women were also aware of the likelihood that they would be the first accused of uloi if contention or sickness visited the household. One older woman who had moved to Chimoio during the war and chosen to remain there permanently with her two daughters-in-law commented: "It is too difficult for me to be there [as a wife in the household of my deceased husband's brother in Machaze] because I have grown children. He has a wife with grown children as well. Then when there is sickness they will say that it is because I am living there. It is different for a young woman."

Postconflict alternatives to returning—or staying—in Machaze were not always easy or unproblematic for the women who opted for such strategies. The cost of living in Chimoio, like that in many urban areas, was much higher than in Machaze. Access to fields on which to raise subsistence crops and space and material for building shelter required money in the city, whereas these had been free in Machaze. Consequently, many of the Machazian women I met in Chimoio struggled to survive on the verge of extreme poverty. If their postconflict relocation choices safeguarded their rights to their children, they nevertheless did not reconfigure or restore the lifescapes of these women in ways that mitigated their war-time state of displacement.

The persistent effects of war-time social dynamics in the aftermath of conflicts provide strong grounds for echoing the call by Koser and Black to extend analysis beyond the standard refugee cycle that is usually presumed to close with postconflict return: "Even where return has occurred there is a need to pay much closer attention to relations after return, and to recognize that even if repatriation is the end of one cycle, it is also usually the beginning of a new cycle which can challenge and expose some returnees [and if I might add "stayees"] to vulnerability" (1999, 3).

New and gender-differentiated social dilemmas and opportunities that emerged during the long Mozambican civil war brought about profound

changes in Machazian social relations, reconfiguring gendered balances of power and the rights and obligations implied in particular types of relationships such as marriage. These transformations in turn had profound implications for how different types of social actors conceptualized "home," experienced postconflict "return," and sought to interact with and influence one another's projects of return.

For transnationally polygynous Machazian men the international community's project of definitive return paradoxically raised the specter of "displacement" by threatening to arrest the mobility on which their new life strategies had come to depend. However, for many Machazian women, transnational polygyny was the source of new vulnerability and social disempowerment, yet another form of "postconflict displacement" (Lubkemann 2000a).

If scholars such as Hammond have drawn much needed attention to the fact that the postconflict return of those who take flight in war is anything but natural, inevitable, or unproblematic, virtually no one has questioned whether those who remain "in place" during the war will in fact continue to do so after hostilities are over." Yet significant numbers of those war-time immobile Machazian women who were most detrimentally affected by the postconflict return of transnationally polygynous men found that the best option was to leave the district—or not to return to it at all—after the war was over. They show that the assumption that those who "stayed put" during the war will remain in place after the cessation of hostilities may well be as unwarranted as the assumption that those who fled will automatically come back.

Black and Koser highlight the fact that "vulnerability can effectively be created after return, as a result of, for example, the allocation of inappropriate settlement sites, or the unequal distribution of land" (1999, 11). However, in a humanitarian industry focused on refugees as the "exemplary victims of war" the analysis of "vulnerability" rarely extends to those who remain behind and never move. Far from being inevitable or unproblematic, Machazian postconflict return was a process whose meanings and impacts were socially contested and contentious, a process that generated entirely new possibilities for postconflict displacement. Machazian men and women often had very different expectations about what the postconflict social order should look like, and consequently about what return (their own and that of others) should imply. The clash between these projects of postconflict return constituted yet another episode in the ongoing "other struggles" that persisted throughout the war and shaped war-time mobility in the first place.

CHAPTER 9

Transnational Contentions

The Moral Economy of Postconflict Migration

The growth of transnational polygyny during the decade that followed the Mozambican civil war transformed Machazian households into sites of heightened social contestation. It occasioned particularly intense argumentation over the meaning of the rights and obligations that defined marriage, as Machazian women confronted and contested spousal behavior that violated their own expectations.

However, wives were not the only ones who looked askance at growing male-migrant investment in transnational polygyny. Many parents accrued virtually none of the benefits expected from welcoming a daughter-in-law into the family from marriages between their sons and women in South Africa. Although senior men had lost a great deal of influence over the selection of their sons' spouses during the twentieth century, parental interests still played a role, even if diminished, in marriages in Machaze.However, parents had no influence on their sons' selection of spouses in the South African townships. These daughters-in-law never came to live in the parental compound, and they provided no assistance with the domestic and other labor customarily provided to parents by a new daughter-in-law.

Not only did parents accrue no benefits from South African marriages but many found that their son's transnational polygyny placed his Mozambican-based marriages at greater risk of failure. Machazian wives, dissatisfied with longer absences by their husbands, reduced remittances, and suspicious that co-wives in South Africa were reaping far greater benefits than they were, were more likely to seek divorce or become disgruntled—raising the specter of uloi. A son's transnational polygyny could therefore

threaten parents with the loss of the vital support and labor of daughters-in-law. More generally, to the extent that transnational polygyny enabled sons to develop and retain significant social options that parents played no role in managing, this strategy recalibrated the balance of intergenerational power in ways that nurtured parental fear that sons increasingly invested in social relations elsewhere would neglect the welfare of their elders in their old age.

The development of transnational polygyny thus intensified the struggle over the configuration of social power and the meaning of key social relationships along multiple social axes within the Machazian domestic sphere, as different actors sought to defend their own social interests. Migrant men and those who remained behind in Machaze (parents and wives) increasingly held mutually exclusive expectations about what marriage should "mean" (i.e., what rights and obligations the relationship implied), about how migrants should make social and economic investments, and about what migrancy should accomplish. In many ways there was a zero-sum relationship between these contending views. The desire of parents and wives to see migrants focus their strategic social and economic investments solely in Machaze was at odds with the risk diversification and social empowerment strategies that a growing number of men sought through transnational polygyny. Although parents and wives in Machaze continued to view labor migrancy as a mechanism for ensuring processes of social reproduction that they viewed as anchored solely in Machaze, a growing number of migrant men saw it as a mechanism for enabling new life strategies that involved equal—and sometimes even greater—levels of social involvement in South Africa.

In short, if the war-time social innovation of transnational polygyny continued to gain traction during the postconflict era, it did not do so unproblematically. Arguments over the meaning and practice of marriage and migrancy intensified as those most detrimentally affected by this development sought to resist it. Far from being able to simply impose their preferred redefinition of marital relations, Machazian men had to devise effective strategies for contending with this resistance. Few felt they could simply disregard the discontent generated by this innovation, if only because, as a life strategy, transnational polygyny still required men to maintain viable social relations in Machaze, especially their marriages. Social endorsement for transnational polygyny was thus an objective that required complex strategies of social navigation rather than a practice that men simply imposed on, or that was unproblematically accepted by, others.

The Loyalty to Voice Continuum in Postwar Social Models

Not every migrant envisioned or attempted to enact transnationality in the same way. Migrants differed over the balance each struck between investing socially and economically in Machaze and in South Africa. Different models of social transnationality ranged along a continuum. At one extreme some men continued to treat Machaze as the sole or primary locus of strategic social investment and at the other extreme some sought an ever more radical departure from conventional practice that involved more significant shifts in this balance toward greater social and economic investment in South Africa.

I find it useful to adapt a typology that Albert O. Hirschman created to analyze how social actors react to organizational change to represent how different models of transnationality represent a continuum of social innovation. Hirschman proposed three possible categories of reaction to dissatisfaction with associational life: "loyalty," "voice," and "exit." Loyalty strategies are attempts to realize objectives within the given terms of interaction, that is, to abide by the rules of the game. In contrast, "voice" strategies are attempts to realize objectives by modifying the terms of interaction itself, that is, by changing the rules of the game. Finally, "exit" strategies are attempts to realize objectives by leaving one milieu of social interaction for another that is governed by entirely different terms of interaction, that is, leaving one type of situation to participate in another one governed by other rules.

For my purposes I propose to adapt Hirschman's (1970) analytical typology so that "loyalty" and "voice" are seen as ends on a continuum rather than categorically dichotomous options (I will return to Hirschman's category, "exit," later). With this modification, responses are not seen as *either* "voice" or "loyalty"" options but as all having *both* voice and loyalty aspects. They vary in their relative weight depending on where the response is located between the two poles of the continuum. Thus, a response located closer to the "loyalty" pole will involve fewer and less fundamental challenges to already established terms of interaction, whereas those located closer to the "voice" pole involve propositions for more profound change. The different models of social transnationality envisioned and enacted by Machazian migrant men can be analyzed as ranging across the entirety of such a continuum.

"Loyal" Returnees

Examined within this framework, those who returned to Machaze "outright" after the war, without retaining social investments in South African marriages, can be thought of as pursuing options closest to the "loyalty" end of the continuum. There were some Machazian men who did not pursue transnational polygyny but sought to resume strategies of circular migrancy and social reproduction that resembled those that had prevailed among Machazian labor migrants before the war. At the time of my 1997 survey of two hundred Machazian migrant men in South Africa, nearly a quarter of all respondents reported that they had wives only in Machaze. Many such men were eager to resume and repair social relations and lifestyles back in Mozambique that had been interrupted by the war:

> When I have [saved] enough money I will return to Butiro [in Machaze]. . . . Here one is always working, working, but there with some money one can just stay seated. Chickens, [fire]wood, water, food—all these things are free [in Machaze]. . . . That is why it is much better to return to live in peace now since the war has ended.

Others wanted to exploit the economic opportunities that might be available to those willing to bring desired services back to their communities, even if this entailed assuming some risk:

> Here in Evaton [South Africa] I have a Polaroid [photography] business. There is too much competition here . . . but this is an easy business to start [in Machaze] because the money is paid for each photo when it is made. I can be the only one doing this business in Tuco Tuco, maybe even in the whole district. . . . Because I will be the first one there, this can bring profit.

If some of those who expressed little interest in transnational polygyny were drawn to opportunities in Machaze, many others could be more accurately described as driven from South Africa by the growing difficulties that immigrants were increasingly confronting there throughout the 1990s (Crush and MacDonald 2002). Rampant crime, surging xenophobia, and rising unemployment encouraged at least some of the men who had waited out the war in South Africa to return and settle permanently in Machaze.

Finally, for many migrants the fact that their ancestors were buried in

Machaze endowed their areas of origin with a socially powerful "place-specific utility" that shaped their aspirations to eventually retire and be buried there themselves.[1] Many of those who opted against maintaining social investments in South Africa strongly believed that the potential consequences of offending ancestors outweighed both the benefits of maintaining social options elsewhere and the many risks and challenges of return—whether these were physical (water scarcity, land mines, minimal access to health care), economic (lack of employment), social (social rifts amplified by the war and the concomitant specter of uloi), or political (mistrust of the state, official corruption). Some saw maintaining social options in South Africa as a direct affront to ancestors that would bring inevitable ruin, while others believed that the violence of the war had generated sociospiritual problematics that could only be resolved by returning to and remaining in Machaze:

> One of my brothers was for FRELIMO and the other was for RENAMO. . . . Because [the one] could not accept that the other was favoring RENAMO he told the masochas to kill him. . . . Later, he also died. Now because of these problems some of their children are also dying [presumably because the brothers' spirits are acting virulently toward each other's living offspring]. Because this wife [of one of the two dead brothers] is now with me [she was remarried to him] I must solve this problem. . . . Even now I am still sitting here [in Machaze] because this is not resolved.

Varieties of Voice: Possibilities of Transnational Polygyny

In contrast to those men who resumed what were clearly Machaze-centric life strategies after the war, a larger number opted to pursue more innovative strategies of social transnationality. Over 40 percent of the men I surveyed in 1998 claimed to have spouses in more than one country, representing almost twice the number who reported spouses in Machaze alone. Ideas about what was the best balance between social and economic investment in Machaze and South Africa varied considerably among those men. Some strove to maintain comparable levels and forms of social investment in both Machaze and in South Africa, while others were far less balanced in their preferences.

Between 1996 and 2001 I met "Jeremias" several times, including on two occasions in South Africa and three in Machaze. He was one of the first to bring a diesel-powered grinding mill to Machaze after the war (in

1996), although when I first met him he constantly complained about how challenging it was to keep it supplied with fuel, which was irregularly available and costly. He had one wife in Machaze and another in South Africa. When I first visited him in South Africa I found that he owned a taxi (operated by a nephew) and lived in an "improved residence" in Sebokeng—with bricks, mortar, electricity, and even running water. We discussed his ambition to take a water pump back to Machaze (he showed me the pump mechanism and some of the pipes wrapped in plastic in a back room of his house) so that he could drill his own well, but he was discouraged by the bribes he had to pay government officials in the district in order to run his still fitfully operational grinding mill. He remained open to returning to live exclusively in Machaze but had no plans for doing so in the foreseeable future. He pointed out several sheets of corrugated tin in the same room that he planned to take on his next trip to the district. Sure enough, when I passed by his homestead three years later in Manassa (an area near Butiro in Machaze District) I found new tin roofs (presumably the same sheets I had seen in Sebokeng) on two buildings in his compound.

While men such as Jeremias sought to establish viable permanent roots back in the district, other transnationally polygynous men maintained a more token social connection to Machaze, increasingly concentrating their time and the bulk of their social and economic investments in South Africa. Although plans to return permanently to Machaze were a frequent topic of conversation among these men, over the course of many visits and interviews a number eventually confessed that they were reluctant to return permanently to Mozambique. As "Raul," a Machazian migrant whom I met with many times in South Africa starting in 1997, eventually confided to me in 2001:

> It is too difficult to go back to Machaze and just stay there sitting. We have grown accustomed to the way of life in Joni. . . . Look, you can visit the doctor, you can buy things. . . . What can you do in Machaze but just stay and sit there? Where is the doctor if you get sick? Maybe only if I go to Chipinge [in Zimbabwe, over one hundred kilometers from Machaze]. . . . When you are used to having money in your hand how can you live without it? Your hand will miss it too much, and then you will start to remember Joni.
>
> [Last year] I went to visit [Machaze]. . . . I stayed for the holidays and through the canyu and I took [my young son] with me. My wife [in Machaze] said we should stay longer, but I had to bring this one [his son] back for school.

> [My wife] was pleased with the capulanas and the money I brought . . . but she was not wanting us to leave so soon . . . and she is not happy thinking about this other one [indicating his South African wife, who was hanging up washed clothes].

As men such as Raul concentrated more and more of their social and economic investments in South Africa, many of them came to see it as more of a social anchor than Machaze. Arguably such men conceived of their lives as more a matter of temporary *migration to* Machaze and *returning to* South Africa rather than the reverse. If the strategies of balanced transnational polygyny pursued by men such as Jeremias infused considerable "voice" into Machazian social practices, strategies of "token transnationality" (Lubkemann 2002b) pursued by men such as Raul ventured even further from the "loyalty" end of the continuum.

Theorizing Migration as Moral Performance

Ultimately, all forms of transnational polygyny increased the likelihood of migrant social diversion (Lubkemann 2005b). I use the term "socially diverted" to refer to migrants whose social and economic investments are no longer primarily oriented toward their community of origin and who often no longer plan to eventually return and permanently resettle there. Rather they have begun to plot, to invest in, and to realize total social lives in areas of migrant destination, even through they may still remain enmeshed in material and symbolic circuits that link them with their communities of origin and to those who still practice circular migration.

To some extent home communities such as Machaze that have come to depend so heavily on circular migration always face the risk that migrants may choose to redirect their investments elsewhere rather than to their areas of origin. In becoming permanent emigrants, circular migrants jeopardize their home communities by ceasing to invest economically or socially in them. Home communities confront this challenge—and at least partially mitigate its threat—through strategic social surveillance and the moral evaluation of social performance.

The behavior of circular migrants is continuously monitored by kin and other home community members, and then compared to what can be thought of as an idealized migrant script (Lubkemann 2002a, 2003). Such scripts idealize a migrant whose commitment to home, hearth, and kin is

continuously manifest through a specific set of social investments, activities, and public performances. Among those types of behavior subject to the most careful scrutiny are investments in key factors of social reproduction, such as marriage, housing, land, or businesses that can generate long-term or permanent income (Lubkemann 2005b; Brettell 1986).

Well before the civil war, relatives in Machaze had paid particularly close attention to the regularity of lobola payments and the amount of goods and cash a migrant brought home from South Africa. When the expectations of relatives were not met, migrants could be accused of having "forgotten" their family and suspected of squandering their earnings elsewhere in morally questionable ways. Relatives in Machaze also monitored the frequency of a migrant's visits home and the duration of his stays. Thus, for example, a man whose stays were not long enough to ensure a wife's pregnancy could confront both spousal and parental recrimination. In a migrant's absence, the well-being of his spouses, children, and elderly parents was used to assess whether he was remitting regularly, working hard, visiting frequently enough, and generally showing signs of continued commitment to his kin and to his social obligations in Machaze. Very close attention was paid to whether migrants returned to Machaze and assumed their social obligations on important life occasions, such as the death of close relatives, especially of parents.

When migrants returned to Machaze and made material and social investments they were not only making economic decisions but were also performing what can be thought of as moral scripts: their behavior was being measured against a socially prescribed script of what appropriate and commendable migrant behavior *should* involve. These social evaluations of whether a migrant was fulfilling social obligations in a morally commendable, merely acceptable, or reprehensible manner were highly consequential to the migrant's own life chances and social status within Machaze. In short, migrant social and economic investments back in Machaze had always been simultaneously transactions in a material economy *and* in a moral economy.[2]

Even before the war labor migrants had confronted considerable challenges in pulling off satisfactory "migratory performances" (Lubkemann 2005b). These challenges had changed significantly throughout the twentieth century, perhaps most notably once the post–World War II shift from the mines to employment based in the townships began to generate more variable migratory outcomes, including both greater success for some and total failure for others. In threatening the balance of intergenerational

power, such historical shifts had occasioned a variety of counterstrategies (such as the restructuring of lobola payments) and heightened migrant surveillance by relatives back in Machaze. The growth of transnational polygyny after the war greatly increased the sensitivity of relatives in Machaze to the possibility of migrant social diversion. The specific patterns, rates, and types of social investments made by migrant men, that is, their performances of the "migrant script," were increasingly subject to what were arguably unprecedented levels of intense scrutiny—and in some cases even unwarranted skepticism:

> The last time I visited [Machaze] was because the [South African] police had bound me and taken me with others to Ressano Garcia [a border post in the southern Mozambican province of Gaza]. . . . When I arrived [home] I had no money, no capulanas, no oil. . . . I told [my relatives] that the South African policemen had imprisoned me and robbed me. But my mother could not accept this. [She said] the money of a man that stays with a Xhosa woman cannot remember his family [in Machaze].

After the war failed migratory performances were likely to arouse more suspicions than had been the case before the conflict. Relatives in Machaze were less likely to attribute failure to the problems known to plague informal labor migrancy, such as the inability to find a job. While those men who remained Machaze-centric were subject to greater suspicion, those who openly acknowledged parallel marriages and families in South Africa were almost always assumed to be favoring South African spouses and families at the expense of their Mozambican households. Transnationally polygynous men thus had to stage migratory performances capable of countering these suspicions.

Managing the Meaning of Migration

Over the course of eight years, I witnessed a variety of strategies that transnationally polygynous men employed to contend with this challenge, and observed different degrees of success in sustaining the new transnational social arrangements to which they aspired. The simplest of these strategies was to keep relatives in Machaze unaware of parallel marriages and households in South Africa. This was often the strategy deployed by men when they first visited Machaze after a prolonged war-time absence,

or as they developed conjugal relationships with South African women for the first time.

However, at least as I observed it, such secrecy proved extremely difficult to sustain over time. Despite what often seemed to be a remarkable conspiracy of silence among migrant men, the continuous circulation of hundreds of migrants between Machaze and South Africa virtually ensured that news of another family in South Africa would eventually reach the ears of always inquisitive relatives back in Machaze. In short, secrecy was rarely a strategy that could be successfully sustained over the long term.

The transnationally polygynous men who seemed most successful in mitigating the suspicions and discontent of Machazian relatives were those who excelled in diligently fulfilling their Machazian social obligations. As one seemingly very successful transnationally polygynist explained:

> I return to Machaze every year at the time of the *festas* . . . and I stay until after the *canyu*. When I go I will always take many capulanas and basins for my wife . . . and a bicycle or a radio for my father. I take two, maybe three, big suitcases with clothes and soap. . . . If even one of my sons does not have something to carry when I arrive then someone may start to think, "He is so thin! Who is the one [implying his South African wife] eating his money?" But when their arms are very heavy then everyone will be clapping. When their arms are too tired [to carry the suitcases] no one can be dissatisfied.

Although transnationally polygynous, such men were often more consistent remitters and visitors to Machaze than those men who only had wives in Machaze. One such man described his yearly routine as follows:

> I cannot fail to visit [Machaze] every year. Sometimes I will go twice or even three times. Even now I am getting ready to go. . . . Some [men] will stay three or four years [without returning to Machaze]. Then their relatives will start to say, "That one has forgotten his mother and brothers." . . . They will see that they are suffering because they have no money to buy even some small oil or soap. . . . I do not have any problems, because I am always going back to Machaze. . . . You know my house in Butiro? You will see it has a zinc roof. Look, here is the rest of that zinc. Even now I am preparing to take it to Machaze. . . . All this [indicating a panoply of petty items typically for sale in a local market] is for the tuck shop that I am opening. . . . It will be in the house—it is possible because it has five rooms [as opposed to the typical single-

> room hut]! . . . My relatives will be too happy to see me. My wife [in Machaze] cannot be jealous of [my South African wife], because she is living in the same way I am living now.

Narratives of Symbolic and Deferred Return

However, such consistent and devoted "home investment" was far from easy for a Machazian migrant to pull off during the 1990s. Not every man who attempted transnational polygyny proved capable of successfully fulfilling the expectations of kin or navigating the complex social challenges necessary to sustain it. Considerable economic means were often required by this strategy. Thus, while polygyny had always involved providing support for multiple spouses and households, it implied a far greater financial burden when one of these households was located in the townships in South Africa. The expectations of South African spouses often required considerably higher expenditures (for example, for children's schooling). Machazian men constantly bemoaned the high cost of living in the townships and the need to pay for many things that could be obtained without money back in Machaze, such as cooking fuel and food. In my own survey of household expenditures in Machaze and South Africa I found that on average the monthly cash expenditures for a single-couple household in South Africa were equivalent to the cash that would be required for seventeen months in a comparable household in Machaze.

Moreover, as the unemployment rate rose dramatically throughout South Africa during the 1990s Machazian migrants struggled with the same daunting challenges confronting all township inhabitants. However, unlike many of their South African neighbors or their Machaze-centric compatriots, transnationally polygynous men not only struggled for the daily survival of their families in the townships but *also* had to find additional means with which to maintain families and vital social investments back in Machaze. Unsurprisingly, many men in South Africa often fell short of meeting their social obligations in Machaze and became "socially diverted" (Lubkemann 2005b) more by default than by design.

However they were socially diverted, transnationally polygynous migrants who failed to meet the expectations of relatives in Machaze often confronted skepticism, discontent, and criticism that threatened to unravel the relationships on which the Machazian end of their transnational strategies relied. Confronted with such pressures, some men chose to end their experimentation with transnational polygyny. However, most

remained unwilling to give up on South African options. Many tried to deal with such pressures through innovative forms of migratory performance that recast prolonged absences and continued social and economic investments in South Africa as necessary to ensure a high quality of return, rather than as evidence of social diversion and neglect. Two of the most important strategies through which migrants sought to reframe and legitimize socially diverted forms of transnationality involved performances of symbolic, or proxy, return and deferred, or contingent, return.

Those men who pursued strategies of symbolic (or proxy) return often went back only briefly and sporadically to Machaze after the war, with the objective of obtaining a wife in Machaze to leave with elderly parents before returning to South Africa, where they focused most of their interests, energies, and time. Through such "marriages," men who were essentially absent from Machaze sought to fulfill at least some of their most critical obligations toward key relatives.

An illustrative case is that of one Machazian migrant I interviewed in Sebokeng township in 1998. With two adult sons married and living with their families in South Africa, with two South African wives living with him in his home with plumbing and electricity, and with his own township taxi business this man admitted the low likelihood of his ever returning to live in Machaze. However, in 1993 he had briefly returned and rebuilt three huts on his deceased father's homestead—one for his mother, one for a new wife whom he brought to live with and help his mother, and a third for himself. Although he had not returned since this visit five years previously he had sent money to his mother and wife and for a brother to build a ritual house for their father's spirit because of reported "spiritual problems."

At the time I interviewed him in 1998 his primary concern was that the wife he had married in Machaze five years previously was about to be sent home to her parents because she was suspected of causing sickness in his extended family (through uloi). He feared this wife's departure would leave his aging mother without assistance, which in turn could potentially trigger ancestral recrimination against him. Rather than responding to his mother's entreaties to return he hoped to counter this emerging spiritual threat by sending a son back with money to use as lobola to obtain another wife in Machaze to live with his mother. Thus, although remaining in South Africa, such men continued to respond to some of the most critical moral imperatives that defined the migrant script through innovative strategies that relied on social proxies.

Other men who were highly invested in South Africa relied more heav-

ily on other framings in their creative social performance of the migrant script. Thus, what I term narratives of "deferred or contingent return" reframed a migrant's continued presence in South Africa as a justifiable—yet often indefinite—delay in return rather than as a definitive break with social investment in Machaze. This carefully crafted public discourse explained the investment in new areas as a means for contributing to an eventual return home, while simultaneously recasting return as a process subject to conditionality whose interpretation could be easily manipulated by the migrant. Thus many Machazian men in South Africa tended to publicly represent their long absences from Machaze and their considerable social and material investments in South Africa as being necessary to ensure the quality and success of an eventual return. They would frequently explain that their children had become accustomed to certain amenities in South Africa and that by delaying their return they would be able to acquire and take back the amenities that would ensure that their children would remain happy in Machaze. Longer sojourns were also often frequently explained as allowing them to bring back more amenities for other extended kin.

Although these narratives always emphasized the inevitability and desirability of eventual "return" to Machaze they simultaneously highlighted conditionalities that infused this goal with temporal indeterminacy. Prefaced by romanticized and stereotyped contrasts that favorably depicted Machaze over South Africa, the concreteness of the return activities depicted in these narratives (constructing houses, starting a grinding mill or a chicken-raising business, drilling a well) tended to contrast sharply with their vagueness about when such a return might occur.

The timing of return was usually described as subject to a loose array of conditions. To quote from a migrant's interventions during a group conversation in South Africa in 1998:

> Of course I *must* return to live in Machaze . . . *but* I must make sure I have enough money for the trip and for drilling [the well]. . . . When the political situation is cool, it will be safe to take my family back. . . . I will return when the administrator is not eating everything [that is, is not corrupt].

The conditions that governed timing in these narratives might be described as "structurally absolving" in that they tended to claim that migrants themselves had little choice as to the timing by portraying this decision as subject to larger conditions over which the migrant had no real control. Of course, those specific conditions (conveniently) tended

to be ones that were highly subjective and could only be identified by the migrant himself. After all, how much money is enough for any particular migrant to return home and live "comfortably"? When is a child "established"? More important, who makes such determinations?

As I witnessed between 1996 and 2002, many migrants continuously reformulated the precise threshold of conditions that would trigger their return, usually in ways that allowed them to postpone it continuously or even indefinitely. In reaffirming return as inevitable, such migrants recast the terms for reinterpreting prolonged absence itself. In casting a migrant's return as a given, "narratives of intended return" (Lubkemann 2000b) suggested that investments abroad were a means to ensure a successful eventual return, rather than evidence of social diversion; and they explained ongoing absence as a conditionally deferred return, rather than as being indicative of permanent relocation. Through these narratives migrants paradoxically affirmed their commitment to Machaze while justifying their continued absence and social investment elsewhere.

Narrative Strategies for Justifying Permanence in South Africa

Although the need for such strategies seems self-evident to migrants who genuinely sought to maintain a viable social foothold in Machaze, it may seem at first glance less obvious why many of those who eschewed any form of postconflict return to Machaze also participated in such performances. After all, men who sought to reestablish themselves solely in South Africa might be supposed to have less need for mollifying relatives back in Machaze or justifying their absence, especially if they had no interest in maintaining an option of return or in pursuing a transnational life strategy.

Although only a small minority (11 percent) of those men I surveyed were willing to openly admit they planned to remain definitively in South Africa, 27 percent admitted that they had spouses only in South Africa—a number that surpassed those who reported that they had spouses only in Mozambique (22 percent). Over the course of six or seven years, many of the same men whom I had heard repeatedly proclaim in public their intention to return confided in more private moments that return was "very difficult" or that "God might not allow it to happen." Why were those migrants, whose behavior indicated little interest in pursuing transnational strategies that involved retaining social investments in Machaze, often still public performers of narratives of intended or deferred return?

The answer requires a full accounting of the audience for which all

migrant performances were staged. This audience included important constituencies other than relatives back in Machaze. In many ways ancestors were regarded as the "box seat occupants" (Lubkemann 2000b) for whom these "presentations of self" (Goffman 1959) were performed by all migrants, including even the most socially diverted. As described in chapter 3, Machazian migrants in South Africa were historically attuned to the ancestral recrimination they believed would be the consequence of neglecting kinship obligations. Many believed that prolonged absences from Machaze and failure to perform necessary rituals of ancestral deference (such as maintaining grave sites) during the war had been "excused" by ancestral spirits because of the conflict's exigent circumstances. However, once return to Machaze became possible after the war many men in South Africa felt they could no longer justify further deferring these obligations. Even those who had little interest in reestablishing permanent connections in Machaze often feared that discontented elderly parents back in Machaze could trigger ancestral sanctions by way of *vadzimu* or that disputes that had arisen during the conflict could provoke even more grievous harm from *mfukwas* if left unresolved.

Machazian men in South Africa who tried to delay return or avoid it altogether were always looking for ways to negotiate with irate ancestors, and narratives of intended or deferred return were often integral to these negotiations. In Sharpeville I interviewed a Machazian migrant who had left Machaze nearly four decades earlier. He was a powerful job broker in the community and the owner of a house of superior quality to those of most Machazians; it was furnished with a color television, a washing machine, and a car parked outside, all marks of socioeconomic distinction in the township. He described how after the war he had fallen prey to a long illness that had been caused by an ancestral spirit who had insisted that he return to Machaze. A brief two-week visit to Machaze two years earlier had alleviated his ailment—but only temporarily. He had consulted a nyanga in South Africa who had told him that his grandfather was asking why he had no house in Machaze and that his ailment would only worsen if he did not make plans to return. He confided that he was not at all eager to do so because his "life was now in South Africa."

However, he also felt increasingly pressured to take some measures that would appease the ancestors. He had paid a church profeta a considerable sum to conduct a series of negotiations with this spirit that would allow him to wait to return until his son had finished his education and "established his profession." This man showed me a string bracelet of various colors given to him by the prophet with knots in it that he constantly

wore on his wrist. Each knot, he explained, referred to something he needed to accomplish before returning—assisting his son, assisting in the completion of the new church, obtaining a passport. The bracelet was meant to protect him from the ire of his ancestral spirits by "reminding" them that they had "agreed" to let him do these things before going back to Machaze—and of his promise to eventually return. Over a five-year period this man had negotiated three new knots on his original bracelet and had added a second bracelet.

The business of negotiating postponements with ancestors over return to Machaze was already a thriving cottage industry when I first arrived in South Africa in 1997, and it continued to boom over the next five years. By some accounts this postconflict surge in demand for ritual specialists who could negotiate with Machazian ancestral spirits in South Africa played a part in redefining Machazian religious roles and transforming the landscape of institutionalized spiritual practice. Whereas long-term migrants seemed to agree that Machazian nyangas and nyamusoros had never been active in South Africa before the war, their services in the townships were in growing demand after the conflict. Between 1996 and 2002 I observed at least two nyangas who relocated from Machaze to South Africa in order to partake in this lucrative practice. As one of these two men explained:

> They also have their own types of nyangas here [in Joni] . . . but these are smarter for resolving problems with South Africans. They do not know the customs of our spirits. . . . If they do not speak Zulu or Shangaan then sometimes there is confusion in understanding. Some of these [South African] nyangas are fearful because Ndau spirits are very strong and they may be too weak. This is why that one [from Machaze] must come to see me . . . [because] I can speak in the right way to his fathers.

In at least some of the churches in South Africa, profetas also began to negotiate with ancestral spirits, increasingly resembling the nyangas and nyamusoros in their modus operandi. According to some church leaders this represented a departure from past practices (in which profetas had only interceded with the Holy Spirit)—one considered significant and controversial enough to have occasioned several recent congregational schisms.

Although performances of symbolic return and narratives of intended return were clearly crafted to take ancestral agency into account, they

served other important purposes, particularly for the most socially diverted migrants. Most significantly, these framings of identity established important rights to membership within the community of Machazians within South Africa.

There are several significant reasons why migrants who eschewed return to Mozambique strove nevertheless to remain within, and preserve the social boundaries of, a Machazian community in the townships, rather than simply disappearing into the South African social fabric. Even before the war the periurban labor market had been ethnically segmented, with certain industries or activities dominated by particular ethnic groups, and access to employment had been secured through "homeboy networks." In the increasingly competitive South African labor market of the postwar era these networks became more crucial than ever for securing jobs and obtaining assistance during the longer and more frequent bouts of unemployment.[3]

A more complex set of issues involved efforts by these Machazian men to renegotiate the balance of social power vis-à-vis their South African wives. If conjugality with South African women created new socioeconomic and risk-diversification possibilities for migrants, it also raised new challenges that became increasingly apparent as growing numbers of Machazian men sought to pursue transnational polygyny after the war. Although economic and social investments in South Africa remained shielded from Mozambique's political and economic volatility, the investments were nevertheless exposed to other risks, especially those related to the dynamics of gender relations between South African women and Machazian men.

South African wives in the townships enjoyed important forms of power in their marital relations with Mozambican men that women back in Machaze did not possess. Perhaps their most important form of leverage was their legal status as South African citizens coupled with their knowledge of their husband's illegal status or foreign origin. Among the stories most frequently circulated among Machazian migrants in the townships during my fieldwork were those of South African women who reported their husband's foreign origin to the authorities during a conjugal dispute or a separation in an effort to have him deported and keep his property.

With the dramatic growth of xenophobic sentiment (Crush and MacDonald 2002) and the South African government's implementation of systematic measures to reverse the tide of illegal aliens after the end of

apartheid, even Mozambicans who had obtained South African identity documents in a strictly legal manner found themselves increasingly vulnerable. For most Mozambicans their foreign origin was clearly signaled by the infamous smallpox vaccination mark carried by most of those born before 1981[4] (and some of those born after) known as the "marca de Samora" after the Mozambican president under whom these vaccination campaigns were carried out. I interviewed one migrant who had been identified to local police as an illegal migrant by his South African spouse after they had a fight. Even though he had legal documentation obtained through an official amnesty, the police arrested him. Local policemen threatened to destroy his documents and deport him if he did not pay a bribe. Without his documentation to verify his legal status, the marca de Samora would, by default, ascribe to him a generic status of "illegal." He paid the bribe and ultimately gave up the house he had purchased to his former South African wife, fearful that if he didn't she would continue to report him until he was either broke or deported.

Among Machazian men in South Africa widely circulated stories about predatory and immoral South African women highlighted the fears that arose from such vulnerability. Such narratives emphasized the predatory character and "narrowness" of South African women's economic interests, in comparison to the "genuine" affection of Machazian women for their husbands. The laziness of South African women and their lavish consumption of a man's earnings were contrasted with the industriousness and frugality of Machazian women. The sexual promiscuity, betrayal, and manipulation of South African women were compared with the moral decency of Machazian women. Different in their specifics, many of these narratives essentially shared a similar story line: The South African woman knows that the Mozambican man is a hard worker and saves his money, and she takes up with him to benefit financially from his work. She demands expensive things—furniture, clothing, appliances, a better house, luxury foods. She rarely works but spends lavishly on herself and her children. She is often already secretly committed to another South African man whom she may introduce to her Mozambican husband as a male relative. Alternatively, she may take up with a secret lover. Either way she channels the hard-earned money of the Mozambican man to her lover. At some point after she has "come to know many things about her husband's way of life" and has benefited from the relationship by having a house built for her, she betrays her Mozambican man in one of several ways—"telling his secrets to thieves," poisoning him, calling on relatives

to beat him, paying to have him killed "by accident," or reporting him as an illegal to the South African police—after which she keeps everything of his for herself.

If nothing else, the sheer pervasiveness of this narrative within the Machazian community in the townships during the 1990s reflected the mounting preoccupation of Machazian men with this problematic side of transnational polygyny. Such vulnerabilities were of greatest concern to the most socially diverted of these migrants, especially to those who planned to stay permanently in South Africa without returning to Machaze.

A somewhat ironic solution to this dilemma that some Machazian men began to explore was that of bringing Machazian wives to live permanently with them—an inversion of war-time efforts to keep Machazian women out of South Africa. Machazian wives could not threaten husbands in the same way as South African women for the simple reason that they almost always had an even more tenuous legal status than their husbands. Among the thirty-one Machazian wives that I interviewed or surveyed in South Africa in 1998, 72 percent had identity documentation of "lower legal quality" than their husbands (over half had no identity document). The "importation" of Machazian wives was a potential solution to what was in essence a very South Africa–specific problem—one that was most acute for those men who were least interested in maintaining ties to Machaze.

Membership in the Machazian community also provided an increasingly important mechanism by which socially diverted migrants could monitor domestic social relations within their growing South African households. The lack of legal standing or documentation did not hinder Machazian women who were brought to South Africa from becoming active and often very successful economic entrepreneurs in the township. The thirty-one Machazian women in South Africa earned on average 44 percent of the household's monthly expenses. Such women were far less likely than other adult males in the household to be bringing in no money at all. In several cases I interviewed men who were entirely supported by the petty trading activities of their Machazian wives in South Africa. Yet even though such men clearly benefited from the economic activity of these women, some also expressed fears that their wives' greater economic independence might eventually translate into undesirable behavior and social autonomy. Another frequently expressed concern was that children raised in the townships would be corrupted by "South African ways" that would lead them to disrespect and "forget" their elders.

Many men reacted to these threats by encouraging their wives and children to primarily interact with others in the Machazian diasporic community and to limit their social interactions with others in the townships. Such men actively constructed a "virtuous Machazian identity," defined through caricaturized and overly sharp contrast to "South African" behavior and customs that were defined as "immoral" and "predatory." The behaviors contrasted in these narratives often centered on the gendered and generational prerogatives that men sought to protect. Churches played a particularly central role in the organization of this carefully crafted public discourse. Pastoral teaching often fostered a sense of Machazian "moral community" cast in sharp contradistinction to the "township culture" of "South Africans." Machazian pastors in South Africa frequently fused biblical invocations with Machazian social references to argue for the importance of maintaining community distinctions—comparing Machazian migrants in South Africa to the Israelites in pagan Egypt, endorsing marriage to other Machazians by referring to biblical admonitions against "being yoked with unbelievers," and warning church members about the "spiritual sickness" that "prodigals who left their families behind" could expect to confront.

A growing number of the churches attended by Machazians living in the townships after the war had congregations that were overwhelmingly or even exclusively Mozambican, providing a milieu where men could confine the social interactions of their wives and children. By most accounts, such Machaze-exclusive congregations signaled a noticeable shift in the role that churches played in the migrant community in the townships. Before the war churches in South Africa had served as important avenues of articulation with non-Mozambicans, providing networks that allowed Machazians to access employment, identity documents, and housing. Consequently, most churches that Machazians attended before the war were often led by South African pastors and had predominantly South African congregations. Predominantly or exclusively Machazian congregations only emerged during the war and became increasingly common in its aftermath.

Participation in the Machazian community in South Africa was crucial even for those who planned on never returning to Mozambique, because it enabled them to cope with a variety of social challenges that permanent residence in South Africa entailed. Somewhat paradoxically, it was often the most socially diverted of migrants who made the greatest effort to maintain a Machazian identity and community in the townships, rather than disappearing into the South African social fabric.

However, participation in this community, and access to Machazian wives, entailed some engagement with narratives that continued to privilege ultimate commitment to social involvement in and return to Machaze as a nonnegotiable imperative. The constitution of a Machazian identity based on moral distinctions between Machazian and South African behavior enabled men to reframe their staying in South Africa as evidence of something other than turning their backs on Machaze. Thus, for example, bringing a Machazian wife to South Africa could be explained as evidence of a migrant's commitment to maintaining a virtuous distinction from the surrounding South African social milieu and loyalty to "Machazian" moral precepts, rather than as a strategy for further securing the permanency of his residence in the township, making it more unlikely for him to return to Machaze. Thus, somewhat paradoxically, narratives of intended or deferred return were perhaps most crucial to the performance of Machazian identity of those migrants who were the most thoroughly socially diverted.

From Struggling through Narrative to Narratively Reconfiguring Struggle

Transnational polygyny had far-reaching consequences not only for those who practiced it but also for others within their intimate social networks. The expansion of this war-time social innovation after the war changed the meaning of particular relations for different actors in dramatically different ways, restructuring social power, rights and obligations, and forms of interdependence between migrants and those who remained behind in Machaze. Greatly advantageous to the men who eagerly sought to adopt transnational polygyny, this innovation also engendered significant resistance from those whose social interests and life chances were most detrimentally affected. The first postconflict decade was consequently a period rife with social creativity, innovation, and experimentation, as people sought to "imagine themselves (and others) in new and vital ways" and did so in terms of mutually exclusive propositions and interests that inevitably resulted in social contestation.

In the final chapter I explore several innovative postwar propositions about Machazian social relations that represented an even more dramatic and controversial departure from the status quo than those discussed so far. I trace the development, negotiation, and contestation of specific "experimental social discourses" about migrancy and marriage

in postconflict Machaze that sought to effect socially seismic transformations in worldviews and social norms, and compare their relative success in moving from the margins into the mainstream, and thus in shifting the mainstream of social practice itself.

My primary concern in examining these propositions is not to catalog the full panoply of innovation and social experimentation that emerged throughout the social condition of war or in its volatile aftermath. Rather, by comparatively highlighting these additional narratives, I aim to highlight the process by which some innovations persisted and gained greater social legitimacy after the conflict while others fell by the wayside—discarded, forgotten, or even suppressed. I am thus interested in tracing the differences between creativities that succeeded in gaining social traction and those that failed, in order to return to the broader question that Giddens bypasses in his theory of structuration: Why do some actions (or innovations) and agents effect more change than others?

To hone in on social change in warscapes, I take my methodological lead from historian Steven Feierman, who analyzes the relationship between agentive power and structural change by focusing on the core question, "Who authorizes discourse and practice?" (1990, 33).

For Giddens, who conceptualizes "agency" as that which is actually done—and thus purely in terms of effects (apart from any actor intention)—the relationship between the social power of agents and the structural effects of their agency is implicitly presumed rather than problematized. That is, agentive power is simply to be deduced from the analysis of (structural) effects.[5] In contrast, Feierman frames the relationship between agentive power and transformative structural effect as a subject for *empirical investigation* that must factor at the very center of any analysis of social change. His framing ushers inquiry past Giddens's unspecific proposition that all agency cumulatively affects structure, or Foucault's general notion that resistance is the constant companion of hegemony, by pushing for the examination of how the agency of *specific actors* fares differently in their transformative effects on structure.

I too propose to address this task by focusing on "peasant intellectuals," who are defined by Feierman as those who, though primarily occupied with everyday practices of subsistence, elaborate new forms of discourse during periods when hegemonic relations are particularly unsettled and subject to renegotiation. In contrast to Gramsci, who defines intellectuals as a socially recognized category tasked primarily with "rethinking," I follow Feierman in focusing in the next chapter on specific

Machazians who performed creative acts of "re-thinking" at a critical historical juncture—regardless of whether they were ever assigned that social task.[6] Feierman's approach is explicitly and strictly historical: he traces how groups acquired different interests, engaged with each other, and how their relative social power affected the success of their competing propositions. Without neglecting to analyze specific historic trajectories of discursive struggle, my objective in comparing the relative success of experimental social discourses in postconflict Mozambique is to begin to distill more general principles of authorizability that might also inform the analysis of social change in other volatile settings.

CHAPTER 10

Where to Be an Ancestor?

The Struggle for the Postconflict Social Imagination

Early one morning in July 1998 two Machazian friends accompanied me to the house of "Reverend Machava" in Sebokeng township. We sat in the front room of his home with him and his senior wife (a woman from Machaze) drinking hot tea, which took the bite out of the frosty winter morning air. The house was assembled from the medley of corrugated tin and wood characteristic of South African township dwellings. Its front door opened into a hard dirt courtyard, flanked on two sides by very similar structures where Machava's two other wives and their children lived. A much larger structure dominated the west side of the courtyard, its sides and roof made entirely of corrugated steel, with a single padlocked entrance and a large red cross painted on the side. This was the minister's church where he greeted between two and three dozen parishioners every Sunday morning.

I first met Reverend Machava almost immediately after I arrived in the Vaal for the first time from Machaze with my closest research associate. It was at a funeral over which the minister was presiding. Funerals, I had learned, brought the largest number of Machazians together at any one time in South Africa. These all-day events were vital to a community that lived widely scattered throughout the sprawling Vaal townships. If one were to replace all but the Machazian homes in the township with dense thickets and trees, the result would have been strikingly similar to the same highly dispersed residential patterns that had made fieldwork such a challenge in Machaze District.

Reverend Machava was one of the most notable figures in the Machazian community in South Africa. He had been one of the early pioneers

who had left the mines and successfully sought employment in the Vaal during the late 1950s. By the late 1960s he had established himself as a key job broker with an important employer—the Dairyboard. Although he no longer worked there when I met him, he was still a man known to have "connections," so that in the two dozen visits I made to his home over the years I cannot recall a single one that was not interrupted by someone needing assistance with identity papers, for a family member who had been picked up by the police, or for some other contact or help. Other pastors consulted regularly with Reverend Machava on broader community matters, and he was among those most frequently invited to preside over funerals and weddings. When I first met him, he had recently played an instrumental role in organizing a vigilante network to try to stop the rising tide of crime against foreign small-business owners in the townships.

However, over the years the pastor stood out as one of the few men who was publicly emphatic about his intention to remain permanently in South Africa. At the outset of the war he had broken ranks with most of his compatriots and sent for his two Machazian wives to come join him in South Africa. He had not been back to Machaze since 1973. On this particular visit to his home I was fresh from an interview the day before with another migrant who had also established himself in a nearby township in the 1960s and who also expressed reluctance to return to Machaze, albeit in private. Reflecting on how this man was investing heavily in a strategy of "symbolic return" in an attempt to deflect what he perceived to be mounting evidence of ancestral recrimination in the form of bad health, I asked the pastor whether he too did not feel subject to similar pressures. He laughed and said, "No, my spirits know where I am staying." Unclear about what he meant by this, I asked him to elaborate.

In response the minister launched into what I immediately recognized as a stock account of Machazian origins. He first spoke at length about the "original" migration that had brought the Nhamunda "family" down from the Zimbabwean highlands and into the Machaze area. Here they had hunted elephants . . . and had found and married the Tonga family. His tale then shifted suddenly to the time when Machazians had become "Gungunhana's men"—pointing to his pierced ear as evidence. He proceeded with another familiar story line: when Gungunhana had left for Bilene (in the southern province of Inhambane) many Machazians had remained hidden in the bush. But others had followed Gungunhana and even after his defeat by the Portuguese had never returned to Machaze. The minister recalled how when he was a child his father had received

visitors from relatives who remained in Bilene, where they were even to that very day.

Machava then proposed that his own permanent move to South Africa was comparable to the two historical migrations from the Zimbabwean highlands to the lowlands of Machaze, and from Machaze to Bilene. When those who undertook these moves decided to make their relocations permanent, he explained, they sent messengers to their places of origin to "tell the ancestors" where they were now staying. At this juncture he ventured into what was, after almost two years of fieldwork, entirely new narrative territory. He claimed that by inviting the ancestors to come stay with them and to "see their descendants' way of life" these migrants convinced their spirits to join them rather than punish them for leaving them behind. Pointing to the history he had just laid out as precedent, he then administered his creative coup de grace by claiming that he had successfully done the same and had received assurances that his ancestors would now join him in South Africa.

Machava's tale immediately elicited discussion within our small group. He was asked whether he would be buried in Machaze or in South Africa. He answered that he intended to be buried in South Africa and pointed out that we had met at a funeral where he had presided over the burial (in South Africa) of a respected Machazian migrant. "There are too many such funerals in which I am called upon," he added.[1] Trying to get a better handle on this novel interpretation and its implications I asked when he became a spirit himself would he urge his children and grandchildren to remain in South Africa or would they need to return to Machaze. In essence my question was, "Where will you be an ancestor"?

Without hesitation he responded that his spirit would compel his children to honor him by staying in South Africa. His conclusive statement "I will be a *vadzimu* [ancestor] here in this very place" greatly animated debate throughout the remainder of the interview . . . and generated an argument that spilled into many subsequent discussions that I witnessed among other Machazian men. Although most claimed the minister's position was "difficult" or even "impossible," a significant number of dissenters found the claim plausible. I had inadvertently stumbled onto a new and highly subversive—and innovative—discourse.

If the performances of "symbolic return" and "narratives of intended/deferred return" discussed in chapter 9 were performances significantly infused with "voice," neither of these strategies was as subversively distant from the "loyalty" pole as this new narrative of "replacement"

floated by Reverend Machava. Although both of the former performative strategies sought to justify greater social investment in South Africa, neither dared any renegotiation of the fundamental centrality of Machaze in sociomoral lifescapes. Much to the contrary, these narratives sought social endorsement of transnational and even more diversionary strategies by reframing social and economic investments in South Africa as a novel means for realizing that uncontested status.

In marked contrast, Machava's tale drew on recognizable epistemological elements of foundational Machazian social narratives to propose a much more profound reordering of the core elements of predominant migrancy narratives. Most notably, his claims explicitly unsettled Machaze's status as a singular central referent in Machazian lifescapes, publicly proposing to dislodge it from a nonnegotiable position of privilege in the organization of sociospiritual interaction. Machava's narrative evidenced much more radical elements of "voice" by proposing a form of sociomoral anchorage for South Africa that previously had been reserved exclusively for Machaze. In challenging a tenet that had hitherto operated hegemonically—as virtual social reflex—the minister's narrative represented a radical social innovation.

At least as I observed it, over the five years that followed Machava's proposition seemed to garner greater social endorsement, much as "narratives of intended/deferred return" and "strategies of symbolic return" also continued to proliferate and gain strength. Far from being shunned as a social heretic, Machava remained as highly esteemed as he had ever been. By 2002 he had moved into a much larger building that could accommodate his rapidly growing congregation, which now averaged more than one hundred souls each week.

In the course of many follow-up visits over the next five years I observed the proliferation of new variations on Machava's theme, each of which challenged Machaze's nonnegotiable status as the center of the sociomoral universe. Most strikingly, on a visit to the Vaal in late 2001 a profeta from the Sabata church explained that he planned to stay permanently in South Africa because he had been urged to leave Machaze by his vadzimu! According to him, his "fathers" were angered that the secretarios and milicias who had caused their demise remained unpunished and "with authority." Consequently, he explained, his ancestors "preferred to be refugees in Joni like me." He proceeded to report that, as a profeta, he frequently interceded on behalf of congregation members who were often confronting similar requests from their own ancestors.

The range of innovative social strategies—"symbolic return," "deferred return," and even "replacement"—all implied varying degrees of departure from previously endorsed social meaning and practice, and they continued to gain traction during the decade that followed the Mozambican civil war. Though far from uncontested or hegemonic, all three of these innovative models clearly consolidated their status in Machazian social discourse as "arguable propositions," at the very least garnering sufficient endorsement to be accepted as legitimate positions from which to negotiate social practice. In short, these experimental discourses increasingly secured their status in the Machazian social imagination.

Suppressed Social Experiments: Women's Bid for Autonomy in the Aldeias

If some social innovations gained legitimacy, even in the face of relative resistance, other innovative propositions met with less success, failing to become viable positions in the Machazian social argument. In 1995, when I first arrived in Machaze District, thick vegetation had already started to reclaim the perimeters of the former communal villages, although these could usually be identified by the "Perigo—Minas!" (Danger—Land Mines) signs that had been posted some months earlier to alert returning refugees. In and around the war-time villages—Machaze, Chitobe, Chipudge, Usa—thick vegetation had already overtaken rusted old truck frames and a howitzer left in its emplacement by FRELIMO. Each of the former aldeias featured a center with an array of tiny tuck shops, usually located near the former lojas do povo, and sometimes a new school, health clinic, or other recently rehabilitated administrative building. Usually one or more wells had been drilled by one of the international NGOs active in the district after the war. One could usually tell which NGO had been involved by the brand of the pump. Traders of Indian descent had resumed business in some of the former lojas, stocking the necessities in greatest local demand. The tuck shops tended to be more meagerly supplied. As often as not they were closed while their owner-operators awaited new infusions of stock from migrant relatives.

Farther from these central areas, the former aldeias faded into overgrowth. Hundreds of huts had collapsed during successive rainy seasons and been left in disrepair by owners who had returned to former homes. Walls and worn thatch roofing had fallen in and weeds had reclaimed

most of the tiny yards in which people had waited out the war—cooking, talking, watching children. An occasional hut sported a bright blue UNHCR tarp that had been turned into an improvised roof for refugees who had only recently arrived and were still receiving assistance. However, most returnees were transients, waiting for the planting season to make the move from these temporary shelters to their own homesteads.

However, here and there were houses with an obviously more permanent appearance: well-swept courtyards and cooking areas in daily use, new thatch on the roof, storage cribs for corn, and sometimes even small maachambas planted amid what must have once been the courtyards of neighboring homesteads. There was little indication that these were temporary shelters or that their inhabitants had any intention of eventually following everyone else who had already left the much-maligned aldeias to return to the dispersed homesteads of the prewar period.

Most of those who chose to remain in the aldeias after the war were single women with their children. Surveys of two of these former aldeias revealed that such women respectively made up 54 percent and 62 percent of the remaining inhabitants. Many had chosen to remain in the former communal villages (rather than return to their original homesteads) to better resist a variety of social claims against them by husbands or other kin. Like many of the women who had remained in Chimoio after the war, some had been abandoned or neglected by husbands who had now returned to press claims on surviving children of their own or on those born through illicit unions with soldiers. Several women were trying to resist the efforts of brothers of deceased husbands to claim them in marriage.

Many of these women found little support from—and were often even at odds with—their own paternal kin. However, they often found they were better able to protect their interests if they remained in the former aldeias. For one, continued residence in the former communal villages provided a modicum of economic independence that would have been far harder to secure if they had returned to former homesteads. Within the former aldeias land for maachambas did not require clearing (and thus any male assistance), even if it was less fertile, exhausted by years of intensive use during the conflict. Water was also more immediately accessible, greatly reducing one of the most labor-intensive domestic tasks. The tuck shops and drinking canteens offered some cash-generating opportunities for women who could brew *doro,* or who were willing to do domestic work or odd jobs for NGO workers, public servants, or Indian

shopkeepers. Some of these women had even begun to organize petty trade, making the trip between Machaze and Espungabera, near the Zimbabwean border one hundred kilometers away, on a regular basis. The former aldeias thus afforded women modest economic opportunities that reduced their dependence on husbands or their own kin.

Perhaps even more important, the former aldeias offered ready access to government administrators and other officials who could offer assistance against the social claims of former husbands or other disenchanted relatives. Throughout the postconflict era the Mozambican government—still FRELIMO—wrestled with the problem of how to organize governance and the administration of justice at the local level. The war had devastated the public infrastructure and decimated the state's administrative capacity, especially at the local level where officials were paid erratically. Aware of the strong reaction against its postindependence social interventionism, and struggling with limited capacity, the postwar state pursued an often contradictory policy at the local level. On one hand the Mozambican government now tried to collaborate with (some would argue co-opt) many of the local authority structures it once so vehemently campaigned to eradicate, while nevertheless seeking to maintain its final-say prerogatives. In Machaze, as elsewhere, such policies generated an ongoing struggle over authority between régulos and local FRELIMO officials such as the district administrator and the former secretarios.[2]

Many of the women who settled in the aldeias sought to exploit this struggle for local political power for their own purposes. When husbands or other relatives successfully brought claims against these women through local régulos, the women would often seek a counterruling from secretarios or other FRELIMO officials, many of whom also continued to live in the former aldeias after the war. By overruling régulos in these appeals, FRELIMO officials who felt threatened by the resurgent power of régulos found a means to effectively maintain their claim to local authority. In practice what often resulted was a de facto division in the jurisdiction of effective authority. The pronouncements of the secretarios prevailed within the limited confines of the former aldeias communais, while régulos and *subchefes* dictated outcomes elsewhere. The former aldeias provided these women with a delimited space within which they could defy gendered social power by appealing to authorities who supported their claims, albeit for their own reasons, which were largely unrelated to the interests or concerns of these women.

Some of the women operating within these confined spaces of social

opportunity sought to implement social innovations that could potentially consolidate and expand this social autonomy even further. I came to know one of these women, "Thelma," fairly early in my fieldwork. On the eve of the war her husband had returned to his job in South Africa where he remained almost until the end of the war, when he died in an industrial accident. Thelma and her two young children had been brought into the aldeia in Usa along with her in-laws at the outset of the conflict and had remained there throughout the entire war. Her youngest child died during the first couple of years in the village. Despite the objections of her in-laws she had started to live with a FRELIMO soldier with whom she bore two children, both of whom she claimed died because of "problems" (implying a situation of uloi accusation) with her in-laws. After her soldier consort was transferred, her disputes with her in-laws and their relatives intensified to the point that she was eventually accused of causing her father-in-law's death through uloi. Around that time she took up residence with a milicia who was related to a secretario in another aldeia in the district (Chitobe). They both moved there along with her surviving child so that "someone would speak for me." She had three children with this man before he too died a few months before the end of the war.

After the war Thelma had remained in Chitobe where she finally received news of her husband's death in South Africa—over a decade and a half after she had last seen him. Under the protection of the secretario she had been able to resist efforts by her former husband's relatives to claim her children. When I first met her in 1995 she seemed to be optimistic about her prospects. She even had plans to eventually return to Usa, but not before she had earned enough from her prosperous *doro*-brewing business to take the innovative step of paying back her own lobola in order to nullify the claims of her dead husband's relatives to her four children. When I asked whether she planned to remarry if this strategy proved successful she was dismissive of the idea, claiming that she would be "marrying herself."

Approximately five years after our first set of interviews in Machaze I met Thelma again, but this time she was living in Chimoio with only two of her children. She was disillusioned with her situation and seemed far less optimistic about her future prospects. Her innovative scheme to repay her own lobola and "marry herself" had proven unsuccessful when she had been unable to enlist the support of any of her male relatives to negotiate the repayment. Her problems had continued to mount when her mother-in-law died, resulting in her again being accused of uloi. She

attributed her own many health problems and the death of her second youngest child to uloi. In the meantime she had also lost her primary patron when the secretario who had been related to the deceased progenitor of her last three children had died. Through circumstances that were unclear, her oldest child—the last from her former husband—had ended up residing with his father's relatives. Fearful that claims might be made on her two remaining children, Thelma had decided to relocate with them to Chimoio, where she continued to brew *doro* and pursue other forms of petty trade.

Thelma's story demonstrates the ultimate fragility of the innovative social autonomy that some women sought to creatively carve out in the former aldeias communais after the war. Heavily reliant on their ability to properly navigate the intricacies of larger struggles for local political power, many women often inadvertently fell prey to the vagaries of those same struggles. In Thelma's case the unexpected death of a powerful patron suddenly left her vulnerable. Such women could lose the patronage of local state authorities for other reasons as well. One woman in Chipudje described her own case in which the district administrator had initially overruled a child-custody decision that a local régulo had made against her. However, the district administrator later reversed his decision, evidently in an effort at rapprochement aimed at influencing that same régulo's mediation in a dispute between claimants contesting another issue altogether.

The space of authorization for alternative forms of social discourse that was initially available to Machazian women not only remained contained within the aldeias but with time seemed to lose effectiveness. In stark contrast to the growing social legitimacy of innovative migrant strategies, the experimental social propositions of these women seemed subject to growing social sanction over time. Women such as Thelma were increasingly referred to by church leaders as models of "immorality" and associated with drinking and licentious sexual behavior. Husbands were admonished to avoid these women and wives were warned to beware lest their husbands be enticed into adulterous liaisons. Machazian men often referred to such women as examples of what would happen to their wives if they were to join them in Joni—thus turning them into generic signs for undesirable female behavior.

Many men imputed the "immoral" character of these women to the influences of life in Zimbabwe during the war where they learned to drink and to make money. This theory increasingly led to the derogatory

labeling of women who defiantly remained on their own in the aldeias as "Zimbabweanas." This was ironic in that the vast majority of those I interviewed had—like Thelma—never left Machaze during the war. Subjected to mounting social stigma, such women were frequently accused of uloi—and they in turn often portrayed themselves as besieged by spiritual malfeasance originating from the same relatives who were their accusers. Many lived in constant fear that uloi would threaten their own health and that of their children.

Theorizing the Struggle for the Social Imagination

Casting these two radically innovative narratives—Reverend Machava's tale and Thelma's efforts to marry herself—against the broader continuum of innovative propositions presented in the previous chapter, how are we to explain how some innovative propositions secure sufficient social endorsement to become legitimate positions in the ongoing social argument while others fail to capture the social imagination? Giddens suggests that the answer lies in the differential power of social agents—yet he deduces agentive power from an analysis of effects rather than from an investigation of the relationship between agency and specific social changes.

However, Machazian war-time accounts and experiences provide a case for more complex problematizing of agentive power and its relationship to effects, if only because recent Machazian history is replete with examples of powerful innovators whose propositions somehow failed in their bid for the social imagination. Perhaps the most notable experimental social discourse to fail was that of FRELIMO against "traditional authorities" and "obscurantist customs" in the period immediately after independence. That ambitious postcolonial state project to reengineer gendered, economic, and political dimensions of local social relations collapsed in ruinous failure and even generated much of the resentment that legitimized a politically vacuous insurgency. FRELIMO's proposed social innovations bore the full imprint of the state's power and were exercised with unprecedented intensity and resolve.

Similarly, I did not observe an unambiguous or direct correlation between the most apparent markers of social power and the ability of migrants to successfully enact performances of symbolic or intended return or to obtain social endorsement for other narratives of replacement. I am

reminded in particular of two very successful migrants who, like Reverend Machava, were very public in pronouncing their intention to never return to Machaze when I first met them, yet who both presented rather different justifications than Machava's for doing so. Most contrastively with Machava, both men bluntly argued that they could never return to Machaze because they would suffer an unacceptable deterioration in their quality of life.

One of these men, an influential and very wealthy pastor in Evaton township, often drew a pointed contrast between the "civilized" way of living in South Africa and the "backwardness" of life in Machaze. In explaining his decision to remain in South Africa Reverend Nhamunda argued that differences in material comfort and convenience were evidence of Machazian "primitiveness" that ultimately justified his nonreturn as an "educated businessman":

> You see, it is a question of civilization. . . . Once you are accustomed to electricity and cars and your water is in the house . . . how can you go back to just sitting in the dirt? I cannot accept such a fate anymore. How will I run a business there with no petrol, no telephone? In Machaze an educated man will only become primitive again.

The other man, an electrician, was settled near the Zimbabwean border with Mozambique along the Mossurize Road, one of the routes most heavily traveled by Machazian labor migrants and, after the war, by refugees trying to make their way back to the district. Dismissive of the idea of any return to Machaze, he pointed to his impressive house, whose size, brick construction, and electric wiring marked it as the residence of someone who was exceptionally well-off by local standards:

> If I have been trained to be an electrician, how can I go back to Machaze where there is no current? Even the administrator must have a generator. But here *I* have current [pointing to the overhead wires]. To build such a house in Machaze you must bring everything with you—bricks, cement, pipes—the expense will be too much. It is better to stay here [than to return to Machaze] because things are a little more reasonable. . . . If you need anything you need only walk [across the border] to Zimbabwe.

Such materialist versions of the replacement narrative, which proposed a full and definitive move from Machaze, were less successful than

Machava's sociospiritual version. They gained little social endorsement over time, despite the social status and material means of its influential advocates. Quite to the contrary, most Machazian pastors in the townships increasingly sermonized against men who forgot the hardships of their families in Machaze and neglected to help them because they were too busy "eating in South Africa." Thus, unlike Reverend Machava, the virtue and moral standing of Reverend Nhamunda was the subject of considerable controversy. Summing up sentiments expressed by many pastors, one church leader commented:

> [Nhamunda] says he is a minister of God . . . but he left his church to become a minister for the IURD [Igreja Universal do Reino de Deus, a charismatic Pentecostal denomination whose teachings emphasize giving to God in order to receive wealth in return] because he saw he could be rich. Before he was very small, but now he wears rings and drives a big car. But if you are not always giving money then he will not want you in his church. This is why he prefers that South Africans come to his church . . . because if you are from Machaze maybe you will send your money home instead of giving it to him. That one is already a South African.

Three years after our first meeting in Mossurize, I happened to meet the electrician again when I was searching for someone in Machaze who could repair my much-needed tape recorder. Surprised to find him back in the district, I asked him why he had returned after all. He described a long succession of health problems that he and his children had suffered that he attributed to the envy of relatives. He explained how, even though he had sent considerable sums of money back to help his brothers and his mother, they had remained convinced that he did not want to return to Machaze because he was hiding his money from them. Did he not have a house and a car that everyone who passed by en route to or from Machaze could plainly see? Finally, after an outbuilding burnt to the ground (a misfortune he also attributed to envious relatives), he decided to sell his house and return to Chipudge to deal with his "problems" and to resettle in a less conspicuous place where, unlike his house on the road, no one could "see his business." In an effort to avert envy and suspicion he had given up many of the amenities that were so important to him earlier, ironically noting that even though he was the only electrician in the area and could well afford one he preferred to not even have a generator in his new dwelling.

Theorizing "Authorization"

In his book about the political discourse of Tanzanian "peasant intellectuals" Steven Feierman suggests that an analysis of how discourse is authorized should focus squarely on the relative power of social agents in specific social and historical contexts:

> The central unresolved question is about who invests a form of discourse or practical activity with authority? Who authorizes it? Who succeeds in defining a set of issues or a course of action as the appropriate one, pre-empting the space of opposed utterances or alternative practice (Asad 1979: 621)? Each person has a sphere of competent knowledge, but not all of that knowledge is equal in its weight within society, in its capacity to move towards collective action or to create authoritative discourse. The study of intellectuals is an attempt to examine the variation in discourse from one social position to another. The purpose in doing so . . . is to understand the contest in society over whose discourse is to become authoritative, whose practice will become accepted. (Feierman 1990, 31)

Expanding on Feierman I want to suggest that an analysis of "authorization," that is, of why and how social innovations are legitimized (at least so far as to secure status in the social imagination) may need to pose additional questions about (1) the propositional content of competing experimental discourses, and (2) the changing relationships among those who grant legitimacy to (i.e., "authorize") such discourses. Determination of authorization outcomes may rest as much on the "authorizability" of the message and on the relationship among potential "authorizers" as it does on the "authority" of the messenger.

I use "authorizability" to refer to the ability of propositional content to appeal, and make sense, to social agents. Authorizability does not imply a consensus in the subscription to, or even agreement about, the legitimacy of innovative propositions, but rather an implicit agreement about their potential plausibility, a recognition even by opponents that the innovative framings in question are "believable" and "serious" enough to merit engagement.

To those who advocate violence-centric approaches to understanding social behavior in "unstable places" (Greenhouse 2002), the merit of innovative solutions is derived directly from the instrumental contours of the most pressing problems at hand. In contrast, I argue that innovative propositions that aim to unsettle and reorganize hegemonic meanings

in specific subfields of social discourse must do more than merely offer instrumentally effective solutions to apparently new and pressing problems; they must offer *socially sensible* solutions in order to be regarded as effective in the first place.

Innovative propositions will be more plausible and justifiable to their audiences to the extent their reconfigurations of meaning are constituted through references to, and are in congruence with, other fundamental strands of social discourse whose hegemonic status remains uncontested. Thus, for example, the endorsement of new social strategies such as transnational polygyny depended in large part on the capacity of narratives of symbolic and deferred return to reframe what was often a de facto abandonment of interests in Machaze as precisely the opposite: mere delays that would ultimately ensure return and as evidence of ultimate commitment to home and hearth. The successful practice of transnational polygyny relied heavily on the ability of such narratives to reframe what were in effect radical acts of "voice" by disguising and reinterpreting them in "loyalty" terms.

Although even more subversive, Reverend Machava's narrative of sociospiritual replacement provides an example of the successful mobilization of fundamental elements of Machazian epistemology in service to the renegotiation of deeply hegemonic notions that specified how place, identity, and the past should define Machazian lifescapes. Although proposing a profound reordering of these constituent elements, Machava anchored his case for a radical innovation—permanent relocation to South Africa—in a reaffirmation of the integrity of the Machazian sociospiritual world and the authority of the ancestors. His narrative's social genius lay in the creative way he drew on uncontested origin myths to affirm the commensurability of relocation with continuity in relationships between the living and their ancestors. The power of these narratives derived from their ability to anchor the unraveling and reweaving of specific corners of the fabric of social hegemony, in the symbolic strength of other unfrayed strands of meaning in that very same fabric.

In other words, the "authorizability" of these experimental social discourses depended on their capacity to draw on existing currents of what has been termed "epistemic power." Jeanette Mageo and Bruce Knauft distinguish "epistemic power" from "instrumental power":

> Power can be conceived as socioeconomic and as entailing physical coercion, or, alternatively, as an epistemic constraint of cultural assumption. The idea of power as socioeconomic or as physical coercion easily associates with Max

> Weber's definition of power as the individual's ability to carry out their own will despite resistance—to exert agency over and against the will of others who oppose it (1958). By contrast, Foucauldian perspectives emphasize power as an epistemic function—the constraints of supposition and category that underpin our very form of knowledge and that shape the experience of being a subject. Unlike Weber, Foucault is interested in tracing how knowledge and subjectivity operate as power in an a priori sense—the power of epistemic assumption within which action takes place. (Mageo and Knauft 2002, 3–4)

FRELIMO's concerted effort to replace local systems of social meaning and organization after independence relied heavily on instrumental power—mobilizing the full coercive power of the state—but it never proved capable of tapping into epistemic power. Its attempt to unravel the fabric of social hegemony in its totality deprived its revolutionary propositions of mooring in existing strands of social discourse. FRELIMO's failure provides compelling evidence that the application of instrumental power serves as an inadequate substitute for epistemic power in securing the "authorizability" of innovative social propositions.

Similarly, other innovators and their experimental social discourses also proved more likely to fail to the extent they neglected to effectively mobilize epistemic power. Examples include those women in the aldeias whose capacity to resist gendered hegemony through alternative social practice remained heavily reliant on the tenuous instrumental power of the state's local agents. Similarly, the educated pastor and wealthy electrician both discovered that elevated social status and economic means could not insulate them from social sanction. Unlike Machava's sociospiritual narrative of replacement, their materialist versions didn't reframe social disinvestment in terms that were creatively congruent with other valued social precepts. Instead, their narratives nakedly and stridently assumed postures of "voice" without any effort to disguise them in "loyalty." Without a mooring in accepted Machazian social discourse their narratives inadvertently anchored themselves in epistemic power, but in ways that ran counter to their purposes and undermined their life-strategy objectives.

Such comparisons highlight the possibility that one of the most consequential components of the creative bid for authorization may not be the innovative practice per se but its discursive framing—not the novelty of the "patch" but the seamlessness with which it is stitched into the existing fabric of social discourse. An analysis of the transformative effectiveness of different agencies must give due consideration to the specific weaving of interpretations that give behaviors their social meaning, framings that

can, for example, render a prolonged absence as evidence of commitment to a quality return rather than a sign of neglect.

In highlighting the importance of "authorizability" for gaining purchase on the social imagination, I do not mean to argue that the process of authorization rests solely on the epistemic power of propositional content. After all, experimental social discourses can still fail to gain social traction despite their grounding in, and creative reaffirmation of, fundamental strands of social discourse. Thelma provides precisely such a case. In proposing to repay her own lobola and ultimately marry herself, this "public intellectual" (Feierman 1990) stood out from the other women in the aldeias as an exceptional social innovator who sought to ground her alternative social practice and autonomy in something more than the instrumental power of the state's local agents. As radical as her proposition to marry herself may have seemed, it was framed as a novel form of computation within the already established terms of the sociomoral calculus of Machazian marriage. Her proposition couched innovation in terms that reaffirmed the merit of lobola as a social practice. Nevertheless, this experimental proposition failed to gain social traction, while others that were just as radical in the propositional content (such as Machava's) had much greater success.

The difference in the ability of these two experimental discourses to gain purchase on the Machazian social imagination must thus lie in something more than propositional authorizability alone. At this juncture it is important to return to Feierman's emphasis on *who* has the capacity for authorizing particular discourses while preempting others. This question suggests a duality of focus, on both the agents who "author" innovative propositions and on the relationships among those who legitimize them.

The very evident differences in social status and power between Thelma and Machava go a long way to explain why propositions that were both potentially authorizable fared so differently in gaining social endorsement. As an influential information broker capable of providing—or potentially denying—highly consequential social connections and resources, Reverend Machava certainly exercised a great deal more instrumental power than a marginalized and socially isolated woman such as Thelma. Moreover, the Machazian social norms conspired to reinforce Machava's social authority, as a man and as a pastor, and to undermine Thelma's, as a woman, unsupported by her kin and seeking a divorce.

Yet not all migrants proved equally capable of successfully realizing even those "performances" that had established some measure of "authorizability"—such as narratives of symbolic or intended return—

even when they benefited from epistemic power grounded in general forms of social differentiation and when they wielded considerable instrumental power. Few migrant men ever dared to publicly venture an experimental proposition as dramatically subversive as Reverend Machava's, regardless of their socioeconomic status and political influence. Even rarer were those who proved capable of securing social endorsement for such propositions.

This was driven home on the many occasions where I witnessed what can only be described as highly situational reactions to Machava's narratives when these were recounted by Machazians. On several occasions I saw his proposition flatly rejected when first presented in discussion by other men. However, throughout the course of some of these discussions the revelation that these were "Machava's teachings" elicited surprise that was often followed by reconsideration. In other conversations in which Machava was present I witnessed an affirmation of his ideas by some of the same pastors who had strongly disagreed with the same propositions when they had been presented to them by others.

Some "public intellectuals," such as Reverend Machava, stand out for their ability to make their agency matter more than most. Such agents exercise exceptional social authority over the reshaping of meaning and the assignment of moral value by virtue of their capacity to "inhabit the sign." By this term I am referring to a capacity that agents acquire when they gain such exceptional sociomoral stature that their reputation tends to prelegitimize their propositions.

Whereas the virtue of most agents' social performances is measured against an idealized script (i.e., the "sign"), some agents accrue a record of such continuous virtue in their social performance that they gain social recognition as emblems of the values that a social script prescribes. When exceptional agents cross a threshold so that their own socially imputed moral value begins to define the virtue of their social performance I term that their capacity to "inhabit the sign."

The capacity to inhabit the sign cannot be attributed to exceptional instrumental power (such as wealth or position as an information broker) nor to forms of generalized epistemic power that derive from an agent's socially categorical privilege (for example, as a man in a patriarchal setting, or as a pastor in a context in which church leadership is respected). Rather, this capacity depends on the convergence of these two forms of power with another more individualized form of epistemic power—that of "moral capital."[3]

I introduce this term to denote an intangible asset that has generative capacity, that is, one that is capable of generating additional value that can be imputed to something beyond itself. The "value" that moral capital generates is that of granting credibility to an agent and legitimizing his interpretations when other interpretations are equally plausible. It is, for example, a migrant's "moral capital" that determines the credibility that relatives in Machaze grant to his claim that a prolonged sojourn in South Africa is "really" only a delay that will enable him to ensure a high-quality return rather than evidence of social diversion.

Credibility and legitimacy are thus the first-order value generated by moral capital. Although largely intangible, this value can significantly affect access to tangible resources, whether these are social (e.g., kinship assistance) or material (e.g., loaned money). Such tangible resources constitute a "second order" value generated by moral capital. "Moral capital" in this sense is primarily the product of cumulative social performance, such as those of men in their performance of migrant scripts.

Reverend Machava stood out from many other persons of influence among Machazian migrants in South Africa precisely in terms of the credibility, integrity, and virtue that others in the community seemed to reflexively attribute to his statements and his actions. In the course of my fieldwork in South Africa I met with many men who held roles that were generically attributed equal social influence and standing (as pastors or profetas), who wielded considerable influence as social brokers of one sort or another, and who often had far greater material wealth than Reverend Machava.[4] However, I did not meet any whose pronouncements tended to be received with as little suspicion of self-interest. It is hard to not consider Machava's "moral capital" in assessing the extent of his social authority, and the role of that authority in gaining social endorsement for one of the more radically transformative experimental social discourses in circulation after the Mozambican civil war.

Such social authority has its own distinct and critical bearing on the authorization of innovative social discourses, most particularly by informing the capacity of agents to successfully deploy potentially "authorizable" discourses in public performance and ultimately secure their social endorsement. It may thus be vital in determining both the extent to which agents can successfully pursue strategies of greater "voice" and the extent to which some agencies have more transformative effect than others.

Finally, Feierman's orienting question "*Who* has the capacity for authorizing particular discourses while preempting others?" (emphasis

added) not only invites a focus on public intellectuals who seek social endorsement but also on the public that grants it. Although propositional authorizability may indeed offer the requisite resonance that makes an innovative strategy for navigating new social opportunity structures both sensible and acceptable, it is likely that it will seem more acceptable to some and less so to others. Thus, for example, these last three chapters have documented at length how transnational polygyny simultaneously appealed to Machazian migrant men while generating resistance from most Machazian women. In this sense innovative propositions such as the variously narrated strategies of social innovation have sought social endorsement in a heterogeneous and conflicted social field.

Not only had interests been reconfigured within this field but so also had social power. Some authorizers had considerably more capacity than others to make their social endorsement matter in shaping public discourse. In the previous two chapters I discussed how the new opportunities offered by transnational polygyny reduced the dependence of Machazian men on Machazian women for the realization of their life strategies in ways that significantly recalibrated the gendered balance of power within households. This shift in social power among "authorizers" served as a significant enabling factor in the legitimization of a variety of transnationalist strategies and narratives that appealed to a growing number of Machazian migrant men, including Reverend Machava's radical narrative of replacement. Conversely, it also served as a disabling factor for those counternarratives that sought to resist transnational polygyny's development, and also for other innovative propositions about social relations (such as Thelma's) that flew in the face of migrant men's interests.

Reverend Machava and his tale represented virtually the perfect storm in which a proponent's exceptional social authority, an innovative narrative's propositional authorizability, and a significant reconfiguration of the balance of power within the social field of "authorizers" converged to enable a successful bid for the social imagination. The exceptional authorizability of Machava's narrative derived from the social genius of his innovative proposition and the way it was creatively woven with uncontested strands of discourse. Machava's exceptional social authority was itself the product of the convergence of his instrumental power (as a social broker), his social standing (as a man and pastor) at a point of generalized epistemic power, and finally from the far more specific and individualized forms of epistemic power that outstanding moral capital gave

him. In stark and diametric contrast to Machava stood the increasingly marginalized women in the aldeias, whose struggling social experiment was solely reliant on the cover of instrumental power, which they could access only through tenuous relationships to the state's local agents—relationships whose terms were often dictated by the interests of others with more socially prescribed power than by the interests of the women themselves. However, even efforts such as Thelma's, which sought additional anchoring in the epistemic power of settled discourse that might potentially provide "propositional authorizablity," finally failed in their bid for the social imagination. Thelma suffered from both an insurmountable deficit of "moral capital" and faced a general reconfiguration of the gendered balance of power in the Machazian social field that increasingly deprived all women of leverage they once had. Equipped with diminishing social authority in the wake of war-time and postconflict social changes, such women had little capacity to successfully pursue strategies of "voice" without sanction, much less secure acceptance for their innovative propositions.

Refocusing the Anthropological Gaze in War: From Violence to the Social Condition

As "socially unstable places" (Greenhouse 2002) warscapes are often treated as interrupted societies in which the myriad social processes and life projects anthropologists investigate are treated as if they have been suspended. In such contexts coping with violence often becomes the only social task that analysts investigate. Such approaches strip warscape inhabitants of the social multi-dimensionality that is assumed to shape behavior and inform agency under less dramatic conditions. Thus, as I noted in the introduction to this study, people who under "normal" circumstances would be investigated as "brothers," "workers," "neighbors," and "elders" are suddenly recast in singularly reductionist molds: either as "refugees"—whose only recognizable role is to flee violence; or as "combatants"—whose only analyzed role is to perpetrate violence; or as "victims"—whose only role of relevance is to suffer violence.

In contrast to such approaches, I have sought to demonstrate that wartime social existence in Machaze was never merely a matter of coping with violence; instead, as in peacetime, it centered on the pursuit of a multidimensional agenda of life projects ansd "other struggles." Throughout

the conflict an array of "other" forms of gendered and generational social struggle continued to inform interests and orient behavior—migratory or otherwise. In fact, far from exercising singularly determinative force in shaping war-time behavior or proving capable of overwriting prior social and cultural difference, both the meaning and deployment of military violence itself tended to be reshaped by the specific sociocultural problematics that had long oriented the social life of the myriad and highly differentiated local groups throughout Mozambique.

In dismissing social relations as largely irrelevant to warscape behavior, violence-centric approaches to war implicitly relegate the development of social relations throughout wars to the status of a nonquestion. In contrast, I have placed a premium on tracing the dynamic development of social relations *throughout* conflict rather than treating war as an interruption of social process. Most specifically, I challenge conceptualizations of war as a desocializing process that simply suspends or erases strategic social projects, by demonstrating how Machazian social relations continued to evolve as people sought to pursue and renegotiate culturally scripted life strategies under changing circumstances.

In my view, one primary task of any anthropology of the social condition in war is to investigate the energized process of the unmaking and remaking of hegemonic social relations and cultural framings, what I have termed here as the struggle for the social imagination. The framework I have introduced in this final chapter is an attempt to analyze the complex and dynamic process of hegemony's unmaking and remaking in warscapes with reference to the *important factors other than violence* that continue to bear on negotiation over the terms in which warscape social existence will be conceptualized and carried out. This framework is an effort to respond to this question: "What *else* (besides violence) must be accounted for in order to understand the *specific* course of social transformation in and through war?"

The macropolitical project of war and the violence it generates ultimately underwrite a bewildering array of processes (migration, displacement, network fragmentation, gendered struggle, localized conflict) whose effects cumulatively enlarge the space of argumentation, creativity, and renegotiation that is the social imagination. Many of the conditions that stem from war (in that they would presumably not exist in the same way without it) have a bearing in complex ways on the authorization process in which rival propositions compete for social endorsement. Most obviously, the conditions introduced by war effect new balances of social

power that overturn or otherwise reconfigure formerly hegemonic relations. They generate novel social dilemmas and opportunities, and they reconfigure the social and material field where agents address established social problematics. Under such circumstances people must indeed imagine themselves in new and vital ways.

However, neither engagement in the struggle for the social imagination nor the outcome is determined only—or even primarily—by conditions that originate during war or from violence. War-time violence introduces new problems and yet violence is only one of the problems war introduces. The questions people continue to pose in warscapes are not only "How do I avoid violence?" but rather more commonly on the order of "How, whom, and when can, should, or will I marry?" "Which field will I hoe?" "How can I avoid this contentious person and the threat of uloi?" and "How shall I raise this child?" An anthropology of the social condition in war, while certainly not neglecting violence, should therefore focus on how violence problematizes the manner in which specific social actors pose and answer questions such as these, rather than making violence itself the central question or problem.

From this perspective the analysis of war-time behavior and the tracing of war-time social processes can never start in war or with violence. Analysis of the micropolitics of everyday social process must begin with an exploration of the historically constituted and culturally specified terms of meaning and social practices that define the life projects and forms of social struggle, which are the final object of such questions. Thus, the complex positioning of marriage in Machazian life strategies that gave this relationship its meaning was not generated in or by the war, but by a long history of social negotiation that predated the war. The social problematics of Machazian marriage in and throughout war cannot be understood without grasping the complex meanings of "marriage" that existed before and were brought into the conflict.

The "authorization" process, by which the specific direction of social change is negotiated in warscapes, is not determined by war-time violence. The "authorizability" of a message derives not only from its instrumental capacity to solve a problem but from its ability to do so in culturally sensible ways that are rooted in already established strands of meaning. Similarly, the "authority" of an innovator rests as much or more in their stellar record of performing established scripts and accruing culturally specified forms of moral capital (Machava) that underwrite their epistemic power as it does in their ability to wield extraordinary instrumental power.

Finally, the reconfigured relationships that emerge among "authorizers" in warscapes reflect the genealogy of social struggle carried out with culturally specific social projects (and not only the problem of violence) in mind. Machazian transnational polygyny thus emerges not only from flight in the face of military violence but out of gendered social struggle.

Imaginings of Last Resort: Reflections on Culture in Chaos

In conclusion I have one more tale to tell. It is directed at those who remain skeptical about the power of culture to inform behavior in the violent chaos of warscapes. It is a story of cultural imaginings of last resort by Machazian women like Thelma who seemed to confront no good options within the "loyalty"/"voice" continuum and thus opted to pursue even more radical strategies of "exit" (Hirschman 1970). Throughout the postwar decade a growing number of these women confronted the predicament of stigma and vulnerability in the aldeias and left the district and made their way to the provincial capital of Chimoio. Unwilling to be subjected to the established terms of the Machazian social order—and unable to change them—these women, once in Chimoio, took drastic measures to extricate themselves from that social milieu and insert themselves in another with more favorable terms of interaction.

Flight to Chimoio certainly placed greater distance between these women and the relatives whose social claims they sought to resist. Moreover, the authority of Machazian régulos was not recognized in Chimoio and these women also had access to more powerful government administrators who were less embroiled in the district's internal politics, thus strengthening their hand in defending their own claims. At the same time, less contact with social rivals in Machaze reduced the likelihood that contentious claims would erupt and trigger accusations or fears of uloi. Finally, petty trade in the market and other economic activities in Chimoio afforded many women the possibility of economic independence, more so than in the aldeias in Machaze.

In the course of my fieldwork I had found that many Machazians who had relocated to Chimoio during the war pursued strategies of translocalism that were similar to those pursued by many men who found refuge in South Africa. In contrast to these translocals, the Machazian women who fled to Chimoio after the war were distinctive in their adamant efforts to sever all social and symbolic ties with their home district. Many of these

women specifically avoided social entanglements with Machazians in Chimoio, and most particularly with those who continued to maintain active social ties and interests back in the district.

Interestingly, most of these women had a strong predilection for joining the relatively recent charismatic Protestant churches in Chimoio that had no sister congregations in Machaze—another contrast to migrant men in both Chimoio and in South Africa, who preferred to participate in denominations that had Machazian counterparts. One of these women explained:

> My friends are all from the church and the market. . . . This is better because there are fewer *complicões* [complications] when they are not also from Machaze. When I worked near my [ex-]husband's relative she would tell them about my life when she visited Machaze. Then they wanted to take my children, and that is why they wanted to call me back to Machaze. She was telling them these things because she was hating me because I was making more money with my business.

Mark Chingono (1996) has discussed how churches in Chimoio afforded many women displaced by the war with an important social support network.[5] In the Machazian case these networks were also important because they allowed women to avoid relying on relatives for assistance—while also providing access to potential husbands and new friends who were not part of the Machazian social milieu. One woman in particular drove home the importance of this advantage for many of these women. "Luisa" explained that her husband had been killed during the war because one of his brothers had falsely accused him of being a RENAMO sympathizer. She had fled shortly thereafter to Chimoio with another woman. Although she had returned to Machaze briefly after the war, she had returned to Chimoio when one of her husband's brothers (allegedly involved in his killing) had tried to marry her and then, when she had refused, had attempted to claim her children. She had only been able to bring two of her four children with her, and her financial situation in Chimoio was dire. She struggled to pay the rent for her maachamba, and eked out a living doing odd jobs such as laundry. The ideal solution to her problem, she explained, would be to marry a "man with a good job." Yet despite a self-proclaimed strong incentive to find a husband she had repeatedly refused the proposals of several well-employed suitors solely because they were from Machaze: "I want nothing with them because they are

from Machaze. Today they are staying here . . . [but] one day they will say: 'I am needing to go [to Machaze]' . . . I will marry any man, any man! . . . except one from Machaze!"

In moving to Chimoio, marginalized women such as Thelma and Luisa sought more than an improved position of power from which to engage in the Machazian social argument—such as the aldeias had tenuously and temporarily provided. Instead, they sought to extricate themselves from the Machazian moral community altogether. Unable to change the terms of their social environment their innovative recourse of last resort was to switch their social milieu. Churches with predominantly non-Machazian congregants—such as the Igreja Universal do Reino de Deus (Universal Kingdom of God Church) and the Igreja Evangelica Cristo Vive (Jesus Lives Evangelical Church)—provided this alternative social milieu.

Of equal importance, their emphasis on charismatic "Holy Spirit power" promised strong protection against uloi and the recrimination of ancestral spirits:

> Before I was instructed I was ignorant. . . . Since I have been in the church the Holy Spirit always protects me against demons. The Holy Spirit is more powerful to show that they disguise themselves as vadzimu. . . . [They pose as vadzimu so that] when you tell them about your problems they know how to do their evil. If they were [true] vadzimu how could they do harm? Who will eat their own children? When the [IURD] pastor speaks, all the demons must run, because the Holy Spirit is too, too powerful.

Bereft of the social authority that might allow them to infuse their own voice into the Machazian social imagination, these women in Chimoio pursued what seemed the only form of strategy—"exit"—that offered any possibility of empowerment and of protection for their vital social interests.

How can reflection on such strategies of social exit—arguably the most dramatic experimental social discourses of all—inform our broader understanding of the dynamics of the social imagination in the unsettling social condition of war and the manner in which we investigate social processes through that condition?

Even though long-standing configurations of instrumental power that sustain hegemonic meanings and relations may be undermined in warscapes, and even though displacement and dispersion may reconfigure social opportunity structures, violence never proves capable of

entirely unraveling the fabric of hegemonic social meaning. Significant strands of meaning always persist as "structures of sentiment" (Appadurai 1996) that continue to inform the definition of both the problematics people perceive themselves to confront (e.g., the wrath of mfukwas, the intrusive surveillance of the state, the social diversion of migrant sons and husbands) and the goals to which they aspire (e.g., socially secure rights in children, the endorsement of vadzimu) in socially differentiated and culturally specified ways.

The innovative social discourse ultimately must make sense not only to an external social jury but also to the agent himself or herself; and therefore it must respond to both internalized structures of sentiment and understandings of social problematics, and not only to external configurations of social power. The migrant who believes he must reenter a war zone to appease an irate vadzimu or the woman who fears that the return of her husband after the war will place her rights to children at risk believe and are afraid not because of what they are told by others but because they *do* believe and *are* afraid. The reflexive monitoring of social authority and authorizability remains integral to even the most radical process of agentive creativity in warscapes. One can exchange one's social milieu but not one's self.

That even the most dramatic and radical experimental social discourse is an engagement with social problematics within already established terms, and one that necessarily draws on strands of the hegemonic social fabric—despite being an effort to unravel and reweave it in part—is evidenced in the concerns that informed the strategies of social extrication pursued by Machazian women in Chimoio. If the new charismatic churches provided these women with the means to substitute their old social milieu with a new one, no doctrine or other interest inherent in these churches dictated that these women sever their social ties with all people and things Machazian. The concerns that drove these women to these churches remained informed in the final instance by the very forms of social hegemony these women sought to challenge and escape. It was these concerns—with countering uloi, with securing their rights to children, and with generally avoiding reimmersion in the Machazian milieu—that made these churches a potential solution to these marginalized women's already specified problems.

In this sense even social extrication is not a denial of hegemonic meanings but rather a radical and dramatic strategy for engaging with it—from positions of marginal power where other means for authorization remain

unavailable. Strategies of exit are thus not processes of social erasure but of social substitution. To the extent that even the most drastic innovations and radically imagined solutions are a response to a specific array of social problematics, they must inevitably continue to bear the imprint—if only in the negative—of what they seek to substitute. The social answer always bears the mark of the social question to which it responds.

War-time violence undoubtedly introduces dramatic new problems into the lives of those who inhabit war zones. However, the problem for most warscape inhabitants is rarely violence per se but the challenge that violence introduces to the realization of other projects. Like the people who navigate warscapes the focus of their analysts must remain centered on that which occupies the attention of their subjects. The task of an anthropology of war as a social condition must be to focus on the culturally negotiated life projects of warscape inhabitants rather than getting caught up in, or remaining mesmerized by, the more violent and uncertain medium in which such projects must be negotiated. The analytical imperative of warscape ethnography is the same as that for all ethnography: to identify (rather than presume) the specific array of social struggles that inform meaningful behavior—migratory or otherwise—and trace their dynamics in the terms that are meaningful to their protagonists.

Notes

Introduction

1. Mozambique, Liberia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Somalia, Algeria, Uganda.

2. Sudan, Chad.

3. Angola, Western Sahara, Rwanda, Burundi.

4. Angola, Mozambique, Uganda, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Somalia, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Western Sahara, Namibia, Chad.

5. Hansen 1982, 1992; Kibreab 1985, 1991, 1995; Harrell-Bond 1986; Daley 1991; Kuhlman 1991; Martin 1992; Abdulrahim 1993; Shahrani 1995; Peteet 1995; Benson 1994; Krufeld 1994; Kulig 1994; Koenig 1995; Malkki 1995a, 1995b; Omidian 1996; Bascom 1998; McSpadden 1999; Matsouka and Sorenson 1999; Steputat 1999; Lubkemann 2000b; Sommers 2001; Bowker 2003.

6. Africa in particular has become virtually synonymous with these "new wars," and the social existence of millions of its inhabitants seen as centered around and singularly determined by war-generated violence that seems thoroughly unpredictable, arbitrary, and irrational.

7. Although their study exemplifies the concept of "vintage," it does not use a predominantly kinetic theoretical approach.

8. Characterized by its own peer-reviewed journals (such as the *Journal of Refugee Studies, Refuge,* and *Forced Migration Review*), institutionalized programs of graduate studies at elite institutions worldwide (including, among others, Oxford, Tufts, Columbia, the American University of Cairo, Witswatersrand, and Georgetown), and rapidly growing professional associations that sponsor periodic conferences, conventions, and publications (such as the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration and the Committee on Refugees and Immigrants of the American Anthropological Association).

9. War-time migration within and from the district was socially differentiated in highly complex ways: far more men left the district and the country than did

women. Machazians who fled the district settled in a variety of destinations. Among those who resettled within Mozambique some relocated to remote rural areas and others to rapidly urbanizing ones; some remained under the government's control and some resettled to areas under the insurgency's influence. Others found refuge in at least two very different international settings: the periurban townships of South Africa and in Zimbabwe. Women who crossed international borders settled almost exclusively in Zimbabwe, while the thousands who settled in South Africa were almost exclusively adult men. Young Mozambican men in Zimbabwe often settled outside the refugee camps, while women, children, and the elderly were more often found within them. At the same time, many thousands of Machaze's residents never left the district throughout a decade and a half of war.

10. Kibreab 1995; Omidian 1996; Chingono 1996; Bascom 1998; Stepputat 1999; McSpadden 1999; Lubkemann 2000b, 2002c; Englund 2002; Matsuoka and Sorenson 2001; Janzen 2004; Stefansson 2004; Hammond 2004.

11. These histories draw on multiple interview sessions (taped and later transcribed) with Machazian men and women ranging across all age groups in Machaze District, among Machazians living in the periurban townships of the Vaal region in South Africa, and in the city of Chimoio. Some of these interviews lasted as little as three hours, and others involved over twenty hours of discussion. While these interviews inevitably followed their own social-interaction logic and idiosyncrasies, I used a life-course history template (see Kertzer and Sciaffino [1986] and Kertzer and Karweit [1986]) in an effort to ensure that certain comparable information was collected in the course of our multiple sessions.

12. Vail and White 1980; First 1983; Negrão 1995; Penvenne 1995; Pitcher 1995; Isaacman 1996; Feliciano 1998; Neves 1998; Hughes 1999; Couvane 2001; Chilundo 2001; Englund 2002; West 2005.

13. Hanlon 1984, 1996; Cahen 1987; Geffray 1991; Urdang 1989; Roesch 1992; Hall 1990; Vines 1991; McLaughlin 1992; Finnegan 1992; Wilson 1992; Dinerman 1994; Abrahamsson and Nilsson 1994; Alexander 1994; Minter 1994; Lundin 1996; Chingono 1996; Hall and Young 1997; Nordstrom 1997; West 1998, 2005; Manning 1998; McGregor 1998; Coelho 1998; Gengenbach 1998; Honwana 2002; Englund 2002.

14. Whereas Englund appears to belong to a camp of anthropological thinking (Strathern 1988; Piot 1999) that sees actors as constituted by "social relations," I admit a greater role for idiosyncratic and individual interests in the constitution of social relationships as actual practices, which may be significantly informed by social relations (which I take as categorical)—hence the difference in the extent to which our studies focus on the question of (individual) "agency." The view that individuals "are social relations" (Piot 1999, 18) often relies on imperceptible slippage between the notion of individuals being constituted by practiced social relationships and the rather different notion that they are constituted by social-relation categories. That people are constituted as social relations or relationships in either

the categorical or practiced sense also neglects the fact that the sum of interests that inform social-interaction practices cannot be solely derived from either social relationships in the practice sense or from social relations in the categorical sense. Individuals are indeed constituted by social relationships, but not *only* by social relationships—and thus are more than merely social relations. Theories that take individuals to be (merely) social relations mistake social representation for actual (observable) social practice.

Section 1

1. Among the most useful overviews of labor migration are Kearney (1986); Kritz, Lim, and Zlotnik (1992); Castles and Miller (1993); Massey (1994); Hammar, Brochmann, Tamas, and Faist (1997); Van Hear (1998); and Brettell (2003). Notable studies of labor migration as a deeply historical process include Brettell (1986) and Massey et al. (1987). Specifically in the southern African region, see Van Onselen (1976); Murray (1981); Bozzoli (1991b); Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman (1991); and Harries (1994). For Mozambique, see First (1983); Vail (1991); Neves (1998); Couvane (2001); and Chilundo (2001).

Chapter 1

1. Until 1986 the area of Machaze was part of Mossurize District, the capital of which was Espungabera. In 1986 Machaze became a separate district with its new capital in Chitobe.

2. For an important recent discussion of the historiographic debate regarding the origins and sociopolitical organization of the Ndau throughout south-central Mozambique (including Mossurize, Machaze, and Buzi districts) see the recent dissertation by Fernando Florêncio (2003). Although the tense political situation and limited time restricted his fieldwork in Machaze, Florêncio presents the best comprehensive categorical overview of Ndau political authority structures in south-central Mozambique.

3. Many Machazians who were taken survived the trip and fought against the Portuguese for Gungunhana up until he was defeated in 1895. Some Machazians stayed in the Bilene area and maintained contacts with relatives in Machaze on a slowly deteriorating basis throughout the century. However, large numbers continued to return to Machaze for over a decade following Gungunhana's defeat, as evidenced in Companhia administrator's annual reports in 1901 (63–71) and 1906 (42).

4. Early colonial reports often referred to the Machaze area as "Madanda"—evidently a pejorative reference to the lowland inhabitants used by those who

remained in the highland areas near Espungabera where colonial officials responsible for the district also lived.

5. Reference to high rates of labor migration appear as early as the second year of annual reports submitted by the Companhia's administrator in Mossurize (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1901: 6).

6. The earliest reports filed by Companhia officials prospecting the area in 1896 before the international boundary had been definitively determined or the concession formally made to the Companhia focused extensively (and overoptimistically) on the prospects for attracting European farmer-settlers to the region (Relatório de Viagem a Mossurize, ao Sr. Conselheiro Governador da Companhia, July 14, 1896: 10–17). However, by 1904 the local administrator in his annual report was beginning to soberly consider the impediments to settler-driven agriculture and mining (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1904: 55–59). In the 1909 annual report the local administrator noted the total failure to attract white settlers and that only substantial improvements in communications, roads, and market access might render such efforts viable in the future (Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1909, unnumbered section on "Colonos Europeus e Colonizacão").

7. For a more detailed discussion of the operations of the Companhia de Moçambique, see Tomlinson 1979.

8. The statute that prohibited the Witswatersrand Native Labor Association (WENELA) from recruiting north of the 22nd parallel was reiterated and reinforced by the conventions signed between the Portuguese colonial government and South Africa successively in 1913, 1923, and 1928 (Couvane 1989, 60 and 83).

9. A review of local administrator reports shows that wages in South Africa remained consistently three to four times higher than those offered in Mozambique throughout the Companhia's tenure—see Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatórios Annuais 1906, 1908, 1912, 1917, 1925, 1934, and Relatório do Auto da Banja, Mossurize, February 5, 1923.

10. Relatório sobre Prisão de Engajadores e Apprênsão de Burros, Administrador de Mossurize ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, January 27, 1909; Relatório sobre Engajadores Junto a Fronteira, Administrador do subposto de Massangena ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, November 15, 1912; Relatório sobre Emigração Clandestina de Indígenas, Administrador de Mossurize ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, May 22, 1912; Letter to the Deputy Administrator of the Companhia de Mozambique from Mr. Alvaro Montez Ribas, May 23, 1938.

11. Order 8:087 of August 3, 1926 of the governor of the Territory of the Companhia de Moçambique. This order abolished the Repartição de Trabalho Indígena (RTI, Native Labor Section) of the Companhia de Moçambique, which by decree 1:303 of December 22, 1914 had been given the charge of labor conscription. The acquisition of native labor thus no longer became a function of the

government. The RTI was replaced by the Associação do Trabalho Indígena de Manica and Sofala (commonly known as the ATI), a corporation formed by (European) merchants, industrialists, and agricultural landowners in the Companhia's territory and given a monopoly on the voluntary recruitment of native labor. Order 5:133 of September 1926 prohibited forced recruitment of native labor for private purposes. The district administrators under this new regime no longer had the job of rounding up labor, but as agents of the Directorate of Native Affairs they were given the responsibility of exercising a "meticulous vigilance over recruitment and native labor, and the indispensable tutelage over workers and an intense propaganda promoting voluntary labor" (Apontamentos à Monografia do Indígena, Governo da Companhia de Moçambique, Direcção dos Negócios Indígenas, 1930).

12. During the 1930s and 1940s motorized transportation from Mozambican borders to the urban areas became increasingly available, facilitating the trip for those who could afford it. In 1944 the inspector of Mossurize for the new Portuguese administration recommended that a regular motorized transport service from Chibabava (on the far northern border of the district) to Massangena (on the district's southern border, adjacent to Southern Rhodesia) be shut down to discourage illegal migration of the district's native population to South Africa (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1944). Apparently this advice was followed, because in 1953 the Mossurize district administrator reported his opposition to the granting of a concession for public transportation between Espungabera and Machaze, which he believed would be used "exclusively for clandestine immigration. . . . [F]or this same reason, years ago, other such existing services were canceled."(Nota No. 115/B/24/4/1 da Repartição Central dos Negócios Indígenas ao Agente do Curador, Mossurize, June 20, 1953).

13. In 1942, the district of Mossurize was administratively divided, with the southernmost area below the Save River assigned to the Sul do Save district, and the remainder of the territory (including the entire Machaze area) assigned to the government of the District of Beira.

14. Farming was defined as having planted two hectares of crops, of which one half was a cash crop. The prevalence of the tsetse fly in the district made it impossible to use the plow animals needed to farm larger tracts of land. In the district inspector's report in 1946 Machaze is described as a "true den for this fly" (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946: 137). In the 1946 annual meeting with the local district administrator, the régulos in Mossurize were asked why most men continued to migrate illegally to South Africa, leaving their families behind, rather than cultivating corn as a cash crop. They responded "that some had already considered this option, but that they could not cultivate the land with plows because the oxen dies with the 'sleeping fly,' and that having next purchased donkeys to plow with instead, these had also died, so that cultivation remained impossible" (Inspecçao Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946 [inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja

held with régulos in Espungabera on December 21, 1946]: 2). Thus, as late as 1960, only fifty-eight men in the Mossurize District were recognized officially as "agriculturists." This number included all those who resided in the higher-plateau areas nearer to Espungabera, quite distant from Machaze—it is highly unlikely that any of this number were from the drastically ecologically different Machaze area (Inspecção Ordinária do Distrito de Mossurize, 1960: 53).

15. Laborers reported as recruited within the Circumscription in the subsequent fifteen years are as follows: 1943: 992; 1944: 1,190; 1945: 1,317; 1946: 1,110; 1947: 798; 1948: 1,416; 1949: 1,573; 1950: 1,657; 1951: 1,806; 1952: unavailable; 1953: unavailable; 1954: 1,244; 1955: 1,837; 1952: 1,295; 1957: 2,615; 1958: 2,316 (data compiled from Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatórios Annuais 1942, 1944, 1950, 1951; "Mapa de Mão de Obra Recrutada na Circunscrição de Mossurize 1943–44," Espungabera, Camilo Ferreira de Almeida, July 6, 1945; Relatório do Director dos Serviço dos Negócios Indígenas, Curadoria Geral, 1958).

16. Local administrators were also tasked with compelling those who were not exempt to work for those six months even if they did not wish to. Those in this "forced recruitment" category were initially to be assigned to public works, and only secondarily (after state quotas had been filled) to private firms.

17. Poorly paid and living under isolated and what they regarded as difficult conditions, colonial officials sometimes resorted to more coercive methods of labor recruitment. A number of local colonial officials availed themselves of their virtually unsupervised status to interpret colonial policies and directives, particularly those regarding indigenous labor, in ways that would benefit them personally. In 1946 Camilo Ferreira de Almeida, the administrator for the whole Circumscription of Mossurize, was charged together with his assistant for brutalizing ten régulos, stealing from the administrative coffers, and using funds designated for "indigenous welfare" for his own personal "comforts" (which included the purchase of a bathtub, electric lamps, carpets, cigarettes, and a bicycle) (Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946: 16). A little over a decade later the administrator of the subpost in Machaze was accused of exploiting local labor for his own personal benefit and that of his two subordinates: "[N]atives reported that many people were forced to work on the *maachambas* (fields) of the post *cipaes* [indigenous police] for 2 or 3 weeks, receiving only manioc as food during this time. . . . [F]or his role in providing this type of food the chief of the post was given the local nickname of Munjunbuia (manioc)" (Nota 90/58 da Companhia Colonial do Buzi ao Director da Secretaria Distrital de Administração Civil, Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala, 1958: 44).

18. Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946; Report on Auto da Banja held with régulos in Espungabera on December 21, 1946.

19. Portuguese colonial administrators constantly compared earnings in Mozambique to those in neighboring British-held colonies where the currency was the British pound. They often accepted payments (of taxes or fines) in this currency.

20. South Africa's mining industry experienced a particularly spectacular period of growth during the 1930s as major currencies devalued relative to gold, driving up the demand and price for gold and leading to a major period of expansion in South Africa's gold-mining industry. Between 1932 and 1941, the amount of ore milled from South Africa's mines doubled, and the production of gold increased by nearly 25% (Jones and Muller 1992, 154).

21. This policy allowed the Portuguese colonial government to collect taxes from the miner on a periodic basis while also benefiting from the "per-head recruitment fee" paid directly by WENELA for each term of employment.

22. These interviews and surveys were conducted in the district of Machaze in 1996. This data was compiled only from the records of individuals who stated that they were no longer engaged in circular labor migration, considering themselves now retired. The N, for each time period, refers to the number of individuals who were engaged in labor migration to South Africa during this time period for which data was available.

23. The number of such recorded "desertions per year between 1948 and 1960" were 1948, 2,111; 1949, 2,512; 1950, 2,651; 1951, 4,057; 1952, 4,075; 1953, 4,753; 1954, 6,814; 1955, 6,300; 1956, 6,608; 1957, 6,736; 1958, 5,771; 1959, 6,977; 1960, 7,539 (Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas, Manica e Sofala, Relatório Annual, 1961).

24. By 1971 South Africa rather than Portugal had become the colony's major trade partner. From 1971 to 1974 89% of foreign capital investment came from South Africa (Newitt 1995, 553). From 1971 to 1973 the colony experienced a 10% annual increase in GNP (Hall and Young 1997, 9). By 1975 Mozambique ranked as the eighth most industrialized country in Africa, with 80% of its manufactured goods targeted at the internal *colono* (white settler) market (Hall and Young 1997, 10).

25. An early effort to compel local cotton cultivation failed in 1948 when the most important régulo in the district (Mecupe) toasted the seeds that the district administrator had given him to plant (Relatório Mensal do Administrador de Mossurize, February 1949). Although Mecupe was imprisoned for his resistance, the point quickly became moot, as a study in 1951 by inspectors from the National Cotton Board assessed the Machaze area's climate as unsuited for cotton cultivation (referred to in Nota 114/B/15/2 Circular Confidencial do Secretario do Distrito de Manica e Sofala ao Administrador da Circunscrição de Mossurize, February 12, 1960: 3). In a small part of Machaze (Ghezhane, in the current-day district's northeast corner) cotton eventually was grown voluntarily as a cash crop on a limited basis (Monografia Psicosocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962).

26. Although undocumented in the colonial records that I was able to locate, several individuals that I interviewed provided oral accounts of one particular European land-seizure attempt in Machaze during the last decade of colonial rule. According to these accounts, in the mid-1960s one of the European shop owners

in the area of Chipudje attempted to commandeer land for a cashew plantation. The remains of this plantation were still visible in 1997 and 1998, extending for about half a kilometer behind the partially rebuilt ruins of the shop area. The area was studiously avoided because land mines had been sown among the cashew trees during the civil war. According to oral accounts, a private Portuguese effort to appropriate an even larger area had been rebuffed by the local régulo (Manasse) with the support of the local population. At one point the régulo evidently drew a line in the dirt and said, "No more trees planted beyond this point." The district administrator then backed the régulo, disturbed by the outrage caused by this unprecedented (for the area) European land claim.

27. The only industry of any note recorded in the district was a sawmill established in the 1960s in the Tuco Tuco area (Relatório Sobre a Elevação da População Nativa, Circunscrição de Mossurize, 30 Trimestre, 1965).

28. In 1970 75% of the white population of Mozambique was estimated to live in urban centers, in particular in the capital of Lourenço Marques and in Beira (Hall and Young 1997, 6).

29. Some women recalled walking a two-day round-trip to obtain water during years of poor rainfall before the boreholes were drilled. Colonial reports dating back to 1904 (e.g., Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1904: 6; Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1937: 75; Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Mensal (Outubro), 1951) often stated that the greatest need of the area was a more permanent water supply.

In recounting their life histories many women in Machaze had no clear sense of the year in which important events in their personal lives had occurred. They used significant events in the community to reference the events. The arrival of boreholes and specific famines were the two types of events that women referred to most frequently when sequencing their life histories.

Chapter 2

1. See, for example, Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1904: 21; Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946 (inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja held with Régulos in Espungabera on December 21, 1946): 2; Circular Confidencial No. 279/B/10 Direcção de Adminstração Civil, Distrito de Manica e Sofala, February 10, 1955).

2. After accounting for the annual tax automatically deducted by officials from each trip's earnings.

3. The oldest Machazians interviewed in my own fieldwork (including four octogenarians) indicated that their fathers and grandfathers had only made one or two trips to South Africa. In two cases they themselves had made only two or three trips.

4. Historian Patrick Harries (1994) has documented the high fatality rate and the difficulties of early Mozambican labor migration to the South African mines around the turn of the century.

5. Circunscrisção de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1906; Circunscrisção de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1925; Circunscrisção de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1934.

6. Relatório sobre Emigração Clandestina de Indígenas do Adminstrador de Mossurize ao Governador do Territorio da Comphania de Moçambique, May 22, 1912; Relatório sobre Engajadores Junto à Fronteira do Governo da Republica do Administrador de Massagena ao Governador do Territorio da Companhia de Moçambique, November 15, 1912.

7. The development of such transportation systems was viewed with outright alarm by the Companhia's administrators, who saw them was a significant problem. Yet despite this concern and fitful countermeasures by district administrators, by 1935 motorized transportation was available *within* the Companhia's territory, so that most of the distance that men from Machaze had to cover within Mozambique was no longer undertaken by foot—from Massagena on the Save River all the way to the South African border at Pafuri. (Letter to the deputy administrator of the Companhia de Mozambique from Mr. Alvaro Montez Ribas, May 23, 1938.) These transportation networks flourished despite the obvious fact that they enabled practices expressly forbidden under Companhia policy and by international agreement.

8. Within this belief system social duties and obligations toward others were often fulfilled in order to avoid provoking ancestral reproach rather than only out of fear of how an offended party might react on their own.

9. Nowadays in Machaze, the tern *mfukwa* refers not to a category of spirit but to a state that a spirit assumes if he or she has suffered a violent death, been wronged in the extreme, or if the dead person grievously abrogated the sociomoral order in life.

10. Usually *nyangas* are associated with divination and the diagnosis of a problem and nyamusoros with the "capture" of and intercession with troubling spirits. The difference refers primarily to the type or "family" of intercessory spirit that enables the person it possesses to access the spiritual world. In Machaze I found that many individuals occupied both roles simultaneously. See also Honwana 2002.

11. Sikkisiranye is derived from "Siki Siray," which means "with heads bowed to the head in collective grief," a reference to the sorrow occasioned by this event.

12. See also, for the district of Marromeu, Carta ao Governador do Territorio da Companhia de Moçambique do Administrador do Distrito de Mossurize, August 11, 1933.

13. Simango's own (pre-muchape) description (Herskovits 1923; Curtis 1920) confirms that earlier in the century the Ndau from between the Buzi and Save

rivers did not believe that the spirits of one's own ancestors could cause serious or deadly harm to their own progeny. In contrast, in the course of my fieldwork I interviewed one man in Machaze who was very sick and dying and had been robbed of his pension money by his son, exclaiming to me: "To that one [his son] I am already a mfukwa."

14. In 1948 five independent Protestant churches were known by the local colonial administrator to be active in the district; in 1964 there were seven. (Nota de Referência à Circular 345/SDI, Mossurize, May 15, 1964)

15. For important comparisons in the teachings of these new independent Protestant churches and their relationship to established systems of socioreligious belief elsewhere in Mozambique, see Honwana 2002 and West 2005. In the broader literature such churches have often been referred to as African Independent Churches (AIC) (Comaroff 1985), indicating that while some of these groups originally had global links or origins, many quickly developed their own variations in doctrine and teaching or inspired new groups that were founded locally and had regional reach at most. In the Machaze area the American Board Mission church was generally acknowledged to be the oldest AIC, founded by local converts who had come into contact with Western missionaries at the Mount Selinda Mission, which was just across the border from Espungabera in the Chipinge area of Southern Rhodesia. Another major group of churches are those that call themselves Zione (Zionist). In Machaze this term was used by many individual congregations without necessarily denoting any strict affiliation. It therefore more accurately describes a category of churches with similar beliefs than an organized denomination. Although scholars have traced Zione churches throughout southern Africa to the early twentieth-century missionary effort of Alexander Dowie's Zion City in Illinois (Daneel 1970; Comaroff 1985; Corten and Marshall-Fratani 2001), in Machaze such a link would be secondary or tertiary, in that Zione churches were founded there by migrants returning from South Africa and not through direct contact with foreign missionaries. The term "Zione" was typically used by the Portuguese colonial administrators in the area to refer to all AICs. Although the structure of belief and practice in all AICs has evolved (and continues to do so) congregations in Machaze fall roughly into two categories: (1) those that used "Zione," "Sabata," "Holy Spirit," or "Apostolic" in their name and professed beliefs that might be described as Pentecostal (such as speaking in tongues and harnessing the Holy Spirit to the task of faith healing, defense against evil spirits, and prophecy [Cox 1995]); and (2) those such as the American Board and Full Gospel that did not practice faith healing or prophecy. In the final chapter I also refer to churches such as the Igreja Universal do Reino de Deus (IURD) that represent a third and more recent wave of AIC that swept through parts of the Machazian social world (South Africa and Chimoio in particular, less so in Machaze District itself) during the first postwar decade. An import from Brazil, IURD has teachings similar to other groups influenced by Pentecostalism (Holy Spirit power, faith

healing) but places additional emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in assuring material prosperity and well-being (Corten and Marshall-Fratani 2001).

16. Anthropologist Igor Kopytoff has convincingly argued that the veneration of ancestors verified in so many sub-Saharan African societies should ultimately be viewed as an integral part of a broader "eldership complex" that privileges and reinforces gerontocratic principles of authority:

> In the view presented here . . . the ancestral cult is an integral part of the system of relationship with elders. The relationship with dead elders (that is "ancestors") is seen as being on the same plane as that with living elders and not as secondary to it or derivative of it. . . . [In fact,] the term "ancestor" sets up a dichotomy where there is a continuum. By conceptually separating elders from ancestors, we unconsciously introduce Western connotations to the phenomena thus labeled and find ourselves having to deal with the paradoxes of our own creation. . . . It is striking that African "ancestors" are more mundane and less mystical than the dead who are objects of "worship" should be in Western eyes. African elders on the other hand look more mystical to us than we are willing to allow the living to be. Similarly Africans treat their living elders more worshipfully than the English term "respect" conveys and they treat the ancestors with less "respect" and more contentiousness than the term "worship" should allow. These are all paradoxes that stem from the difficulty of our vocabulary to accommodate the fact that African living elders and dead ancestors are more similar to each other than the Western living and dead can be, that an elder's role does not radically change when he crosses the line dividing the living from the dead, and that African "ancestorship" is but an aspect of the broader phenomenon of "eldership." (1971 [1997]: 419–20)

17. The 1964 revised agreement stipulated that the amount of deferred pay was to be 60% of the worker's net wage after the first six months (Whiteside and Patel 1985, 7).

18. Furthermore a portion of this deferred pay went to head taxes (First 1983; Couvane 2001) before the remainder was paid the migrant on his return home. This feature worked against men from Machaze who were often doubly taxed because of their need to pass themselves off as Shangaanas from "South of the Save" (River). Consequently, the amounts deducted (at the border) from their deferred pay under these identities did not count toward the tax obligations that they faced on return to Machaze, where they resumed their original residential status.

19. To this effect, Section 10 status was eventually declared as an eligible status only for those born in the urban areas prior to the date of their homeland's ascribed date of independence (Giliomee and Schlemmer 1985, 8–9).

20. Under the Section 10 legislation homeland residents who wished to find "legal" urban employment had to visit an urban area, locate a prospective employer who would specifically request them in writing, and then return to their homeland—all within seventy-two hours, to avoid charges of vagrancy. This

request then had to be cleared through the labor bureaus charged with verifying that Section 10 exemptees could not be found to do the job. The contract could then only be signed for a maximum of one year, after which the process of registration through the labor bureau would have to be done again.

21. Whereas Section 10 status was supposed to guarantee an urban labor supply for manufacturing and service industries, it also contained the provision that those qualifying under that status could not be compelled to work (without any prejudice to the exemption status they had already achieved). Consequently, black workers could legally refuse employment and yet maintain their Section 10 status, which allowed them to continue to live in urban areas. Thus, urban residents with Section 10 status often tended to reject the lowest echelon jobs, to demand higher wages, and to be regarded as more recalcitrant and less compliant by urban white employers. Consequently, many employers preferred to employ rural (or even foreign) migrants because they were seen as far more compliant, particularly if their status was illegal (Posel 1993).

22. The fact that "illegal" migrants accepted lower wages than their urban Section 10 counterparts was of particular importance to industries that depended on labor-intensive methods. Able to avail themselves of inexpensive black labor, employers in industry and services such as construction consistently resisted replacing unskilled labor with mechanization. For example, well into the 1960s almost all construction work was still done by hand, including the passing of bricks up scaffolds by hand rather than using motorized winches (Crankshaw 1997, 54). In manufacturing, it was only the sharp rise in black wages in the early 1970s that induced many industries to mechanize handling operations, accounting for a replacement of approximately 10% of the African workforce in the process (Crankshaw 1997, 57).

23. The greater informality of some industries in labor recruitment is independently confirmed through documentation dating back to the 1930s of Brick and Tile's employing nearby illegal squatters (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 4–5).

24. Different jobs entailed different types of benefits and restrictions for those employed. While heavy industry jobs at Iscor and Vecor usually paid the highest wages, the leave times involved were often far more restrictive and the costs involved in negotiating one's position back in the case of an overextended leave were generally higher. Some heavy industry jobs were also regarded as dangerous and physically taxing. On the other hand, domestic service, though it generally paid less than industrial work, usually included food, accommodations, and greater flexibility in negotiating extended leave times. This type of work was also regarded favorably as "soft" when compared to the more physically grueling and dangerous type of work in heavy industry. However, the lack of contracts in domestic service left such workers more vulnerable to employer manipulation, in particular to demands that employees work longer hours and not take weekends off.

25. Of these, 36,500 were believed to be living in the 5,477 houses while another 1,712 single men were believed to be living in men's hostels (Van der Westhuizen 1997, 8).

26. Although a "housing stand" was supposed to hold only one house, in practice many of these plots accommodated anywhere from two to six houses.

27. Among many other reports listing lobola at this rate see Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1904: 23; Circunscrição de Mossurize, Relatório Annual, 1934; Circular Confidencial No. 279/B/10, Direcção de Administração Civil, Distrito de Manica e Sofala, February 10, 1955.

28. Machazian marriage practices currently allow and historically have allowed for polygyny, that is, for a man to have multiple wives.

29. In the 1901 annual and tax reports the district administrator of the Companhia de Moçambique based in Espungabera bemoaned the difficulty of collecting taxes when the population lived in hundreds of small settlements. These settlements were described as usually composed of multiple families (though the definition of "family" is ambiguous) in settlements of between ten to twelve huts, some of which were surrounded by spiny thickets for protection.

30. According to Simango, at the time of death of this senior man public disputes about headmanship based on appeals to competing criteria of generation, age, or mother's seniority usually surfaced and might produce subdivision. Strictly speaking, the next oldest brother had the claim to headmanship (Herskovits 1923, 376).

31. Roughly equivalent to a diplomatic consul.

32. In this same report the curator estimated that in 1948 only 15% of those migrating illegally worked in the mining sector, whereas 60% worked in the commercial sector and another 25% in the domestic service sector (Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas, Joanesburgo, União da Africa do Sul, Relatório, 1948: 210).

33. As a result of these networks, certain industries in the Vaal area came to be known as "Shangaana industries" (the designation Machazians used), even as others became primarily associated with the ethnicity of other key brokers (such as Xhosa or Zulu).

34. However, the amounts régulos received were not more than could typically be brought back from a sojourn in South Africa by the average mine worker.

35. This hierarchical system is discussed in greater detail in chapter 5.

36. That this development in local ideology was new during the 1960s is reinforced by very specific stories, such as the one by a migrant who reported his shock at discovering this problem in Machaze on return there in 1963, after having been absent in South Africa for eight years: "This thing of the "reign of the *mambos*" happened after Pandanomwamuna [a famine that occurred in 1960–61]. I left that year to Joni and worked with the Dairyboard. I worked for two years. . . . When I came back everyone was talking about Chikwatira [one of the most powerful mambos, i.e., régulos, spirits]." Similarly, Banda Simango's reports on how

witchcraft worked among the Ndau to ethnomusicologist Natalie Curtis in 1920 mentioned that the most egregious spirits were never one's own direct ancestors, nor the mambos, but those who had died a wrongful death—much as was reported to be the case among other Ndau groups in Rhodesia up through the 1970s (Rennie 1973; Lan 1985; Bourdillon 1991).

37. In the course of my interviews I heard many different explanations about why this change had come about. Some referred to the fact that these were the régulos who in life had eaten muchape. Some remarked that these were régulos who had been very powerful during their lifetimes and thus must have been involved in uloi. Others suspected that the emergence of these mfukwa had involved collusion for economic benefit by régulos and nyangas. Most people had no explanation.

38. Although the régulos and nyamusoros benefited economically from this development and politically through their implication as the sources and mechanisms for redress, it is not necessary to assume "conscious collusion" in this development.

39. The two kinds of churches that the majority of respondents reported as growing rapidly during the late colonial era were the Zione and Sabata. Of the churches I observed these were the most syncretic in that they most fully incorporated local beliefs about ancestors (and allowed polygyny even for church leaders). A Machaze post administrator reported in 1964 that eleven of the fifteen prominent Protestant leaders he knew of in his jurisdiction were "Zione" (Nota de Referência à Circular 345/SDI, Mossurize, May 15, 1964). In 1962 a colonial report documented seventeen separate Zione congregations in the Machaze area (Monografia Psicossocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962). This growth was believed by most Machazians who spoke to me about the matter to have been achieved largely at the expense of denominations such as Full Gospel and American Board Mission, which remained less doctrinally accommodating and had no *profetas* (prophets).

40. This is still the case in Machaze today. In the divination consultations that I observed, profetas and nyamusoros or nyangas were often treated by clients as rather interchangeable. I watched one informant go back and forth through six consultations (of which I observed four), in which both nyamusoros and church profetas were consulted and drew on one another's consultations as part of a continuously evolving process.

41. Only two churches were reported by the Machazians I consulted to have been active in Machaze in the 1930s, the first of which was the American Board. By 1964 seven denominations were known to colonial authorities (Nota de Referência à Circular 345/SDI, Mossurize, May 15, 1964).

42. Although this did not prevent some young men from staying permanently in South Africa throughout the first half of the century, such cases, according to oral accounts, tended to be exceptional. The Portuguese curator in South Africa, commenting on this problem in 1948, alluded to a recent survey in Botswana by Isaac Schapera that estimated that approximately 6% of those Tswana who mi-

grated to South Africa failed to return home because they married South African women. He believed the percentage among black migrants from the Portuguese territories to be significantly lower (Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas, Relatório, 1948, Curadoria de Joanesburgo, União de Africa do Sul, 1948: 325–27).

43. Smit 1985, 116–17.

Section 2

1. Notably, the references that are drawn on in the constitution of such "vernaculars of violence" (Hinton 2005) reflect local enmeshment in global semiotic currents. Thus, in the intertwined Sierra Leonean and Liberian conflicts, the violent images drawn on to convey "locally meaningful" messages include not only those culled from the Poro and Sande initiation societies but also Rambo (Richards 1996), Lara Croft (Utas 2005), and the gangsta rapper Tupac Shakur (Hoffman 2005). Similarly, in the Holy Spirit Movement in Uganda insurgents not only invoked the "Christian" spirit "Lakwena" but also appealed to that of the action hero superstar Bruce Lee (Behrend 1999). In short, the narratives that fundamentally shape "local" expectations may be derived from Hollywood's distorted views of life in America (Utas 2005), the tales of expatriate diasporas (Lubkemann 2004d; Moran 2005), or from the disproportionately privileged lives of expatriate aid workers in the compound next door (Uvin 1998) as they are from the more obviously local realities.

Chapter 3

1. As Uvin notes: "The concept of structural violence draws our attention to unequal life chances, usually caused by great inequality, injustice, discrimination, and exclusion and needlessly limiting people's physical, social, and psychological well-being (Uvin 1998, 105).

2. It may be argued that there are conditions so tenuous as to be likely to trigger a sense of deprivation in any human society—an "absolute threshold" below which structural violence is inevitably recognized by everyone everywhere. However, an emphasis on subjective—and thus socially constructed measures of deterioration in one's own condition, rather than on absolute threshold conditions, suggests why similar sentiments of deep grievance are often triggered by different specific conditions in different societies, and even among different categories of actors in the same society. Thus, many of the same government measures that elicited resistance and resentment in Machaze sparked no such sentiments in other parts of Mozambique where socioeconomic organization was already based on collective agriculture and less dependent on migratory labor. From this perspective it is easy to understand why sentiments of grievance are often triggered well

before any externally determined "absolute thresholds" are reached. In this sense, the experience of deterioration in one group's condition that still leaves them better off than others in absolute terms may nevertheless engender sentiments of profound loss that motivate dramatic acts of redress—even while those others who are more absolutely disadvantaged may remain politically inert if they have not experienced a similar deterioration in their capacity to realize their expectations. As defined here, structural violence is thus less about what happens to different social groups or actors when they cross the same threshold of conditions than it is about the experience of living through and reflecting on the deterioration of whatever conditions each social actor or group starts with and expects to confront. Structural violence is thus a function of how far one has come from where one once was, rather than a common destination that is reached.

3. For an in-depth discussion of the development and implications of racial classification and economies under Portuguese colonial rule, see Penvenne 1995.

4. By 1972 over 250 teachers and 340 paramedical staff were providing services to the populations that remained in these zones (Johnston 1989, 78).

5. The anticolonial war would probably have soon had a more direct effect on life in Machaze had the conflict continued and had FRELIMO been successful in its strategy of "creeping south." Confidential documents in the district administrator's file dating from 1972 mention the Portuguese military's plans to eventually implement forced villagization in Machaze as a precautionary measure (Nota Confidencial No. 183/A/2 do Administrador de Espungabera aos Administradores dos Postos de Goigoi e Machaze, October 13, 1972). However, independence occurred before any of these plans were implemented by authorities in the district.

6. In reviewing the available PIDE/DGS files for the Machaze area, the local colonial administrators did express concern about the potential for the indigenous "Zionist" churches to serve as the base for the infiltration of revolutionary ideas. However, there is no evidence in these files that any anti-Portuguese political activity ultimately occurred during this time—nor did any evidence of local involvement in the anticolonial movements emerge from any of my interviews—although there were, evidently, a number of local inhabitants who were recruited to serve in the colonial army.

7. Several scholars have argued that the experiences of migration labor in South Africa stimulated political consciousness and mobilization among Mozambican migrants from different areas in the country (First 1983; Newitt 1995). I found little evidence to support a similar conclusion with relation to the migrants from Machaze. In part this may have been because many Machazians were posing illegally as South Africans and therefore generally shunned any activities (labor movements, strikes, and so forth) that might have invited unwanted official attention.

8. The Marxist notion of "false consciousness" provided a ready ideological tool by which the FRELIMO leadership justified its role as a necessary paternal vanguard in the march toward progress.

9. This term could also be used to refer to régulos themselves and to the dead régulos—as when used to refer to the "reign of the mambos" discussed in chapter 2.

10. While the concrete embodiment of this idealized structure was continuously contested at all levels by subordinates who claimed independence from, or equivalence in rank to, superordinates—or who even tried to reverse the order of the hierarchy outright, often by holding their ceremony prior to that of a superordinate authority—the principles of the system remained intact as an expression of the relational logic that connected Machazians to one another and to their ancestors in a seamless sociospiritual world. Several efforts to reverse hierarchical relationships between régulos and subchiefs were happening during my fieldwork in the late 1990s. Evidence of such changes and even of shifts in the seat of the régulo-in-chief (Mecupe) can be elicited from oral accounts and historical documents. This logic is not unlike the historically governed processes of fission and schism within extended households.

11. Much has been written about the resentment this policy occasioned elsewhere throughout the country (see Geffray 1991; Alexander 1994; Carrilho 1995; Coelho 1998; West 1998, 2005).

12. Between 1973 and 1981 petroleum as a percentage of Mozambique's total import spending rose from 6% to 21% (Abrahammson and Nilsson 1994, 132).

13. During my fieldwork the effects of Rhodesian military action were still visible in Manica and in other neighboring provinces such as Sofala and Gaza. In Sofala, Rhodesian forces destroyed key bridges along the only north-south highway. In northern Gaza Province the train yard in Mapai was destroyed by Rhodesian bombing. In the far northern Gaza border town of Chicualacuala, and in Espungabera (the border post crossed when traveling directly from Machaze to Zimbabwe in Manica Province) buildings still have pockmarks from shelling that I was surprised to find had been the result of this Rhodesian conflict (rather than the subsequent fighting between FRELIMO and RENAMO). As late as 1997, land mines laid down by Rhodesian forces were still being found on roads many kilometers inside southern Manica Province.

14. During the 1970s the South African Chamber of Mines (SACM) had grown increasingly dependent on foreign labor, particularly from Malawi and Mozambique. The vulnerabilities of this arrangement were made starkly apparent in 1974, when Malawian president Hastings Kamuzu Banda arbitrarily responded to the death of seventy-four Malawian miners in an aircraft crash by banning all Malawian labor from migration to the South African mines. Over 120,000 Malawian miners were brought home virtually overnight (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 106–7). The shortfall was made up largely through an increase in the number of Mozambicans recruited during that year, from 87,000 in 1974 to 112,000 in 1975 (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 236–37). However, the Portuguese decolonization process encouraged the SACM to revise its labor recruitment policy. The focus began to shift toward a diversification of foreign sources and to the

privileging of those more susceptible to direct South African political and economic influence (Crush, Jeeves, and Yudelman 1991, 105–12).

15. The Machazian case, as I observed it, contrasts with the ways in which the Portuguese have been reported to have been incorporated into local belief systems by anthropologists working elsewhere in Mozambique. Most notably, Harry West describes how the Portuguese were believed by some Muedans to have been initially conjured by local sorcerers and later to have actually been powerful sorcerers themselves (West 2005, 87–98). By contrast, in Machaze it was often explained to me that as a "white outsider" (*muzungo*) I was fortunate because "I was like the Portuguese and could not be troubled by uloi."

16. Relying in part on the well-known colonial report on traditional authority structures in Manica and Sofala written in 1966 by José de Melo Branquinho, Florêncio (2003) has documented a number of Portuguese attempts to intervene in local political authority structures throughout south-central Mozambique, including a number of notable cases in Machaze, which was one of the two primary subposts of the Circumscription of Mossurize. Florêncio sees in such cases more evidence for the penetration and extension of colonial power in local life than I believe is the case. When I read much of the same primary material for the post–World War II period (and additional material he does not refer to from the time of the Companhia de Moçambique's tenure) four facts stood out about the relationship between Portuguese colonial authorities and "traditional" authorities in Machaze: (1) during the nearly seventy-five-year period there were only a handful of Portuguese attempts to intervene in secession disputes or to reconfigure territorial authority in the Machaze region (although there were more in other areas); (2) many of these Portuguese efforts to bring about such changes failed outright or were abandoned in the face of resistance; (3) many of these cases can be equally read as successful efforts by particular Machazians to co-opt colonial power in secession disputes that were played out according to local sociopolitical logics rather than ones imposed by colonial ideologies or interests; and (4) Florêncio's own evidence corroborates the endless difficulties that colonial authorities confronted when trying to collect taxes and mobilize labor conscripts through local traditional authorities.

The evidence as a whole thus tends to underscore the limited leverage of colonial authorities in determining even the strategic course of local political dynamics, much less the workings of everyday local governance (e.g., dispute and conflict resolution) as experienced by the average Machazian throughout the colonial period.

17. For a striking parallel in such interpretations, see the description that West (2005) provides of how some Muedans interpreted FRELIMO's campaign against sorcery:

> Muedans who interpreted the actions of FRELIMO leaders in accordance with the scheme of *uwavi* (the local term for sorcery and the beliefs surrounding it) saw no con-

> tradiction in these leaders' behavior. . . . By simultaneously condemning sorcery and trafficking in medicinal substances, FRELIMO authorities acted much as Muedan authority figures always had. Where settlement heads once stood at night . . . calling out to sorcerers and commanding them to cease their practice . . . FRELIMO officials now stood before assemblies . . . crying out that sorcery was "a problem." . . . Many interpreted FRELIMO slogans against *uwavi* as the *enactment by FRELIMO authorities as uwavi wa kudenga—sorcery of construction.* (2005, 159–60; emphasis in original)

18. It was one of the young postcolonial government's most successful social welfare accomplishments (Abrahammson and Nilsson 1994; Hanlon 1984, 1996).

19. Interestingly, the beliefs surrounding this physical mark have evolved as the technologies of border control developed throughout the late 1990s and into the beginning of the new millennium. In interviews I conducted in 2001 and 2002 with Machazian migrants in South Africa many claimed that these marks contained latent images of Samora Machel's face that could be read by the newly installed laser machines for reading visa bar codes at South African border posts—a claim I had not heard in 1997 when I had spoken with well over one hundred migrants during eight months of continuous fieldwork in the townships in the Vereeniging area. On one of my trips in 2002 from South Africa to Mozambique I struck up a conversation with a number of South African border guards that provided an occasion to ask about this belief. One mentioned that he had heard of colleagues catering to this belief in trying to identify illegal migrants—a claim further reinforced in discussions with South African policemen in Vereeniging.

Chapter 4

1. Under General Kaúlza de Arriaga the Portuguese armed forces in Mozambique had been gradually reorganized in the early 1970s to include more black troops recruited and trained in Mozambique, so that by 1973 60% of the sixty thousand Portuguese troops in Mozambique were "native" blacks (Hall and Young 1997, 25).

2. Although the exact details of their stories are the subject of contradictory claims, both the first commander of RENAMO, Andre Matsangaissa, and his successor and the present-day leader of RENAMO, Afonso Dhalkarma, may have originally been FRELIMO officers who defected in the postindependence period after being accused of and imprisoned for corrupt practices (Vines 1991, 15–20).

3. With the independence of Angola, Mozambique, and Rhodesia the apartheid regime in South Africa found itself isolated. Seeking to discourage neighboring regimes from supporting the African National Congress, the South African government embarked in the 1980s on a policy of political and economic destabilization of these neighboring regimes. In the former Portuguese colonies

of Angola and Mozambique, in particular, it actively supported armed opposition movements to the postcolonial governments (Vines 1991; Minter 1994).

4. For some of the most important positions in this debate see Hanlon 1984, 1996; Saul 1985; Cahem 1987; Gersony 1988; Vines 1991; Hall and Young 1997; Geffray 1991; Minter 1989, 1994; Alexander 1994; McLaughlin 1992; Finnegan 1992; Dinerman 1994; Manning 1998; Wilson 1991, 1992; Englund 1995, 2002; McGregor 1998; and West 1998.

5. By most accounts the first major base was in Gorongosa in northeastern Manica Province—the first leader of RENAMO, Andre Matsangaissa, reportedly died as a result of a FRELIMO assault on this base in 1979 (Vines 1991, 16–17).

6. In his landmark study of RENAMO and its origins, Vines mislocates Garagua (map 2) in northeastern Gaza Province just south of the Save River. In fact, it is just north of the Save River in the remote southwestern corner of the present-day Mossurize District—thus it literally borders Machaze.

7. For example, RENAMO only began to have any significant impact in some northern provinces such as Nampula (Geffray 1991), Niassa (Englund 2002), and Cabo Delgado (Vines 1991) after 1984.

8. Although most white Portuguese colonists who fled Mozambique in 1974–75 migrated to Portugal (see Pires 1984 and Lubkemann 1994, 2002a, 2003), a sizeable number chose to resettle in Rhodesia or South Africa. This group included many of the most influential and militant of the colonists, some of whom (such as Jorge Jardim) had played key roles in the colonial war against FRELIMO. Many had bitterly opposed the terms of independence that had granted FRELIMO political control over the country, and they still hoped to have an impact on Mozambique's political future. Consequently, some of these colonists participated in the Rhodesian regime's efforts to subvert FRELIMO (Hall and Young 1997, 115–17).

9. Chipinge is approximately 120 kilometers from Machaze center, directly in line across the international border.

10. Initially, RENAMO was locally known as the "Matsangaiisse"—derived from the name of their first leader, Andre Matsangaissa (see Vines 1991, 74–75).

11. For a detailed discussion of villagization plans and practices under FRELIMO see Hall and Young (1997, 73–114) and Lorgen (1999); and, more generally, see Hanlon (1984), West (1998), and Coelho (1993, 1998).

12. Hall and Young point out: "That FRELIMO was more concerned about the communal villages as a way of concentrating rural populations than collective production reflected a real worry about the possibility of peasants being out of state control. As Machel put it, 'The communal villages are a political instrument because they unite and organize us and thus enable us to exercise power'" (1997, 102).

13. In at least two of the communities in which I did extensive fieldwork former milicias walked me to areas on the outskirts of former aldeias communais where groups of captives—by their accounts mostly men—were regularly executed. These small ravines choked with bush still contained bits of clothing. It was also explained to me that they were close enough to the aldeias to permit the captives

to first serve as porters before they were killed, and for the shots to be "heard as a lesson" in the aldeia—yet far enough away to prevent odors from the unburied bodies from reaching the village. Both of these areas were shunned by most of the local population during the period of my fieldwork after the war.

14. Tuck shop is a South African term for a small, home-based store or canteen in which an assortment of general merchandise (soap, drinks, and so forth) is sold. The term is also used by return migrants to refer to similar enterprises established in Machaze.

15. RENAMO received 8,611 votes to FRELIMO's 2,435 (Mazula 1995).

16. Most notably Mossurize, Sussundenga, Manica, Gorongosa, and Macossa.

17. Several such situations have given rise to postwar struggles over who is the legitimate "régulo." I observed three such struggles in process and heard details about two others in the late 1990s.

18. With a prewar population of only 82,000 (Wenzel and Bannerman 1995), and given the unknown loss of life during the war and of population movement to destinations in South Africa and Zimbabwe, it is clear that the vast majority of the population in the district fled into RENAMO areas at the outset of the war (1979–82). All available evidence points to the fact that despite widely divergent and even internally contradictory social and economic interests the vast majority fled from areas under FRELIMO's control. Given the difficulty and risks of fleeing FRELIMO communal villages during the war, most of the forty thousand Machazian refugees who ended up in UNHCR camps in Zimbabwe (1990) came from these RENAMO areas (Tandai 1992).

19. Throughout the war RENAMO's relationship with the local population in Machaze was not as strained as it was elsewhere in the country. Moreover, this relationship remained somewhat less antagonistic than that between FRELIMO and the local population for the war's duration.

20. This view also explains the results of the first national election in which RENAMO received the overwhelming majority of votes (just under 80%) in the district (Mazula 1995).

21. For several years even the postcolonial government characterized the situation in the districts where RENAMO first emerged as a matter of "armed banditry" rather than an incipient war. While labeling insurgents as "armed bandits" clearly served the political purpose of delegitimizing armed opponents later in the war, it is likely that early on such characterizations may have reflected a level of government confusion that mirrored much of the uncertainty at the local level.

Chapter 5

1. For further discussion of customary legal practice and the ontological basis of local justice in Mozambique since the colonial era, see the broad reviews by Lubkemann and Garvey (forthcoming); Abudo 1995; Narroromele 1995; Alves

1995; Ciscato 1995; Magode 1995; Lundin 1995, 1998; Mataquiha 1998; Negrão et al. 2002; Osório and Temba 2003; Meneses et al. 2003; Santos 2003; and Santos and Trindade 2003.

2. The spirits of the deceased were regarded in this sense as "persons" with a degree of their own volition and not as forces that simply served the will of living rivals. Ancestral reproach, in particular, could be triggered by any disregard for the ancestors, who inevitably resented being forgotten.

3. In many parts of the country FRELIMO established "popular tribunals" to adjudicate local disputes (Negrão et al. 2002; Santos 2003). While oral evidence suggests that a number of these tribunals were established in Machaze during the brief interregnum between independence and the war, in most localities in the district this task was simply taken over by secretarios.

4. In over three quarters of the more than 120 life histories I collected, the person recounted a story in which he or she suspected that they or a close family member had suffered from military violence because of the action of a social rival.

5. That is, she still belonged to him because he had paid lobola. This type of claim could potentially imply rights to deference from any children born to that woman.

6. Elsewhere (Lubkemann 2005a) I have suggested that the concept of "fragmented wars" may be particularly useful in explaining the dynamics of war-time violence in other contexts in which "political logics" may be described as "localist" in nature—localist in the sense that local actors are unlikely to be animated by projects that aim to replace one set of central-authority actors with another, but are likely to mobilize around projects that resist all forms of central-authority presence in local affairs. I offer the following as hypotheses about which historical and precipitating conditions may more generally lead to the susceptibility of war-time violence becoming "fragmented":

Historical conditions: (1) a national context characterized by significant sociocultural and socioeconomic variation; (2) in which historical conditions have produced a generalized political culture that revolves around efforts at local disengagement from central authority; (3) in which local forms of social authority are regarded as more legitimate than supralocal forms of national central authority; (4) in which national strategies of governance are sporadic, based on coercive force, and involve dependence on local agents (in former colonial contexts we may speak of a form of perpetuation of 'indirect rule')—a result of the central government's lack of instrumental power;

Precipitating Conditions: (5) an environment in which economic policies or conditions amplify already existing forms of local social antagonism and competition; (6) the implementation of policies of governance that directly challenge the established local sociopolitical order; (7) the emergence of political movements whose primary political agenda is the articulation of grievances against central authority (rather than stating an alternative vision of it); and (8) that has access

to sufficient means of violence (weapons) so as to mount a publicly credible challenge to the government's exercise of power at the local level. I suggest that conflicts such as those in Afghanistan (Marsden 1999; Donini, Niland and Wermester 2004), Somalia (Besteman 1999; Brons 2001), and possibly Liberia (Huband 1998; Sawyer 1992, 2005; Ellis 1999; Adebajo 2002; Pham 2004; Moran 2006) may be particularly promising cases in which to test whether these conditions produce a "fragmented war" dynamic—in which social agendas and relationships largely unrelated to those of national parties or with the struggle for national political power play a far more central role in the organization of war-time violence.

Section 3

1. The 1951 United Nations Refugee Convention defines "statutory refugees" as "individuals who are outside their own country and are unable to return as a result of a well-founded fear of persecution on grounds of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership of a social group." Refugees are entitled to safe asylum, education, and medical care and to not be repatriated against their will. The rights of refugees also include freedom of thought, of movement, and from torture or degrading treatment. The convention defines the duties of states to uphold these rights as a matter of international law. It also requires refugees to uphold the laws of their host countries and to be noncombatants. However, the vast majority of those who are forcibly uprooted from their homes do not fit the criteria that would allow them to be categorized as convention refugees. Some are displaced within their own countries. Others have been forced to move for reasons other than those specified in the convention, such as natural disasters, environmental degradation, or extreme economic duress. The number of those who are displaced worldwide is thus three or four times larger than the number of those who are officially designated as convention refugees. Those without convention status (i.e., "statutory refugees") are not entitled to the legal protections that the convention affords (Lubkemann 2004c).

Chapter 6

1. This formulation is important to any investigation of how nonportable meanings are assigned to particular locations (what economists designate as "place-specific utility"). Most notably, sacred geographies often invest specific locations—whether mountains, or shrines, or sites of dramatic events—with value and symbolism that is socially regarded as spatially nontransferable. Thus in Machaze the burial of ancestors in the district invests the district with unique qualities that most residents cannot imagine as replicable elsewhere. Such social

constructions of "space" often play a central role in motivating and organizing particular types of social behavior and even conflict. For example, at the heart of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict lies the seemingly intractable problem of mutually exclusive claims to the social value of a specific location: Jerusalem.

2. In this definition "place" remains anchored in the final analysis to space. To speak of "place" in this sense is to discuss social practices of spatialization, that is, the processes of social negotiation by which space is carved up and differentiated in ways that are meaningful to specific constituencies. There is no "natural" reason for associating a particular physical space with certain peoples and practices such that they should be seen as having more in common with each other than with those outside their borders. Thus, for example, in all likelihood the social life of someone living the northern border of Minnesota may bear closer resemblance to that of the Canadian who lives a mile away than it does to that of a compatriot living in the "same place" (i.e., the United States) on the U.S. side of the border with Tijuana, Mexico, yet the two Americans may still identify themselves as residents of the "same place" and identify their neighbors across borders as occupants of "different places." The processes by which a "place" in this sense (such as "the United States") is constituted and legitimized are always social, political, and historical. Such processes are also frequently contested in ways that are often at the very heart of contemporary geopolitical struggles. Thus whether "Jerusalem" is in "Israel" or in "Palestine," or whether there are such things as a "Palestine" or an "Israel", depends very much on your point of view—presumably as a self-ascribed "Israeli" or "Palestinian" (see Bornstein 2001).

3. In contrast to the definition of "place" used by geographers, in these usages of the term "place" space itself becomes merely one possible element, no more privileged a priori than any other, in another social construction process—what Appadurai (1996) refers to as a "structure of sentiment." Thus, for example, notions of "home" (an archetypical "place") may in some cases be more a matter of who you are with than where you are.

4. According to most Machazian oral accounts, including those with former combatants on both sides, FRELIMO and RENAMO were far more likely to forcibly recruit men then women into their ranks. While many women suffered considerable violence and in exceptional cases were required to assist RENAMO combatants (usually as temporary porters and sometimes as domestic workers), by most accounts women were not usually inducted into permanent military service. Rather they tended to be forcibly resettled in areas under the military control of their captors.

5. Civilians in areas under RENAMO control were required to make mandatory food contributions through a tributary system administered by régulos recognized or appointed for this purpose by local commanders. This system was similar to that reported in other RENAMO-held areas (Gersony 1988; Geffray 1991; Vines 1991).

6. Father, or "old man," a term of respect, in this case used ironically to highlight the old man's lack of respectful treatment.

7. In this usage the interviewee is referring to all of his father's co-wives.

8. This group also was ignored after the conflict by the humanitarian community's provision of pay and professional training for demobilized soldiers.

9. This remarkable story was later independently confirmed by two former milicias, including one who claimed to have participated in the attack.

10. Even for many of these early settlers the land they acquired in Zimbabwe was held in tenuous tenure. Anthropologist David Hughes has documented how local Zimbabwean headman used these early Mozambican refugees to press their land claims vis-à-vis the Zimbabwean government, by "authorizing" their settlement on national park lands in an effort to gain control over areas to which they technically had no legal claim. Mozambicans fleeing the conflict and seeking land were often unaware of how they were being used, and many were willing to readily accept land with such tenuous and contested tenure because they lacked better alternatives and believed their relocation would be a short-term one (Hughes 1999).

11. At the official end of hostilities in 1992 the 35,067 Machazians living in Tongogara and the 4,000 living in Chambuta made up 60% of all "official refugees" from Manica Province, and just over one-third of all Mozambicans residing in all five of the UNHCR-run refugee camps in Zimbabwe. In Tongogara, Machazians made up 85% of the camp's population (Tandai 1992, 4; Wenzel and Bannerman 1995, 22).

12. An internal UNHCR document that I was shown (but not allowed to copy) by a local UN official in the Chimoio office confirmed his own oral account of this event—in it the regional UNHCR director raised doubts about whether UNHCR should have participated in the operation at all given its inability to monitor or continue to assist those it brought back to Mozambique after they crossed the border.

13. Butiro is a régulado in the northeast of Machaze District.

14. See, for example, Harrell-Bond 1986; Daley 1991; Abdulrahim 1993; Moussa 1993; Koenig 1995; Kibreab 1995; Callamard 1996; Van Esterik 1996; Cammack 1999; Indra 1999; Lubkemann 2000c; Jacobsen 2005.

15. The international humanitarian community's perennial concern with the emergence of "dependency syndrome" was further disproved in the Machazian case by the speed with which Tongogara was eventually disbanded—just over two years after the peace accord was signed in 1992.

Chapter 7

1. Many thanks to my good friend Malangatana for graciously permitting the use of this painting for the cover. *Tabonga manigue! Kanimambo!*

2. This is one of the reasons that one of the litmus tests used in evaluating a man's status in the community and in granting him influence in the arbitration of disputes among community members as a madoda is his ability to manage disputes within his own polygynous household.

3. Much of the inspiration for my approach draws on Victor Turner's classic work, *Schism and Continuity in Ndembu Society* (1957), in which he analyzes a similar interplay of contrasting structural tendencies in the entirely different sociocultural (and non–war-time) setting of the Ndembu in Zambia. Turner's analysis of Ndembu society focused on delineating the ways a system of culturally defined social roles tended to bring particular categories of actors into social conflict with one another at specific points in a community's development in ways that ultimately produced schism—although the same logic could be applied to domestic and other levels of social units.

4. By "fully intact" I refer to situations in which two or more co-wives remained in the same union with the same man. In many relationships at least one wife remained in a marital relationship with her husband while one or more other wives did not—I refer to these latter cases as "partially intact polygynous unions."

5. Ideally I would have data on prewar polygyny from the perspective of women. However, the way the life-history survey that I conducted was structured (focusing on the respondent's social relationships) did not lead to women consistently listing their husband's (prewar) co-wives.

6. This survey was conducted in 1997, and not the 1980s, when the war was in full swing. However, women from throughout southern Africa have been extensively studied and documented as being successfully involved in the informal economy in the townships for well over two decades.

7. Interestingly, I found that those few women from Machaze brought to South Africa during the war had indeed changed their ideas about gender relations. In the course of an interview with a three of these women, one of them expressed her views unwaveringly:

> These [Mozambican] men are afraid of [South African] immigration [officials]? Bah! What they should be is afraid of *me* because of what I have to say when I go back to Machaze! I know of their other women here, and I know that they treat these women here better than their own wives in Machaze. These men buy things for them when they ask. Men even do work in the house for these women! When I say these things to other women [in Machaze] that is when these men should be afraid. They should be afraid of me!

Such statements lend some credence to Machazian men's fear that greater Machazian women's presence in South Africa will challenge men's domestic authority and relative social power. The reproduction of gendered social expectations and the household power configurations that men favored remained highly

dependent, in the view of most men, on preventing Machazian women from migrating to South Africa.

8. This strategy was pursued by several elderly men whom I interviewed in Machaze in 1996–97. When they could not locate children or spouses on their return to Machaze after the war they had negotiated lobola payments for much younger women and started new families. Such men were confident that their young wives would support them in their retirement: "I cannot find my son. So after my wife died I found this one so that I can rest my back against her in my old age."

9. In Machaze older widows rarely had many prospects for remarriage.

10. For example, I met several men whose sons (by different wives) had over forty years of difference in their ages. In one remarkable case a man had two great-grandchildren (children of a son of his eldest son) who were older than his youngest child, who had been born just months before our interview.

11. For example, Angola, Sudan, Chechnya, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo, Burundi, Somalia, Chad, Colombia, Afghanistan, Palestine, Sri Lanka, and Kashmir.

Section 4

1. It was a reasonable skepticism given the collapse of similar peace efforts in places such as Angola, Yugoslavia, Liberia, and in the Great Lakes region of East Africa. Mozambique proved to be the fortunate exception rather than the rule. It is thus important to avoid attributing the certainty that comes with 20/20 hindsight to the thinking of individuals who had just survived fifteen years of war—an easy "presentist" fallacy.

Chapter 8

1. For a review of repatriation trends, see Allen and Morsink 1993; Allen and Turton 1996; Koser and Black 1999; and Hammond 2004.

2. In late 1997 I worked closely with my team of Machazian research associates in South Africa to survey two hundred Machazian men residing in the periurban townships of the Vaal area.

3. Since the end of the war the government (FRELIMO) has pursued a more tolerant policy toward traditional authorities and has even passed legislation that has restored some of the prerogatives of régulos. Moreover, in practice (if not always stipulated by law) many régulos are permitted to perform most of the local governance functions they performed under the Portuguese (e.g., land distribution, conflict arbitration), particularly in rural areas. In other rural areas—particularly in aldeias communais—secretarios still retain local authority.

For more on this complex and evolving state of local governance in postconflict Mozambique, see Santos and Trindade (2003), West (2005), and Lubkemann and Harvey (forthcoming).

Chapter 9

1. The power of this belief and its influence in motivating migrant return has been reported in many other African societies as well (e.g., Schapera 1947; Parkin 1975; Gugler 1975, 1997, 2002; Bourdillon 1991; Geschiere and Gugler 1998; Piot 1999).

2. First introduced by Thompson (1963), the concept of "moral economy" has been variously retheorized, sometimes in mutually contradictory ways (see, for example, Hyden 1980 and Scott 1985). I take my point of departure from Harri Englund's definition of moral economy as "a continuous argument about the specific meaning and imputation of morality itself . . . [in which] . . . the focus is not on the material process of livelihood, but rather on certain qualities of relationships which may, of course, secure access to livelihood as a concomitant" (Englund 1995, 25). I take moral economies to be systems of symbolic transaction in which (1) different values are assigned to behavior by those who inhabit the social context of their performance; (2) value is assessed as a measure of performative conformity to idealized social scripts; (3) the assignment of value is a socially negotiated process; (4) such evaluations are consequential to social actors, either enabling or constraining their possibilities for social interaction and their ability to command resources, social or material; (5) to which social actors are highly responsive in formulating strategies and realizing actions (Lubkemann 2005b).

3. The term "homeboy networks" is from Mitchell 1969 and from Wilson and Wilson 1968. In responding to growing xenophobia and crime in South Africa, these networks also provided the only alternative for illegal immigrants unable to avail themselves of legal recourse to South African officials.

4. FRELIMO carried out successful immunization campaigns throughout Mozambique during the first five years of independence. Although it was able to continue those efforts successfully in many parts of Mozambique, the advent of war brought these campaigns to a halt in Machaze by 1981.

5. Some philosophers have argued that for an event in which a human being to count as an example of agency it is necessary at least that what the person does be intentional under some description, even if the agent is mistaken about that description" (1993, 95). In Giddens's view, however, agency is about doing apart from intention: "Agency concerns events in which the individual is a perpetrator. . . . Whatever happened would not have happened if that individual had not intervened. . . . I am the author of many things I do not intend to do and may not want to bring about, but nevertheless do" (1993, 96).

6. Thus, "to call them peasant intellectuals defines their historical role at moments of leadership, moments of organization, and moments of direction" (Feierman 1990, 19).

Chapter 10

1. While most Machazian migrants stated a preference to be reburied back in Machaze, economic hardships often forced many to be buried in South Africa. However, many of these were then symbolically reburied in Machaze through rituals that supposedly allowed their spirits to return to Machaze. Machava was innovative in claiming no need or desire for his spirit to ever return to Machaze.

2. Generally on this subject see Sousa-Santos and Trindade (2003), Lubkemann and Garvey (forthcoming), and West 2005, as well as the case studies by Knight 2000, Jossias 2005, Gomes et al. 2003, Waterhouse and Vijfhuizen 2001, and Gonçalves 2004. For a more extensive discussion of the evolving relationship between the post–civil war Mozambican state and local traditional authority structures among the Ndau in south-central Mozambique, see Florêncio (2003).

3. I use this term in contradistinction to the more widespread but highly problematic term "social capital." Although variously deployed by different theorists (Bourdieu 1990; Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Coleman 1994; Putnam 1993; Portes 1998; Lin 2000) they all tend to share the notion that social capital is a function of the density and breadth of social relations. Yet, as critics such as Durrenberger (2002) and Field (2003) have pointed out, it is not clear what form of value social relations necessarily generate. Being more enmeshed in denser or more extensive social networks may or may not provide an individual with more resources to draw on—since relations of hierarchy and power may equally result in such social relations restricting options and making claims on a person's resources. It thus seems analytically useful to separate out a notion of credibility value generation (i.e., "moral capital") from any a priori relationship with particular structural characteristics of social relations—such as density and extent of networks (what might still be called "social capital"). At the very least such a move fruitfully problematizes the relationship between social relations and social reputation or credibility and allows us to empirically investigate the effect of each on the other (also see Lubkemann 2005b).

4. My conceptualization of "moral capital" bears some resemblance to Englund's notion of a "moral personhood" that is constituted through demonstrated performances of categorical social prescriptions that generate trust, which Englund (2002, 158–66) argues serves in turn to constitute "authority." The concept of "moral capital" as I specifically develop it is different in a significant respect that reflects differences in our theoretical postures. My argument is that this capacity, though acquired through the realization of moral scripts, can come to inhere in individuals in a way that grants them the capacity to signify virtue (or

"trust," which is to inhabit the sign) and thus to challenge and transform those scripts themselves. Whereas Englund finds the term "capital" objectionable and too focused on the individual in referring to the authority that accumulated trust can endow, I find the term useful precisely because it can inhere in individuals in a way that empowers them as transformative agents of social relations (and not just "in" social relations); and because the term "capital" accurately conveys a sense of both the generative capacities of social authority and the tendency of that capacity to depreciate over time if it is not maintained and renegotiated through continuous social performance.

5. For an in-depth discussion of African Independent Churches since the end of the Mozambican civil war in Chimoio, see Pfeiffer (2002); for the central region, including Manica Province, see Fry (2000).

References

Primary Sources

Apontamentos à Monógrafia do Indigena, Governo da Companhia de Moçambique, Direcção dos Negócios Indígenas. 1930. *Companhia de Moçambique, Direcçãao de Negocios Indígenas—Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

CARE (Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere). 1994a. "Baseline Nutritional Survey—Machaze District (March, 1994)." *CARE International Report.* Maputo, Mozambique.

——. 1994b. "Mine Surveys and Clearance: Machaze District, Manica Province, Mozambique." *CARE International/Mine-Tech Report.* Maputo, Mozambique.

Carta ao Governador do Territorio da Companhia de Moçambique do Administrador do Distrito de Mossurize, August 11, 1933. *Companhia de Moçambique, Direcção de Negócios Indígenas-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Carta ao Governador do Territorio da Companhia de Moçambique do Administrador do Distrito de Mossurize, March 15, 1934. *Companhia de Moçambique, Direcção de Negócios Indígenas-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circular Confidencial No. 279/B/10 Direcção de Adminstração Civil. Distrito de Manica e Sofala, February 10, 1955. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1904. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1906. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1917. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual 1944. *Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala (Fundo do Distrito da Beira-Relatórios e Diarios de Servico).* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual 1950. *Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala (Fundo do Distrito da Beira-Relatórios e Diários de Serviço).* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual 1951. *Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala (Fundo do Distrito da Beira-Relatórios e Diários de Serviço).* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1901. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1908. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1909. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1913. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1915. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1916. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatóorio Annual de 1919. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1925. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1926. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1930. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1932. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1933. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1934. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1937. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório Annual de 1942. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório do Administrador, September 14, 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório do Arrolamento e Recenseamento, 1918. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório do Arrolamento e Recenseamento, 1942. *Governo Geral da Colónia De Moçambique-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Circunscrição de Mossurize—Relatório do 30 Trimestre, 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas de Joanesburgo, Relatório Annual, União de Africa do Sul, 1948. *Direcção de Serviços de Negócios Indíigenas.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Curadoria de Negócios Indígenas, Manica e Sofala—Relatório Annual 1961. *Direcção de Serviço de Negócios Indígenas.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Curadoria Geral dos Indígenas à Direcção dos Serviços de Negócios Indígenas de Moçambique—Relatório Annual 1953. *Direcção de Serviço de Negócios Indígenas.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Direcção de Negócios Indígenas, Inspecção de Manica e Mossurize, 1953. *Direcção de Administração Civil-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Direcção dos Negócios Indígenas, Inspecção de Manica e Mossurize, 1952. *Direcção de Administração Civil-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçbique.

Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique, Circular 566/D/7 of May 15, 1947. *Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Technische Zusammenarbeit). 1992. *The Sector of Small-Scale Farmers in Mozambique.* Chimoio, Mozambique: GTZ-MAARP (Maicia Agricultural Rural Reconstruction Programme).

——. 1993. *Projecto de Reintegração, Reassentamento e Reconstrução do Distrito de Mossurize.* Chimoio, Mozambique: GTZ-MAARP.

——. 1996. *Conflict Driven Migration, Post-Conflict Reintegration, and Rehabilitation 1984–1996.* Chimoio, Mozambique: GTZ-MAARP.

GTZ/UNHCR/Mine-Tech. 1994. "Reconstruction of Infrastructure and Agricultural Services in Resettlement Areas." Mines Survey Final Report. Harare, Zimbabwe.

Inspecção Ordinária do Distrito de Mossurize, 1960. *Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Inspecção Extraordinária da Provincia de Manica, 1946. *Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1944. *Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Inspecção Ordinária de Mossurize, 1946 (inclusive of Report on Auto da Banja held with Régulos in Espungabera on December 21, 1946). *Governo Geral da Colónia de Moçambique-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Letter to the Deputy Administrator of the Companhia de Mozambique from Mr. Alvaro Montez Ribas, May 23, 1938. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Mapa de Mão de Obra Recrutada na Circunscrição de Mossurize 1943–44. Espungabera, por Camilo Ferreira de Almeida, July 6, 1945. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Minter, William. 1989. "The Mozambican National Resistance Movement (RENAMO) as Described by Ex-Participants." Research report submitted to SIDA and the Ford Foundation. New York: Ford Foundation.

Monografia Psicosocial, Posto de Machaze, 1962. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Nota 114/B/15/2 Circular Confidencial do Secretário do Distrito de Manica e Sofala ao Administrador da Circunscrição de Mossurize, February 12, 1960. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Nota 90/58 da Companhia Colonial do Buzi ao Director da Secretaria Distrital de Administração Civil, Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala, 1958.

Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize. Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Nota de Referencia à Circular 345/SDI, Mossurize, May 15, 1964. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Nota No115/B/24/4/1 da Repartição Central dos Negócios Indígenas ao Agente do Curador, Mossurize, June 20, 1953. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Nunes, Jovito. 1992. "Peasants and Survival: Social Consequences of Displacement." Maputo: SIDA.

Referencia à Nota Confidencial No52/72 de 2/6/972, do Chefe do Gabinete Distrital de APSIC de Vila Pery, July 24, 1972. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Referencia Confidencial à Nota No. 3199/B/17/1 de 30-4-953 do Administrador de Mossurize ao Director da Administração Civil, May 6, 1953. *Arquivo da Circunscriçao de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório de Viagem à Mossurize—ao Sr. Conselheiro Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, July 14, 1896. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório do Auto da Banja—Mossurize, February 5, 1923. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Relatórios.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório do Director dos Serviços dos Negócios Indígenas, Curadoria Geral 1958. *Direcção de Servico de Negócios Indígenas.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório Mensal do Administrador de Mossurize, February 1949. *Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala (Fundo do Distrito da Beira-Relatórios e Diários de Serviço).* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório Sobre a Elevação da População Nativa, Circunscrição de Mossurize 30 Trimestre 1965. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório Sobre Emigração Clandestina de Indígenas-Administrador de Mossurize ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, May 22, 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório Sobre Emigração Clandestina de Indigenas do Adminstrador de Mossurize ao Govrnador do Territorio, May 22, 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório sobre Engajadores Junto à Fronteira—Administrador do sub-posto de Massangena ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, November 15, 1912. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório Sobre Prisão de Engajadores e Apprensão de Burros- Administrador

de Mossurize ao Governador da Companhia de Moçambique, January 27, 1909. *Companhia de Moçambique—Secretaria Geral-Processos.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Relatório-10. Trimestre, "Elevação da População Indígena," Administração da Circunscrição de Mossurize, April 6, 1962. *Arquivo da Circunscrição de Mossurize.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Rodgers, Graeme. 1994. "Mozambican Refugees' Attitudes to Repatriation from South Africa." Johannesburg: UNHCR-RSA.

Serviço de Agrimensura de Manica e Sofala—Relatório Annual de 1953. *Governo do Distrito de Manica e Sofala Fundo do Distrito da Beira.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Tandai, Stella. 1992. *Mozambican Refugees: Preparing for Repatriation.* Harare, Zimbabwe: Report prepared for CIES/School of Social Work, University of Zimbabwe, Harare.

UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees). 1994a. "Mission Report to RSA (Logistics Officer-Maputo)." January 17.

——. 1994b. "Migrant Labour and the UNHCR Repatriation Operation (RSA/MOZ)." December.

——. 1994c. "File Note—Economic Migrants and the RSA Repatriation Operation." November 25.

——. 1994d. "Report on Mission to South Africa." March 3.

——. 1994e. "Report on UNHCR Meeting in Nelspruit South Africa." May 27.

——. 1995a. "Mission Report—Joint NAR/UNHCR/Moz. Gov't Mission to RSA." February 11.

——. 1995b. "Lessons Learnt—Voluntary Repatriation of Mozambicans from RSA, Report." March 23.

——. 1996. "Reintegration Programme in the Southern Region Report." March 26.

UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 1996. "District Development Profile-Machaze." Maputo: UNDP.

UNOHAC (United Nations Office for Humanitarian Assistance Coordination). 1994. *Relatório Final: Programa Consolidado de Assistencia Humanitaria, 1992–1994.* Maputo: ONUM, Gabinete Coordenação da Assistencia Humanitaria.

Van der Westhuizen, J. W. 1997. "Sharpeville, Evaton, and Sebokeng: A Short History." Unpublished report for the Gauteng Provincial Administration Museum Services. Vereeniging, South Africa: Vereeninging (Teknorama) Museum.

Wenzel, Hand-Joachim, and James Bannerman. 1995. "Manica Province, Mozambique: Population Structures and Migration; Modern Development Trends." GTZ Report on Integrated Rural Development Strategy Plan. Osnabruck, Germany.

Whiteside, A., and C. Patel. 1985. "Agreements concerning the Employment of Foreign Black Labour in South Africa." Working paper. Geneva: ILO.

Secondary Sources

Abdulrahim, Dima. 1993. "Defining Gender in a Second Exile: Palestinian Women in West Berlin." In *Migrant* Women, edited by G. Buijs. New York: Berg.

Abler, Thomas. 1979. "Review of *War in Ecological Perspective,* by Andrew P. Vayda." *Ethnohistory* 26, no. 1: 86–88.

Abrahamsson, Hans, and Anders Nilsson. 1994. *Moçambique em Transição.* Maputo: Centro de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais.

Abudo, Jose. 1995. "Administração—Justiça e Terras." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Abusharaf, Rogaia. 2002. *Wanderings: Sudanese Migrants and Exiles in North America.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Adebajo, Adekeye. 2002. *Liberia's Civil War: Nigeria, ECOMOG, and Regional Security in West Africa.* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Alexander, Jocelyn. 1994. "Terra e Autoridade Política no Pós-Guerra em Moçambique: O Caso da Provincia de Manica." *Arquivo* 16, no. 3: 5–95.

Allen, Tim, and Hubert Morsink, eds. 1994. *When Refugees Go Home.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Allen, Tim, and David Turton. 1996. Introduction to *In Search of Cool Ground: War, Flight, and Homecoming in Northeast Africa,* edited by T. Allen. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Alves, Armando Melo Nobre. 1995. "Analise da Política Colonial em Relação à Autoridade Tradicional." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by I. B. Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Asad, Talal. 1979. "Anthropology and the Analysis of Ideology." *Man* 14, no. 4: 607–28.

Ashforth, Adam. 2000. *Madumo: A Man Bewitched.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Azarya, Victor. 1988. "Reordering State-Society Relations: Incorporation and Disengagement." In *The Precarious Balance: State and Society in Africa,* edited by Donald Rothchild and Naomi Chazan. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Bascom, Jonathan. 1996. "Reconstituting Households and Reconstituting Home

Areas." In *In Search of Cool Ground: War, Flight, and Homecoming in Northeast Africa,* edited by T. Allen. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

——. 1998. *Losing Place: Refugees and Rural Transformations in East Africa.* New York: Berghahn.

Beach, David. 1994. *The Shona and Their Neighbors.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Behrend, Heike. 1999. *Alice Lakwena and the Holy Spirits: War in Northern Uganda 1985–97.* Oxford: James Currey.

Bennet, Jon. 1998. "Problems and Opportunities of Displacement." In *Internally Displaced People: A Global Survey,* edited by J. Hampton. London: Earthscan.

Benson, Janet. 1994. "Reinterpreting Gender: Southeast Asian Refugees in American Society." In *Reconstructing Lives, Recapturing Meaning: Refugee Identity, Gender, and Culture Change,* edited by L. Camino and R. Krufeld. Basel, Switzerland: Gordon and Breach.

Berreman, Gerald. 1962. *Behind Many Masks: Ethnography and Impression Management in a Himalayan Village.* Monograph No. 4. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association, Society for Applied Anthropology.

Besteman, Catherine. 1999. *Unraveling Somalia: Race, Violence, and the Legacy of Slavery.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bjeren, Gunilla. 1997. "Gender and Reproduction." In *International Migration, Immobility, and Development,* edited by T. Hammar, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas, and T. Faist. New York: Berg.

Bledsoe, Caroline. 2002. *Contingent Lives: Fertility, Time, and Aging in West Africa.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bloch, Maurice. 1995. "Internal and External Memory: Different Ways of Being in History." In *Tense Past: Cultural Essays in Trauma and Memory,* edited by P. Antze and M. Lambek. London: Routledge.

Blok, Anton. 2000. "The Enigma of 'Senseless' Violence." In *Meanings of Violence: A Cross-Cultural Perspective,* edited by G. Aijmer and J. Abbink. Oxford: Berg.

Bonner, Philip. 1993. "The Russians on the Reef, 1947–57: Urbanisation, Gang Warfare and Ethnic Mobilisation." In *Apartheid's Genesis, 1935–1962,* edited by P. Bonner, P. Delius, and D. Posel. Johannesberg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Borges Coelho, João Paulo. 1993. "Protected Villages and Communal Villages in the Mozambican Province of Tete (1968–1982): A History of State Resettlement Policies, Development, and War." PhD diss., Department of History, University of Bradford.

——. 1998. "State Resettlement Policies in Post-Colonial Rural Mozambique: The Impact of the Communal Village Programme on Tete Province, 1977–1982." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24, no. 1: 61–91.

Bornstein, Avram S. 2001. *Crossing the Green Line: Between the West Bank and Israel.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Loïc Wacquant. 1992. *In Other Words: Essays towards a Reflexive Sociology.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdillon, Michael. 1991. *The Shona Peoples.* Gweru, Zimbabwe: Mambo Press.

Bowker, Robert. 2003. *Palestinian Refugees: Mythology, Identity, and the Search for Peace.* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Bozzoli, Belinda. 1991a. "The Meaning of Informal Work: Some Women's Stories." In *South Africa's Informal Economy,* edited by C. Rogerson and E. Preston-Whyte. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 1991b. *Women of Phokeng: Consciousness, Life Strategy and Migrancy in South Africa 1900–1983.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Brettell, Caroline. 1986. *Men Who Migrate, Women Who Wait.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——. 2003. *Anthropology and Migration: Essays on Transnationalism, Ethnicity, and Identity.* Walnut Creek, Calif.: Altamira Press.

Briggs, Charles. 1986. *Learning How to Ask: A Sociolingusitic Appraisal of the Role of the Interview in Social Science Research.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brons, Maria. 2001. *Society, Security, Sovereignty and the State in Somalia: From Statelessness to Statelessness?* Utrecht: International Books.

Bulcha, M. 1987. "Sociological and Economic Factors in Refugee Integration: The Case of Ethiopian Exiles." In *Refugees and Development in Africa,* edited by P. Nobel. Uppsala, Sweden: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Cahen, Michel. 1987. *La Revolution Implosee.* Paris: L'Harmattan.

——. 1996. "Unicidade, Unidade ou o Pluralismo a Estado." In *Moçambique, Etnicidades, Nacionalismo e o Estado-Transição Inacabada,* edited by José Magode. Maputo: Centro de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais.

Callamard, A. 1996. "Flour Is Power: The Gendered Division of Labour in Lisongwe Camp." In *Development and Diaspora: Gender and the Refugee Experience,* edited by W. Giles, H. Moussa, and P. Van Esterik. Dundas, Ontario: Artemis.

Cammack, Diana. 1999. "Gender Relief and Politics during the Afghan War." In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice,* edited by D. Indra. New York: Berg.

Carneiro, Robert. 1990. "Chiefdom-Level Warfare as Exemplified in Fiji and the Cauca Valley." In *The Anthropology of War,* edited by J. Haas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1994. "War and Peace: Alternating Realities in Human History." In *Studying War: Anthropological Perspectives,* edited by S. P. Reyna and R. E. Downs. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science.

Carrilho, Joao. 1995. "Administração Local e Administraçço Tradicional de Terras." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin

and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Casimiro, Isabel. 1992. *O Direito a Alimentos e a Mulher em Moçambique: Estudo de Casos na Região Sul—Projecto Sobre a Situação Legal da Mulher na Africa Austral.* Maputo: Departamento de Estudos da Mulher e do Género, Centro de Estudos Africanos, Eduardo Mondlane University.

Castles, Stephen, and M. Miller. 1993. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World.* London: Macmillan.

Chagnon, Napoleon. 1968a. "Yanamamo Social Organization and Warfare." In *War: The Anthropology of Social Conflict and Aggression,* edited by M. Fried, M. Harris, and R. Murphy. New York: Doubleday.

——. 1968b. *Yanamamo: The Fierce People.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

——. 1979. "Mate Competition, Favoring Close Kin, and Village Fissioning among the Yanamamo Indians." In *Evolutionary Biology and Human Social Behavior,* edited by N. Chagnon and W. Irons. North Situate, Mass.: Duxbury.

Chambers, Robert. 1986. "Hidden Losers? The Impact of Rural Refugees and Refugee Programs on Poorer Hosts." *International Migration Review* 20, no. 2: 245–63.

Chilundo, Arlindo. 2001. *Os Camponeses e os Caminhos de Ferro e Estradas em Nampula (1900–1961).* Maputo: Prómedia.

Chingono, Mark. 1996. *The State, Violence and Development.* Aldershot, England: Avebury Press.

Ciscato, Padre Elia. 1995. "A Dimensao Cosmológica do Político." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Clausewitz, C. von. 1968 [1832]. *Der Kriege (On War).* Translated by J. Graham. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Cohen, Roberta, and Francis Deng. 1998a. *Masses in Flight: The Global Crisis of Internal Displacement.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

——, eds. 1998b. *The Forsaken People: Case Studies of the Internally Displaced.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Cohen, Ronald. 1984. "Warfare and State Formation: Wars Make States and States Make Wars." In *Warfare, Culture and Environment,* edited by R. B. Ferguson. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.

Cole, Jennifer. 2001. *Forget Colonialism? Sacrifice and the Art of Memory in Madagascar.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Coleman, James. 1994. *Foundations of Social Theory.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Belknap Press.

Colson, Elizabeth. 1971. *The Social Consequences of Resettlement.* Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

——. 1999. "Gendering Those Uprooted by Development." In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice,* edited by D. Indra. New York: Berg.

Colson, Elizabeth, and Thayer Scudder. 1988. *For Prayer and Profit.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Comaroff, Jean. 1985. *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comaroff, Jean, and John L. Comaroff. 1999. Introduction to *Modernity and Its Malcontents,* edited by J. Comaroff and J. L. Comaroff. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Corten, Andre, and Ruth Marshall-Fratani, eds. 2001. *Between Babel and Pentecost: Transnational Pentecostalism in Africa and Latin America.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Couvane, Luis A. 1989. *As Relações Económicas Entre Moçambique e a Africa Do Sul, 1850–1964.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

——. 2001. *O Trabalho Migratório e a Agricultura no Sul de Moçambique (1920–1992).* Maputo: Prómedia.

Cox, Harvey. 1995. *Fire from Heaven: The Rise of Pentecostal Spirituality and the Reshaping of Religion in the Twenty-first Century.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Crankshaw, Owen. 1997. *Race, Class and the Changing Division of Labour under Apartheid.* New York: Routledge.

Crush, Jonathan, Allan Jeeves, and David Yudelman. 1991. *South Africa's Labor Empire: A History of Black Migrancy to the Gold Mines.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

Crush, Jonathan, and David A. MacDonald, eds. 2002. *Transnationalism and the New African Immigration to South Africa.* Ontario, Canada: Southern African Migration Project and Canadian African Studies Association.

Cuny, Frederick, and Barry Stein. 1990. "Prospects for and Promotion of Spontaneous Return." In *Refugees in International Relations,* edited by G. Loescher and L. Monahan. New York: Oxford University Press.

Curtis, Natalie. 1920. *Songs and Tales from the Dark Continent Recorded from the Singing and the Sayings of C. Kamba Simango, Ndau Tribe, Portuguese East Africa.* New York: Shirmer.

Daley, Patricia. 1991 "Gender, Displacement and Social Reproduction: Settling Burundi Refugees in Western Tanzania." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4, no. 3: 248–66.

Daneel, Marthinus. 1970. *Zionism and Faith Healing in Rhodesia.* The Hague: Mouton.

Davis, John. 1992. "The Anthropology of Suffering." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 5, no. 2: 149–61.

De Vletter, Fion. 1987. "Foreign Labour on the South African Gold Mines: New Insights on an Old Problem." *International Labour Review* 126, no. 2 (1987): 199–218.

De Vletter, Fion, and W. R. Bohning. 1987a. *Mozambican Migrant Workers in South Africa: The Impact of the Expulsion Order.* Geneva: International Labour Organisation.

——. 1987b. *The South African Mining Industry and Mozambican Migrant Labour in the 1980s: An Analysis of Recent Trends in Employment Policy.* Geneva: ILO.

DeVoe, Pamela, ed. 1992. *Selected Papers on Refugee Issues I.* Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Dinerman, Alice. 1994. "In Search of Mozambique: The Imaginings of Christian Geffray in *Le Cause des armes au Mozambique.*" *Journal of Southern African Studies* 20, no. 4: 569–86.

Divale, William, and Marvin Harris. 1976. "Population, Warfare, and the Male Supremicist Complex." *American Anthropologist* 78, no. 3: 521–38.

Dolan, Chris. 1999. "Repatriation from South Africa—Undermining Durable Solutions?" In *The End of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction,* edited by R. Black and K. Koser. New York: Berg.

Donini, Antonio, Norah Niland, and Karin Wermester. 2004. *Nation Building Unraveled? Aid, Peace, and Justice in Afghanistan.* Bloomfield, Conn.: Kumarian Press.

Dubernet, Cecile. 2001. *The International Containment of Displaced Persons.* Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate.

Durrenberger, Paul. 2002. "Why the Idea of Social Capital Is a Bad Idea." *Anthropology News* 43, no. 9: 5.

Eastmond, Marita. 2006. "Beyond Exile: Refugee Strategies in Transnational Contexts." In *Forced Migration and Global Processes: A View from Forced Migration Studies,* edited by F. Crepeau, D. Nakache, M. Collyer, N. H. Goetz, A. Hansen, R. Modi, A. Nadig, S. Spoljar-Vrzina, and L. H. M. van Willigen. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books.

Ellis, Stephen. 1999. *The Mask of Anarchy: The Destruction of Liberia and the Religious Dimension of an African Civil War.* New York: New York University Press.

——. 2002. "Interpreting Violence: Reflections on West African Wars." In *Violence,* edited by Neil L. Whitehead. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.

Ember, Melvin. 1982. "Statistical Evidence for an Ecological Explanation of Warfare." *American Anthropologist* 84, no. 3: 645–49.

Englund, Harri. 1995. "Brother against Brother: The Moral Economy of War and Displacement in the Malawi-Mozambique Borderland." PhD diss., Department of Social Anthropology, University of Manchester.

——. 2002. *From War to Peace on the Mozambique-Malawi Borderland.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Entrikin, N. 1991. *The Betweenness of Place.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Erikson, Kai. 1995. "Notes on Trauma and Community." In *Trauma: Explorations in Memory,* edited by C. Caruth. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Evans-Pritchard, Edward E. 1940. *The Nuer: A Description of the Modes of Livelihood and Political Institutions of a Nilotic People.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Farmer, Paul. 1997. "On Suffering and Structural Violence: A View from Below." In *Social Suffering,* edited by A. Kleinman, V. Das, and M. Lock. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feierman, Steven. 1990. *Peasant Intellectuals: Anthropology and History in Tanzania.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Feldman, Allen. 1991. *Formations of Violence: The Narrative of the Body and Political Terror in Northern Ireland.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Feliciano, José Fialho. 1998. *Antropologia Económica dos Thonga do Sul de Moçambique.* Maputo: Arquivo Histórico de Moçambique.

Ferguson, James. 1998. *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ferguson, R. Brian. 1983. "Warfare and Redistributive Exchange on the Northwest Coast." In *The Development of Political Organization in Native North America: 1979 Proceedings of the American Ethnological Society,* edited by E. Tooker. Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

———. 1990. "Explaining War." In *The Anthropology of War,* edited by J. Haas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1994. "The General Consequences of War: An Amazonian Perspective." In *Studying War: Anthropological Perspectives,* edited by S. P. Reyna and R. E. Downs. Amsterdam: Gordon and Breach Science.

Ferme, Mariane. 2001. *The Underneath of Things: Violence, History, and the Everyday in Sierra Leone.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Field, John. 2003. *Social Capital.* London: Routledge.

Finnegan, William. 1992. *A Complicated War: The Harrowing of Mozambique.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

First, Ruth. 1983. *Black Gold: The Mozambican Miner, Proletarian and Peasant.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Fischer, Peter, Reiner Martin, and Thomas Straubhaar. 1997. "Should I Stay or Should I Go?" In *International Migration, Immobility, and Development,* edited by T. Hammar, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas, and T. Faist. New York: Berg.

Florêncio, Fernando. 2003. *As Autoridades Tradicionais vaNdau, Estado e Política Local em Moçambique.* PhD diss., Instituto Superior de Ciencias e Tecnologias, Lisbon.

Flower, Ken. 1987. *Serving Secretly: An Intelligence Chief on Record, Rhodesia into Zimbabwe, 1964–1981.* London: John Murray.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *Power/Knowledge.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Frankel, Philip. 1979. "The Politics of Passes: Control and Change in South Africa." *Journal of Modern African Studies* 17, no. 2: 199–217.

Friedman, M., and M. Hambridge. 1991. "The Informal Sector, Gender and

Development." In *South Africa's Informal* Economy, edited by C. Rogerson and E. Preston-Whyte. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fry, Peter. 2000. "O Espirito Santo Contra o Feitiço e os Espiritos Revoltados: 'Civilização' e 'Tradição' em Moçambique." *Mana* 6, no. 2: 65–95.

Gale-Andrews, Lacey. 2005. "Home Is Who You Make It: Place, Agency, and Relationships among Fula Refugees in Guinea." PhD diss., Department of Anthropology, Brown University.

Galtung, John. 1969. "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research." *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 1: 167–91.

Gampel, Yolanda. 2000. "Reflections on the Prevalence of the Uncanny in Social Violence." In *Cultures under Siege: Collective Violence and Trauma,* edited by A. M. Robben and M. Suarez-Orozco. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Geffray, Christian. 1991. *A Causa das Armas: Antropologia da Guerra Contemporanea em Moçambique.* Lisbon: Afrontamento.

——. 2000. *Nem Pai, Nem Mãe: Crítica do Parentsco—o Caso Macua.* Maputo: Editorial Ndjira.

Gengenbach, Heidi. 1998. "'I'll Bury You in the Border!' Women's Land Struggles in Post-War Facazisse (Magude District) Mozambique." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24, no. 1: 7–36.

Gersony, Robert, 1988. *Summary of Mozambican Refugee Accounts of Principally Conflict-Related Experience in Mozambique.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. State Department.

Geschiere, Peter. 1997. *The Modernity of Witchcraft: Politics and the Occult in Postcolonial Africa.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Geschiere, Peter, and Josef Gugler. 1998. "The Urban-Rural Connection: Changing Issues of Belonging and Identification." *Africa* 68, no. 3: 309–19.

Giddens, Anthony. 1976. *New Rules of Sociological Method.* New York: Harper and Row.

——. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure, and Contradiction in Social Analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

——. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of a Theory of Structuration.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

——.1993. *The Giddens Reader.* Edited by Philip Cassell. London: Macmillan.

Giliomee, Hermann. 1985. "The Changing Political Functions of the Homelands." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Giliomee, Hermann, and Lawrence Schlemmer. 1985. "The Influx Control Fence." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Glaser, C. 1993. "'When Are They Going to Fight?' Tsotsis, Youth Politics and

the PAC." In *Apartheid's Genesis, 1935–1962,* edited by P. Bonner, P. Delius, and D. Posel. Johannesberg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Gluckman, Max. 1960. *Custom and Conflict in Africa.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Gomes, Conceição, Joaquim Fumo, Guilherme Mbilana, and Boaventura de Sousa Santos. 2003. *Os Tribunais Comunitarios. Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem de Justiças.* Vols. 1 and 2. Porto: Afrontamento.

Gonçalves, Euclides. 2004. "Local Powers and Decentralization in Southern Mozambique: The Case of the Administrative Post of Mocumbi." Master's thesis, Department of Social Anthropology, University of Capetown.

Goody, Esther. N. 1982. *Parenthood and Social Reproduction.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Goody, Jack. 1956. *The Developmental Cycle in Domestic Groups.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1976. *Production and Reproduction: A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* Translated and edited by Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey N. Smith. New York: International Publishers.

Greenberg, S., and Hermann Giliomee. 1993. "Managing Influx Control from the Rural End: The Black Homelands and the Underbelly of Privilege." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Greenhalgh, Susan. 1995. "Anthropology Theorizes Reproduction: Integrating Practice, Political-Economic and Feminist Perspectives." In *Situating Fertility: Anthropology and Demographic Inquiry,* edited by S. Greenhalgh. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greenhouse, Carol J. 2002. "Introduction: Altered States, Altered Lives." In *Ethnography in Unstable Places: Everyday Lives in the Contexts of Dramatic Political Change,* edited by C. Greenhouse, E. Mertz, and K. Warren. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gugler, Josef. 1975. "Migration and Ethnicity in Sub-Saharan Africa: Affinity, Rural Interests and Urban Alignments." In *Migration and Development: Implications for Ethnic Identity and Political Conflict,* edited by H. I. Safa and B. M. du Toit. The Hague: Mouton.

——. 1997. "Life in a Dual System Revisited: Urban-Rural Ties in Enugu, Nigeria, 1961–1987." In *Cities in the Developing World: Issues, Theory and Policy,* edited by J. Gugler. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

——. 2002. "The Son of a Hawk Does Not Remain Abroad: The Urban-Rural Connection in Africa." *African Studies Review* 45, no. 1: 21–41.

Gurr, Ted R., M. Marshall, and Deepa Khosla. 2000. *Peace and Conflict 2001: A*

Global Survey of Armed Conflicts, Self-Determination Movements, and Democracy. College Park: University of Maryland, Center for International Development and Conflict Management.

Haas, Jonathan. 1982. *The Evolution of the Prehistoric State.* New York: Columbia University Press.

——. 1990. "Warfare and the Evolution of Tribal Polities in the Prehistoric Southwest." In *The Anthropology of War,* edited by J. Haas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1992. *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays.* Boston: MIT Press.

Hagerstrand, T. 1975. "Space, Time, and the Human Condition." In *Dynamic Allocation of Urban Space,* edited by A. Karlquist. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.

Hall, Margaret. 1990. "The Mozambican National Resistance Movement (RENAMO): A Study in the Destruction of an African Country." *Africa* 60, no. 1: 39–67.

Hall, Margaret, and Tom Young. 1997. *Confronting Leviathan: Mozambique since Independence.* Athens: Ohio University Press.

Hammar, Tomas, Grete Brochmann, Kristoff Tamas, and Thomas Faist, eds. 1997. *International Migration, Immobility and Development.* New York: Berg.

Hammond, Laura. 1999. "Examining the Discourse of Repatriation: Towards a More Proactive Theory of Return Migration." In *The End of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction,* edited by R. Black and K. Koser. New York: Berghahn.

——. 2004. *This Place Will Become Home.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hampton, Janie, ed. 1998. *Internally Displaced People: A Global Survey.* London: Earthscan.

Hanlon, Joseph. 1984. *Mozambique: The Revolution under Fire.* London: Zed Books.

——. 1996. *Peace without Profit: How the IMF Blocks Rebuilding in Mozambique.* London: James Currey.

Hansen, Art. 1982. "Self-Settled Rural Refugees in Africa: The Case of Angolans in Zambian Villages." In *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement,* edited by A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

——. 1992. "Some Insights on African Refugees." In *Selected Papers on Refugees I,* edited by P. De Voe. Washington, D.C.: American Anthropological Association.

Hansen, Art, and Anthony Oliver-Smith. 1982. "Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: Causes and Contexts." In *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement,* edited by A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Harrell-Bond, Barbara. 1986. *Imposing Aid: Emergency Assistance to Refugees.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harries, Patrick. 1994. *Work, Culture and Identity: Migrant Laborers in Mozambique and South Africa 1860–1910.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Harris, Marvin. 1972. "Warfare, Old and New." *Natural History* 81, no. 3: 18–20.

———. 1979. "The Yanamamo and the Causes of War in Band and Village Societies." In *Brazil: Anthropological Perspectives; Essays in Honor of Charles Wagley,* edited by M. Margolies and W. Carter. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1984. "A Cultural Materialism Theory of Band and Village Warfare: The Yanamamo Test." In *Warfare, Culture, and Environment,* edited by R. B. Ferguson. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.

Herskovits, Melville J. 1923. "Some Property Concepts and Marriage Customs of the VaNdau." *American Anthropologist* 25, no. 3: 376–84.

Hinton, Alex. 2005. *Why Did They Kill? Cambodia in the Shadow of Genocide.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschman, Albert O. 1970. *Exit, Voice and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hoffman, Danny. 2005. "Violent Events as Narrative Blocs: The Disarmament at Bo, Sierra Leone." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 2: 329–54.

Hoffman, Danny, and Stephen Lubkemann. 2005. "Warscape Ethnography in West Africa and the Anthropology of 'Events'." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 2: 315–28.

Honwana, Alcinda. 2000. "Innocents et coupables: Les enfants-soldats comme acteurs tactiques." *Politique Africaine* 80: 58–78.

———. 2002. *Espiritos Vivos, Tradições Modernas: Possessão de Espiritos e Reintegração Social Pós-Guerra no Súl de Moçambique.* Maputo: Prómedia.

Huband, Mark. 1998. *The Liberian Civil War.* London: Frank Cass.

Hughes, David. 1999. "Frontier Dynamics: Struggles for Land and Clients on the Zimbabwe-Mozambique Border." PhD diss., Department of Anthropology, University of California—Berkeley.

Human Rights Watch. 1992. *Conspicuous Destruction: War, Famine, and the Reform Process in Mozambique.* New York: Human Rights Watch.

Hutchinson, Sharon. 1996. *Nuer Dilemmas: Coping with Money, War, and the State.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hyden, Goran. 1980. *Beyond Ujamaa in Tanzania: Underdevelopment and an Uncaptured Peasantry.* London: Heinemann.

Igreja, Victor. 2002. "Why Are the Many Drums Playing Until the Dawn? Exploring the Role of Gamba Spirits and Healers in Postwar Recovery in Gorongosa." Presentation at the Institute for Ethnographic Research, George Washington University, Washington, D.C., November.

———. 2003. "A History of Neglect and Denial of Medical Pluralism in Mozambique." *In Mental Health: Global Policies and Human Rights,* edited by Peter Morrall and Mike Hazelton. Philadelphia: Whurr.

Indra, Doreen. 1999. "Not a Room of One's Own: Engendering Forced Migration Knowledge and Practice." In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice,* edited by D. Indra. New York: Berg.

Instituto Nacional de Estatistica. 1999. *II Recenseamento Geral da População e Habitação 1997, Resultados Definitivos.* Maputo: Instituto Nacional de Estatistica.

International Labour Organisation. 1987. "The South African Mining Industry and Mozambican Migrant Labour in the 1980s: An Analysis of Recent Trends in Employment Policy." *International Migration for Employment Working Paper.* Geneva: ILO.

Isaacman, Allen. 1973. "Madzi-Manga, Mhondoro and the Use of Oral Tradition—A Chapter in Barue Religious and Political History." *Journal of African History* 14, no. 1: 395–409.

——. 1983. *Mozambique: From Colonialism to Revolution, 1900–1982.* Boulder, Colo.: Westview.

——. 1996. *Cotton Is the Mother of Poverty.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Jacobsen, Karen. 2005. *The Economic Life of Refugees.* Bloomfield, Conn.: Kumarian Press.

Janzen, John. 2004. "Illusions of Home in the Story of a Rwandan Refugee's Return." In *Coming Home? Refugees, Migrants, and Those Who Stayed Behind,* edited by L. Long and E. Oxfeld. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jezequel, Jean-Herve. 2004. "Liberia: Orchestrated Chaos." In *In the Shadow of "Just Wars": Violence, Politics, and Humanitarian Action,* edited by Fabrice Weissman. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Johnston, Anton. 1989. *Study, Produce and Combat! Education and the Mozambican State 1962–1984.* Studies in Comparative and International Education No. 14. Stockholm: University of Stockholm, Institute of International Education.

Jones, Stuart, and Andre Muller. 1992. *The South African Economy, 1910–1990.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Jossias, Elisio. 2005. "Autoridades Locais em Moçambique: Dinamicas e Processos de Sua Articulação em Matola." Presentation at the "Seminario Internacional: Uma Avaliação do Decreto 15/2000 sobre a Politica de Descentralização: Experiencias, Obstaculos, e Possibilidades," Maputo, May 12–13.

Junod, Henri A. 1927. *The Life of a South African Tribe.* London: Macmillan.

Kaplan, Robert. 1993. "The Coming Anarchy: How Scarcity, Crime, Overpopulation, and Disease Are Rapidly Destroying the Social Fabric of Our Planet." *Atlantic Monthly* (February): 44–78.

Kearney, Michael. 1986. "From the Invisible Hand to Visible Feet: Anthropological Studies of Migration and Development." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15: 331–61.

Kertzer, David, and Nancy Karweit. 1986. "Data-base Management for Life-

Course Family Data." In *Family Relations in Life Course Perspective,* edited by D. Kertzer. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press.

Kertzer, David, and A. Sciaffino. 1986. "Historical Demographic Methods of Life-Course Study." In *New Methods of Old Age Research,* edited by C. Fry and J. Keith. New York: Praeger.

Kibreab, Gaim. 1985. *African Refugees: Reflections on the African Refugee Problem.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

——. 1991. "The State of the Art Review of Refugee Studies in Africa." *Uppsala Papers in Economic History, Research Report* 26. Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University, Department of Economic History.

——. 1995. "Eritrean Women Refugees in Khartoum, Sudan, 1970–90." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 8, no. 1: 1–25.

Klimt, Andrea, and Stephen Lubkemann, eds. 2002. *Arguments across the Portuguese Diaspora.* Special issue of *Diaspora* 11, no. 2: 1–141.

Knight, Rachel. 2000. "Camponeses' Realities: Their Experiences and Perceptions of the 1997 Land Law." Unpublished manuscript, Eduardo Mondlane University.

Koenig, Dolores. 1995. "Women and Resettlement." In *The Woman and International Development Annual,* edited by R. Gallin, A. Ferguson, and J. Harper. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Kopytoff, Igor. 1971. "Ancestors as Elders in Africa." *Africa* 41, no. 1: 129–42.

Koser, Khalid, and Richard Black. 1999. "The End of the Refugee Cycle?" In *The End of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction,* edited by R. Black and K. Koser. New York: Berghahn.

Kritz, Mary, L. Lim, and Hania Zlotnik. 1992. *International Migration Systems: A Global Approach.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Krohn-Hansen, Christian. 1994. "The Anthropology of Violent Interaction." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 50: 367–81.

Krufeld, Ruth. 1994. "Buddhism, Maintenance, and Change: Reinterpreting Gender in a Lao Refugee Community." In *Reconstructing Lives, Recapturing Meaning: Refugee Identity, Gender, and Culture Change,* edited by L. Camino and R. Krufeld. Basel: Gordon and Breach.

——. 1997. "When the 'Powerless Take Control': Self-Empowerment through Organization Building among Lao Refugee Women." In *Beyond Boundaries,* edited by D. Baxter and R. Krufeld. Arlington, Va.: American Anthropological Association.

Kuhlman, Thomas. 1991. "The Economic Integration of Refugees in Developing Countries: A Research Model." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4, no. 1: 1–20.

Kulig, Judith. 1994. "Old Traditions in a New World: Changing Gender Relations among Cambodian Refugees." In *Reconstructing Lives, Recapturing Meaning: Refugee Identity, Gender, and Culture Change,* edited by L. Camino and R. Krufeld. Basel: Gordon and Breach.

Kunz, Egon F. 1973. "The Refugee in Flight: Kinetic Models and Forms of Displacement." *International Migration Review* 7, no. 1: 125–46.

——. 1981. "Exile and Resettlement: Refugee Theory." *International Migration Review* 5, no. 1: 42–51.

Lan, David. 1985. *Guns and Rain: Guerrillas and Spirit Mediums in Zimbabwe.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Liesegang, Gerhard. 1983. "Notes on the Internal Structure of the Gaza Kngdom of Southern Mozambique 1840–1895." In *Before and after Shaka,* edited by J. B. Peires. Grahamstown, South Africa: Institute of Social and Eeconomic Research.

——. 1993. "Droughts and Famines: Nothing New in Mozambique." *MSF-CIS Bulletin* 18, no. 1: 27–33.

Lin, Nan. 2000. *Social Capital: A Theory of Structure and Action.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lorgen, Christy Cannon. 1999. *The Experience of Villagisation: Lessons from Ethiopia, Mozambique and Tanzania.* London: Oxfam-GB.

Lubkemann, Stephen. 1994. "Contested Identities: The Narrative Construction of Refugee Identity in Portugal in the Wake of Decolonization." Master's thesis, Department of Anthropology, Brown University.

——. 1998. "Local Productions of Violence and Displacement in Mozambique." Paper presented at the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences Congress, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, July 28.

——. 2000a. "Situating Wartime Migration in Central Mozambique: Gendered Social Struggle and the Transnationalization of Polygyny." PhD diss., Department of Anthropology, Brown University.

——. 2000b. "The Transformation of Transnationality among Mozambican Migrants in South Africa." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 34, no. 1: 41–63.

——. 2000c. "Other Motives, Other Struggles: Gender Politics and the Shaping of Wartime Migration in Mozambique." In *Selected Papers on Refugees and Immigrants VIII,* edited by E. Godziak and D. J. Shandy. Arlington, Va.: American Anthropological Association.

——. 2000d. "Sociocultural Factors Shaping the Mozambican Repatriation Process." In *Humanitarian Action: Social Science Connections,* edited by S. Lubkemann, L. Minear, and T. Weiss. Providence: Brown University, Watson Institute for International Studies.

——. 2001. "Foreign Aid, Local Capacity, and Civil Society in the Reconstruction of Mozambique's National Health System." In *Patronage and Partnership: Local Capacity Building in Humanitarian Crisis,* edited by Ian Smillie. West Hartford, Conn.: Kumarian Press.

——. 2002a. "The Moral Economy of Portuguese Post-Colonial Return." *Diaspora* 11, no. 4: 189–214.

——. 2002b. "Where to Be an Ancestor? Reconstituting Socio-Spiritual Worlds

and Post-Conflict Settlement Decision-Making among Displaced Mozambicans." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 15, no. 2: 189–212.

———. 2002c. "Ambiguous Intimacies: Transnationalism and the Gendered Politics of Anti-Mozambican Sentiment in Peri-Urban South Africa." *Afriche e Oriente* 4, no. 2: 79–95.

———. 2003. "Race, Class, and Kin in the Negotiation of 'Internal Strangerhood' among Portuguese Retornados 1975–2000." In *Europe's Invisible Migrants,* edited by A. Smith. Netherlands: University of Amsterdam Press.

———. 2004a. "Situating Migration in Wartime and Post-War Mozambique: A Critique of Forced Migration Research." In *Categories and Contexts: Anthropological Studies in Critical Demography—IUSSP Studies in Social Demography,* edited by S. Szreter, A. Dharmalingam, and H. Sholkamy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2004b. "Reduzir o Colonialismo à sua Real Dimensão: A Migração Internacional entre os Moçambicanos do Centro Sul, 1900–1999." In *A Peristencia da Historia: Passado e Contemporaneidade em Africa,* edited by J. Pina-Cabral and C. Carvalho. Lisbon: Imprensa de Ciencias Sociais.

———. 2004c. "Refugees: The Anthropology of Worldwide Displacement and International Response." In *Anthropology Explored,* edited by R. Selig. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.

———. 2004d. "Global Locals and Political Process in War-torn Nations: The Liberian Diaspora in War-Making and Peace-Building." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the African Studies Association, November 11–13, New Orleans.

———. 2005a. "Migratory Coping in Wartime Mozambique: An Anthropology of Violence and Displacement in 'Fragmented Wars.'" *Journal of Peace Research* 42, no. 4: 493–508.

———. 2005b. "The Moral Economy of Non-Return among Socially Diverted Migrants from Portugal and Mozambique." In *Migration and Economy: Global and Local Dynamics,* edited by L. Trager. New York: Altamira Press.

———. 2005c. "Unsettling the Metropole: Decolonization, Migration, and National Identity in Postcolonial Portugal." In *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies,* edited by C. Elkins and S. Pedersen. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Lubkemann, Stephen, and Orlando Esteves. 2004 *Malangatana on Malangatana: Nation and the Artist's Heart: A Documentary Film.* Lisbon: Fortress Video Productions.

Lubkemann, Stephen, and Jennifer Garvey. Forthcoming. "'Traditional Authority' and 'Customary Law' in the First Post-Conflict Decade in Mozambique." In *Justice and Rule of Law in War-Torn Societies: The Role of Customary Law in Comparative Perspective,* edited by D. Isser. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute for Peace.

Lubkemann, Stephen, Larry Minear, and Thomas G. Weiss. 2000. "The Social Dimensions of Forced Migration: Practitioner Needs, Policy Sensitivities, and Social Science." In *Humanitarian Action: Social Science Connections,* edited by S. Lubkemann, L. Minear, and T. Weiss. Providence: Brown University, Watson Institute for International Studies.

Luedcke, Tracy. 2002. "Visions of the Prophets: Memory and History in Healing in Northern Tete Province, Mozambique." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the African Studies Association, Washington, D.C., December 8.

Lundin, Iraê Baptista. 1995. "Pesquisa Piloto sobre a Autoridade/Poder Tradicional em Moçambique." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Bapista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

——. 1996. "Realidades Sócio-culturais e Modelos Sócio-Politicos: Um Problema de Democratização." In *Moçambique, Etnicidades, Nacionalismo e o Estado-Transição Inacabada,* edited by José Magode. Maputo: Centro de Estudos Estratégicos e Internacionais.

——. 1998. "Relatório de Trabalho de Campo Realizado em Manica/Sofala." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 2, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Machel, Samora. 1985. *Samora Machel, an African Revolutionary: Selected Speeches and Writings.* Edited by Barry Munslow. London: Zed Books.

Mageo, Jeannette M., and Bruce M. Knauft. 2002. "Introduction: Theorizing Power and the Self." In *Power and the Self,* edited by J. Mageo. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Magode, Jose J. 1995. "Subsidios Para o Estudo da Autoridade/Poder Tradicional em Moçambique." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Malkki, Liisa. 1992. "National Geographic: The Rooting of Peoples and the Territorialization of National Identity among Scholars and Refugees." *Cultural Anthropology* 7, no. 1: 24–43.

——. 1995a. "Refugees and Exile: From 'Refugee Studies' to the 'National Order of Things.'" *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24: 495–523.

——. 1995b. *Purity and Exile: Violence, Memory, and National Cosmology among Hutu Refugees in Tanzania.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1997. "Speechless Emissaries: Refugees, Humanitarianism and Dehistoricizaton." In *Siting Culture: The Shifting Anthropological Object,* edited by K. F. Olwig and K. Hastrup. London: Routledge.

Malmberg, Gunnar. 1997. "Time and Space in International Migration." In *International Migration, Immobility, and Development,* edited by T. Hammar, G. Brochmann, K. Tamas, and T. Faist. New York: Berg.

Manning, Carrie. 1998. "Constructing Opposition in Mozambique: RENAMO as Political Party." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24, no. 1: 161–89.

Marsden, Peter. 2002. *The Taliban: War and Religion in Afghanistan.* London: Zed Books.

Martin, Susan. 1992. *Refugee Women.* London: Zed Books.

Marx, Emmanuel. 1990. "The Social World of the Refugee: A Conceptual Framework." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 3, no. 1: 189–203.

Massey, Douglas. 1994. "Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal." *Population and Development Review* 19, no. 1: 431–66.

Massey, Douglas, R. Alarcon, J. Durand, and H. Gonzales. 1987. *Return to Aztlan: The Social Processes of International Migration from Western Mexico.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mataquiha, Januario. 1998. "Relatório de Trabalho de Campo Realizado em Nampula." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Matsuoka, Atsuoko, and John Sorenson. 1999. "Eritrean Canadian Refugee Households as Sites of Gender Renegotiation." In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice,* edited by D. Indra. New York: Berghahn.

——. 2001. *Ghosts and Shadows: Construction of Identity and Community in an African Diaspora.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mazula, Brazão. 1995. *Moçambique: Eleições, Democraçia, e Desenvolvimento.* Maputo: Commissão Nacional de Eleicões.

Mazur, R. 1989. "The Political Economy of Refugee Creation in Southern Africa: Micro and Macro Issues in Sociological Perspective." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 2, no. 4: 441–67.

McGregor, Jo Ann. 1998. "Violence and Social Change in a Border Economy: War in the Maputo Hinterland, 1984–1992." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24, no. 1: 37–60.

McLaughlin, Bridget. 1992. "Interpretations Matter: Evaluating the War in Mozambique." *Southern Africa Report* 7, no. 3: 22–33.

McSpadden, Lucia A. 1996. "Returning Home? The Decision-Making Processes of Eritrean Women and Men." In *Development and Diaspora: Gender and the Refugee Experience,* edited by W. Giles and H. Moussa. Dundas, Ontario: Artemis Press.

——. 1999. "Negotiating Masculinity in the Reconstruction of Social Place: Eritrean and Ethiopian Refugees in the United States and Sweden." In *Engendering Forced Migration: Theory and Practice,* edited by D. Indra. New York: Berg.

Meneses, Maria Paula, Joaquim Fumo, Guilherme Mbilana, and Conceição Gomes. 2003. "As Autoridades Tradicionais no Context do Pluralismo Jurídico." In *Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem de Justiças,* vol. 2, edited by B. Santos and J. Trindade. Porto: Afrontamento.

Merton, Robert K. 1987. "Three Fragments from a Sociologist's Notebook: Establishing the Phenomenon, Specified Ignorance, and Strategic Research Materials." *Annual Review of Sociology* 13: 1–28.

Messiant, Christine. 2004. "Angola: Woe to the Vanquished." In *In the Shadow of "Just Wars": Violence, Politics, and Humanitarian Action,* edited by Fabrice Weissman. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Minaar, Anthony. 1993. "Hostels and Violent Conflict on the Reef." In *Communities in Isolation: Perspectives on Hostels in South Africa,* edited by A. Minaar. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Minter, William. 1994. *Apartheid's Contras: An Inquiry into the Roots of War in Angola and Mozambique.* London: Zed Books.

Minter, William, and G. Clarence-Smith. 1989. "Correspondence." *Southern African Review of Books* (June–July): 22–23.

Mitchell, J. Clyde. 1969. *Social Networks in Urban Situations.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Moller, Valerie, and Lawrence Schlemmer. 1985 "Migrant Workers: A Profile of Their Rural Resources." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Moran, Mary. 2005. "Time and Place in the Anthropology of Events: A Diaspora Perspective on the Liberian Transition." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 2: 457–64.

———. 2006. *Liberia: The Violence of Democracy.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Moussa, Helene. 1993. *Storm and Sanctuary: The Journey of Ethiopian and Eritrean Women Refugees.* Dundas, Ontario: Artemis Press.

Murray, Colin. 1980. "Migrant Labor and Changing Family Structure in the Rural Periphery of Southern Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 6, no. 2: 139–56.

———. 1981. *Families Divided: The Impact of Migrant Labour in Lesotho.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nandy, Ashis. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self under Colonialism.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Narroromele, Albano. 1995. "Nao há Alternativa ao Poder/Autoridade Tradicional no Planalto de Mueda." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 1, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Negrão, José. 1995. *One Hundred Years of African Rural Family Economy: The Zambezi Delta in Retrospective Analysis.* Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Lund.

Negrão, José, João Donato, Telma Mbeve, and Sandra Bulha. 2002. "O Papel dos Tribunais Comunitários na Prevenção e Resolução de Conflitos de Terras e Outros Cruzeiro do Sul—IID." *FAO—Projecto Centro de Formação Jurídica*

e JudiciáriaJ GCP/MOZ/069/NET (2002). http://www.iid.org.mz/Tribunais_Comunitarios.pdf.

Neves, Joel. 1998. "Economy, Society and Labour Migration in Central Mozambique, 1930–1965: A Case Study of Manica Province." PhD thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Newitt, Malyn. 1995. *A History of Mozambique.* London: Hurst and Company.

Niehaus, Isaak, Eliazaar Mohlala, and Kally Shokane. 2001. *Witchcraft, Power, and Politics.* London: Pluto Press.

Nordstrom, Carolyn. 1997. *A Different Kind of War Story.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Norwegian Refugee Council. 2002. *Internally Displaced People: A Global Survey.* 2nd ed. London: Earthscan.

Omidian, Patricia. 1996. *Aging and Family in an Afghan Refugee Community: Transition and Transformation.* New York: Garland.

Osório, Conceição, and Elália Temba. 2003. "A Justica no Feminino." In *Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem de Justiças,* vols. 1 and 2, edited by B. Santos and J. Trindade. Porto: Afrontamentó.

Otterbein, Keith. 1970. *The Evolution of War: A Cross-Cultural Study.* New Haven, Conn.: HRAF Press.

Parkin, David, ed. 1975. *Town and Country in Central and East Africa.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parkin, David, and D. Nyamwaya, eds. 1987. *Transformations of African Marriage.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Pels, Peter. 1998. "The Magic of Africa: Reflections on a Western Commonplace." In *Conflicting Scenarios in Postcolonial Africa,* edited by Diane M. Ciekawy and Peter Geschiere. Special issue of *African Studies Review* 41, no. 3: 193–209.

Penvenne, Jeanne. 1995. *African Workers and Colonial Racism: Mozambican Strategies and Struggles in Lourenco Marques 1877–1962.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Peteet, Julie. 1995. "Transforming Trust: Dispossession and Empowerment among Palestinian Refugees." In *Mistrusting Refugees,* edited by E. V. Daniel and J. C. Knudsen. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pfeiffer, James. 2002. "African Independent Churches in Mozambique: Healing the Afflictions of Inequality." *Medical Anthropological Quarterly* 16, no. 2: 176–99.

Pham, John-Peter. 2004. *Liberia: Portrait of a Failed State.* New York: Reed Press.

Piot, Charles. 1999. *Remotely Global: Village Modernity in West Africa.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pires, Rui Pena. 1984. *Os Retornados: Um Estudo Sociográfico.* Lisbon: Instituto de Estudos Para o Desenvolvimento.

Pitcher, Anne. 1995. "From Coercion to Incentives: The Portuguese Colonial

Cotton Regime in Angola and Mozambique." In *Cotton, Colonialism and Social History in Sub-Saharan Africa,* edited by A. Isaacman and R. Roberts. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

——. 2002. *Transforming Mozambique: The Politics of Privatization 1975–2000.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Portes, Alejandro. 1998. "Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 1–24.

Posel, Deborah. 1993. "Influx Control and Urban Labour Markets in the 1950s." In *Apartheid's Genesis, 1935–1962,* edited by P. Bonner, P. Delius, and D. Posel. Johannesberg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Posel, P., P. Delius, and D. Posel. 1993. "The Shaping of Apartheid: Contradiction, Continuity, and Popular Struggle." In *Apartheid's Genesis, 1935–1962,* edited by P. Bonner, P. Delius, and D. Posel. Johannesberg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Preston-Whyte, Eleanor. 1991. "Invisible Workers: Domestic Service and the Informal Economy." In *South Africa's Informal Economy,* edited by C. Rogerson and E. Preston-Whyte. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

——. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Ranger, Terence. 1994. "Studying Repatriation as Part of African Social History." In *When Refugees Go Home,* edited by T. Allen and H. Morsink. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Rennie, John K. 1973. "Christianity, Colonialism, and the Origins of Nationalism among the Ndau of Southern Rhodesia, 1890–1935." PhD diss., Department of History, Northwestern University.

Richards, Audrey. 1935. "A Modern Movement of Witch-finders." *Africa* 8, no. 4: 448–61.

Richards, Paul. 1996. *Fighting for the Rainforest: War, Youth and Resources in Sierra Leone.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

——. 2004. "New War: An Ethnographic Approach." In *No Peace, No War: An Anthropology of Contemporary Armed Conflicts,* edited by P. Richards. Athens: Ohio University Press.

——. 2005. "War as Smoke and Mirrors: Sierra Leone 1991–92, 1994–95, 1995–96." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 2: 377–402.

Riches, David. 1986. "The Phenomenon of Violence." In *The Anthropology of Violence,* edited by D. Riches. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Richmond, Anthony. 1988. "Sociological Theories of International Migration: The Case of Refugees." *Current Sociology* 36, no. 2: 7–26.

Robben, Antonius M. 2000a. "State Terror in the Netherworld: Disappearance and Reburial in Argentina." In *Death Squad: The Anthropology of State Terror,* edited by Jeffrey Sluka. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

——. 2000b. "The Assault on Basic Trust: Disappearance, Protest, and Reburial in Argentina." In *Cultures under Siege: Collective Violence and Trauma,* edited by A. M. Robben and M. Suarez-Orozco. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Roesch, Otto. 1991. "Migrant Labour and Forced Rice Production in Southern Mozambique: The Colonial Peasantry of the Lower Limpopo Valley." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 17, no. 1: 239–70.

——. 1992. "Renamo and the Peasantry in Southern Mozambique: A View from Gaza Province." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 26, no. 3: 462–84.

Rogge, John, ed. 1987. *Refugees: A Third World Dilemma.* Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Ruiz, Hiram. 1998. "The Sudan: Cradle of Displacement." In *The Forgotten People: Case Studies of the Internally Displaced,* edited by R. Cohen and F. Deng. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa. 2003. "O Estado Heterogéneo e o Pluralismo Juridico." In *Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem de Justiças,* vol. 1, edited by B. Santos and J. Trindade. Porto: Afrontamento.

Santos, Boaventura de Sousa, and João Carlos Trindade, eds. 2003. *Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem das Justiças em Moçambique.* Vols. 1 and 2. Porto: Afrontamento.

Saul, John. 1985. *A Difficult Road: The Transition to Socialism in Mozambique.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Sawyer, Amos. 1992. *The Emergence of Autocracy in Liberia: Tragedy and Challenge.* San Francisco: ICS Press.

——. 2005. *Beyond Plunder: Toward Democratic Governance in Liberia.* Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner.

Schapera, Isaac. 1947. *Migrant Labour and Tribal Life.* London: Oxford University Press.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy. 1993. *Death without Weeping: The Violence of Everyday Life in Brazil.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scheper-Hughes, Nancy, and Philippe Bourgois. 2004. "Introduction: Making Sense of Violence." In *Violence in War and Peace: An Anthology,* edited by N. Scheper-Hughes and P. Bourgois. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schlemmer, Lawrence. 1985. "Squatter Communities: Safety Valves in the Rural-Urban Nexus." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Schlemmer, Lawrence, and V. Moller. 1985. "Constraint, Stress, and Reaction: The Responses of Migrant Contract Workers to Their Situation." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Sciulli, David. 1986. "Voluntaristic Action as a Distinct Concept: Theoretical Foundations of Societal Constitutionalism." *American Sociological Review* 51, no. 6: 743–66.

Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scudder, Thayer, and Elizabeth Colson. 1982. "From Welfare to Development: A Conceptual Framework for the Analysis of Dislocated People." In *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement,* edited by A. Hansen and A. Oliver-Smith. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Shahrani, M. Nazif. 1995. "Afghanistan's Muhajirin (Muslim 'Refugee Warriors'): Politics of Mistrust and Distrust of Politics." In *Mistrusting* Refugees, edited by E. V. Daniel and J. C. Knudsen. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Sheldon, Kathleen. 2002. *Pounders of Grain: A History of Women, Work, and Politics in Mozambique.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Silva, Alvaro. 1998. "Relatório do Trabalho de Campo Realizado em Tete." In *Autoridade e Poder Tradicional,* vol. 2, edited by Iraê Baptista Lundin and F. J. Machava. Maputo: Ministério da Administração Estatal—Núcleo de Desenvolvimento Administrativo.

Smit, Philip. 1985. "The Process of Black Urbanization." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Smith, Daniel J. 2001. "Ritual Killing, '419' and Fast Wealth: Inequality and the Popular Imagination in Southeastern Nigeria." *American Ethnologist* 28, no. 4: 1–24.

Sommers, Marc. 2001. *Fear in Bongoland: Burundi Refugees in Urban Tanzania.* New York: Berghahn.

Spencer, Leon P. 1975. "Toward an African Church: Kamba Simango, Fred R. Bunker, and the Lowlands of Mozambique, 1893–1945." Paper presented at the 18th Annual Meeting of the African Studies Association, San Francisco, October 29.

Stefansson, Anders. 2004. "Sarajevo Suffering: Homecoming and the Hierarchy of Homeland Hardship." In *Homecomings: Unsettling Paths of Return,* edited by F. Markowitz and A. Stefansson. Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books.

Stepputat, Finn. 1999. "Repatriation and Everyday Forms of State Formation in Guatemala." In *The End of the Refugee Cycle? Refugee Repatriation and Reconstruction,* edited by R. Black and K. Koser. New York: Berghahn Books.

Strathern, Marilyn. 1988. *The Gender of the Gift: Problems with Women and with Society in Melanesia.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo. 1992. "A Grammar of Terror: Psychocultural Responses to State Terrorism in 'Dirty War' and Post-'Dirty-War' Argentina." In *The Paths to Domination, Resistance, and Terror,* edited by C. Nordstrom and J. Martin. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo, and Antonius Robben. 2000. "Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Violence and Trauma." In *Cultures under Siege: Collective Violence and Trauma,* edited by A. Robben and M. Suarez-Orozco. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tambiah, Stanley. 1986. *Sri Lanka: Ethnic Fratricide and the Dismantling of Democracy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, Christopher. 1999. *Sacrifice as Terror: The Rwandan Genocide of 1994.* Oxford: Berg.

Thompson, E. P. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class.* London: Victor Golancz.

Tomlinson, Barry Neil. 1979. "The Growth of Colonial Economies and the Development of African Labour: Manica and Sofala and the Mozambican Chartered Company 1897–1942." In *Mozambique Seminar Proceedings,* December 1–2, 1978. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, Centre for African Studies.

Tonkin, Elizabeth. 1992. *Narrating Our Pasts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Townsend, Nicholas. 1997. "Men, Migration and Households in Botswana: An Exploration of Connections over Time and Space." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 23, no. 3: 405–19.

Trindade, João C. 2003. "Rupturas e Continuidades nos Processos Politícos e Juridicos." In *Conflito e Transformação Social: Uma Paisagem de Justiças,* vol. 2, edited by B. Santos and J. C. Trindade. Porto: Afrontamento.

Turner, Victor. 1957. *Schism and Continuity in an African Society.* Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Turton, David. 1996. "Migrants and Refugees." In *In Search of Cool Ground,* edited by T. Allen. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

——. 2005. "The Meaning of Place in a World of Movement: Lessons from Long-Term Field Research in Southern Ethiopia." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 18, no. 3: 258–80.

Urdang, Stephanie. 1989. *And Still They Dance: Women, War and the Struggle for Change in Mozambique.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Utas, Mats. 2005. "Victimcy, Girlfriending, Soldiering: Tactic Agency in a Young Woman's Social Navigation of the Liberian War Zone." *Anthropological Quarterly* 78, no. 2: 403–30.

Uvin, Peter. 1998. *Aiding Violence: The Development Enterprise in Rwanda.* New York: Kumarian Press.

Vail, Leroy. 1976. "Mozambique's Chartered Companies: The Rule of the Feeble." *Journal of African History* 17, no. 3: 389–416.

——, ed. 1991. *The Creation of Tribalism in Southern Africa.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Vail, Leroy, and Landeg White. 1980. *Capitalism and Colonialism in Mozambique.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Van Esterik, Peggy. 1996. "Food and Refugee Experience: Gender and Food in Exile, Asylum and Repatriation." In *Development and Diaspora: Gender and the Refugee Experience,* edited by W. Giles, H. Moussa, and P. Van Esterik. Dundas, Ontario: Artemis Press.

Van Hear, Nicholas. 1998. *New Diasporas: The Mass Exodus, Dispersal, and Regrouping of Migrant Communities.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Van Onselen, Charles. 1976. *Chibaro: African Mine Labour in Southern Rhodesia 1900–1933.* London: Pluto Press.

Vayda, Andrew. 1976. *War in Ecological Perspective: Persistence, Change, and Adaptive Processes in Three Oceanian Societies.* New York: Plenum Press.

Vigh, Henrik. 2003. "Navigating Terrains of War: Youth and Soldiering in Guinea-Bissau." PhD diss., Institute of Anthropology, University of Copenhagen.

Vines, Alex. 1991. *Renamo: Terrorism in Mozambique.* London: James Currey.

Voutira, Eftihia, and Barbara Harrell-Bond. 1995. "In Search of the Locus of Trust: The Social World of the Refugee Camp." In *Mistrusting Refugees,* edited by E. V. Daniel and J. Knudsen. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Warren, Kay. 2000. "Death Squads and Wider Complicities: Dilemmas for the Anthropology of Violence." In *Death Squad: The Anthropology of State Terror,* edited by J. A. Sluka. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Waterhouse, Rachel, and Carin Vijfhuizen. 2001. Introduction to *Strategic Women, Gainful Men: Gender, Land, and Natural Resources in Different Rural Contexts in Mozambique,* edited by R. Waterhouse and C. Vijfhuizen. Maputo: Eduardo Mondlane University, Land Tenure Center.

——, eds. 2001. *Strategic Women, Gainful Men: Gender, Land, and Natural Resources in Different Rural Contexts in Mozambique.* Maputo: Eduardo Mondlane University, Land Tenure Center,.

Webster, David. 1977. "Warfare and the Evolution of Maya Civilization." In *The Origins of Maya Civilization,* edited by R. Adams. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Wells, Susan. 1990. "Narrative Figures and Subtle Persuasions: The Rhetoric of the Move Report." In *The Rhetorical Turn,* edited by S. Herbert. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wentzel, M. 1993. "Historical Origins of Hostels in South Africa: Migrant Labour and Compounds." In *Communities in Isolation: Perspectives on Hostels in South Africa,* edited by A. Minaar. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

West, Harry. 1998. " 'This Neighbor Is Not My Uncle!': Changing Relations of Power and Authority on the Mueda Plateau." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 24, no. 1: 141–60.

——. 2005. *Kupilikula: Governance and the Invisible Realm in Mozambique.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

White, Louise. 2000. *Speaking with Vampires: Rumor and History in Colonial Africa.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Whitehead, Neil. 2004. "Introduction: Cultures, Conflicts, and the Poetics of Violent Practice." In *Violence,* edited by N. Whitehead. Santa Fe, N.M.: School of American Research Press.

Wilson, Francis. 1972. *Labour in the South African Gold Mines 1911–1969.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

——. 1985. "Mineral Wealth and Rural Poverty: An Analysis of the Economic Foundations of the Political Boundaries in Southern Africa." In *Up against the Fences,* edited by H. Giliomee and L. Schlemmer. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Wilson, Godfrey, and Monica Wilson. 1968. *The Analysis of Social Change Based on Observations in Central Africa.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Ken. 1992. "Cults of Violence and Counter-Violence in Mozambique." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 18, no. 1: 527–82.

——. 1994. "Refugees and Returnees as Social Agents." In *When Refugees Go Home,* edited by T. Allen and H. Morsink. Trenton, N.J.: Africa World Press.

Wilson, Ken, and Jovito Nunes. 1994. "Repatriation to Mozambique: Refugee Initiative and Agency Planning in Milange District, 1988–1991." In *When Refugees Go Home,* edited by Tim Allen and Hubert Morsink. London: James Currey.

Wolpe, Howard. 1972. "Capitalism and Cheap Labour Power in South Africa: From Segregation to Apartheid." *Economy and Society* 1, no. 1: 425–58.

Wuyts, Marc. 1984. *Money and Planning for Socialist Transition: The Mozambican Experience.* Aldershot, England: Gower.

——. 1985. "Money, Planning and Rural Transformation in Mozambique." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 22, no. 1: 180–207.

Young, Crawford. 1994. *The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zolberg, Aristide, Astri Suhrke, and Sergio Aguayo. 1989. *Escape From Violence: Conflict and the Refugee Crisis in the Developing World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Index

Acholi, 106
adoption, 244
African Independent Churches. *See* AIC
agency: amplified by violence, 22, 179–80; and the forced migration paradox, 18–20; Giddens's theories of, 254–57, 358n5; and intention, 358n5; political, 108, 153–56; of refugees, 5, 15–21; of spirits, 69–70, 352n2; as tactic, 219; and violence, 15–16, 23–25, 247–50; of warscape inhabitants, 158–59, 246–50; and war-time decision making, 179–80, 247
AIC, 340n15. *See also* churches
airstrip ethnography, 27–28
aldeias communais: conjugal relations within, 211–12, 245; flight from, 201–2, 211–12; and forced immobility, 193; humanitarian airlifts to, 211; inhabited by women after the war, 309–10; isolated by war, 211–12; starvation within, 211; subsistence within, 209–10; as a technique for political control, 141, 350n12. *See also* villagization
Alexander, Jocelyn, 152
American Board. *See under* church denominations
ancestors. See *vadzimu*
anthropological demography, 5
anthropology: and history, 31–35; and the study of political conflict, 103–9
Apartado, San Jose de, 20
apartheid policies: Bantu Laws Amendment Act, 78; and employment, 80–82; and housing, 82–84; influx control, 76–80; Native Laws Amendment Act, 77; Native Urban Areas Act, 77; Native (Urban Areas) Consolidation Act, 78, Section 10, 78–83, 341n19, 341n20, 342nn21–22
Appadurai, Arjun, 26, 329
armed conflict. *See* war
assimilados, 115
authorizability, 316–17; and epistemic power, 317–18, 325–26

bandidos armados (armed bandits). *See under* RENAMO
Bantustans, 79. *See also* apartheid policies
Behrend, Heike, 106
Beira, 4
Bennet, Jon, 10
Berlin Conference of 1884, 51
Berreman, Gerald, 44
Bilene, 50, 306, 333n3
Bintu (Liberian refugee), 22
Black, Richard, 260–62, 280
Boas, Franz, 67
bribes, 269–70
Brick and Tile: employing illegal squatters, 342n23; obtaining employment at, 80
bride price. See *lobola*
Briggs, Charles, 34

Chambuta, 203–4. *See also* refugee camps; Tongogara
chibalo. See forced labor
children: as motivating post-conflict migration, 277–80; role in women's life security, 223; war-time importance of, 224–25. *See also* fertility; social fertility

Chimoio, 4, 25, 47; churches in, 326–29; living conditions in, 278–80; as a post-conflict destination for women, 277–78; women living in, 251, 313, 326–28
ChiNdau, 50
Chingono, Marc, 327
Chipinge, 1, 25; as origin of Voz de Africa Livre transmissions, 135
ChiShangaana, 50
church denominations: American Board, 67, 73–74, 99, 344n39, 334n42; Full Gospel, 344n39; Igreja Evangelica Cristo Vive, 328; Igreja Universal do Reino de Deus, 315, 328, 340n15; Sabata, 307, 340n15; Zione, 99, 344n39, 346n39
churches: arriving in Machaze, 73; in Chimoio attended by women, 326–29; as fostering a Machazian moral community, 300–1; growth in Machaze, 74–75, 99; PIDE concern with, 346n6; schisms, 99; township services provided by, 94–95. *See also* church denominations; pastors; *profetas*
Clausewitz, Carl von, 9, 42, 162
Cole, Jennifer, 31
collective trauma, 11
Colson, Elizabeth, 19–20, 30, 221–22, 247
colonialism: influence in Machaze, 348n16; as varied throughout Mozambique, 113–14. *See also* Companhia de Moçambique
Comaroff, Jean, 107
Comaroff, John, 107
Committee on Refugees and Immigrants of the American Anthropological Association, 331n8
Companhia de Moçambique: concession of territory to, 50–51; devolution of authority by, 54; labor recruitment policies of, 51–54, 334n11
conflict resolution: as crippled during the war, 177; traditional mechanisms and objectives of, 166–68; under FRELIMO, 169–72
cotton, compulsory cultivation of: in Machaze, 337n25; in Mozambique, 114
crime, in the townships: increasing after the war, 269; by tsotsis 88
culture: in chaos, 248–50, 326–30; conservatism of, 221–22; as created entirely anew, 220; cultural involution, 221–22; in war zones, 12, 219–20
Curtis, Natalie, 67–68, 70

Dairyboard, 305
decolonization, 116; different meanings of, 117–18
Dedza-Angonia borderland, 182–83
desertions, rates of, 337n23, 344n42. *See also* mining; migration labor
Dhalkarma, Afonso, 349n2
Dinerman, Alice, 150–51
disengagement, political culture of, 65; reinforced by FRELIMO's policies, 127–28, 134–36
displacement: in *aldeias communais,* 209–12; associated with loss, 188; defined in relation to lifescapes, 213; effected by repatriation, 277–80; high incidence of in Machaze, 2; as the loss of mobility, 193, 212–14; migratory versus "in place," 193, 212–14; post-conflict, 280; as socially mediated, 246; and structural violence, 213; *See also* forced migration
divorce, 223, 276–78, 282–82. *See also* marriage
droughts: bean hunger, 133; as cause for war-time migration, 200–2; Chikapachoto, 201; colonial administrator reports of, 71–72; and military predation, 198–99; Pandomwanamuna, 201, 343n36; Sikkisiranye, 72, 201, 339n11

eldership, 341n16. See also *vadzimu*
Ellis, Stephen, 37
employment: conditions in colonial Mozambique, 55–56; conditions in South Africa, 57–58; different types, comparative advantages of, 342n24; as ethnically segmented, 343n33; obtaining through job brokers, 94–95, 305; shift from mine to nonmine, 60–61. *See also* migration, labor; mining; unemployment
engenderation, 21
Englund, Harri, 40–41, 152, 182–83, 332n14, 359n4
Erati, 29, 180–81
Erikson, Kai, 11
Eskom, 80, 82
Espiritos Vivos, Tradicoes Modernas, 39
Espungabera, 47, 52
Evans-Pritchard, Edward E., 103–4, 252
exit strategies, 326–30

Farmer, Paul, 37, 112
Feierman, Steven, 302–3, 316, 319–22, 359n6

Felipe (transnational polygynist), 272–73
fertility: affected by spousal separation, 242–46,as a time-embedded project, 241–42
field site determination, 25–26
Fischer, Peter, 29
Florencio, Fernando, 333n3, 348n16
Flower, Ken, 137–38
forced labor: change in Companhia de Moçambique policy, 54; demographic effects of, 52–53; employer abuses of, 56–57; and the indigenous labor code, 54; official exploitation of, 336n17; recruitment, 52–54, 336nn15–17; resistance to, 51–60; the role of *régulos,* 55, 97; and the shift to nonmine employment, 59–60; termivnation of, 62
Forced Migration Review, 331n8
forced resettlement: into refugee camps, 203–4. *See also* villagization
Forget Colonialism?: Sacrifice and the Art of Memory in Madagascar (Cole), 31
Foucault, Michel, 302
FRELIMO, 2; abuses of authority, 170–72; accomplishments in liberated zones, 117, 346n4; actions against *uwavi,* 348n17; in anti-colonial war, 114–16; as blamed by population, 171–72; economic policies, 124–28; effects on local conflict resolution, 168–72; forced villagization in Machaze, 142–47; forced villagization throughout Mozambique, 149–50; gender-differentiated treatment of civilians, 354n4; harsh punishments, 169–70; as having Shangaana leadership, 182; internal schisms, 115; local governance reorganization, 119–22; *lojas do povo,* 124–25; *machaambas do povo,* 125–27; measures against religion, 122; Organization of Mozambican Women, 123; political objectives of villagization, 141, 346n4; post-war policies toward traditional authorities, 310–12; public education campaigns, 123–24; reactions to noncompliance, 145–47; rumors about, 135; suspicion of tradition, 118–19; targeting traditional authorities, 119–20; Third Party congress, 120; troops, targeting civilians, 199; as understood in local terms, 132–35; WENELA post closings, 130
From War to Peace on the Mozambique-Malawi Borderland (Englund), 40–41

Galtung, John, 37, 111
Gampel, Yolanda, 49–51
Garagua, 139, 148, 350n6. *See also* RENAMO
Gaza empire, 49–51
Geffray, Christian, 142, 149–54, 180–81
gender relations: as affected by humanitarian aid, 206–9; as affected by transnational polygyny, 274–80; as affected by women's migration, 356n7; and *lobola,* 86; and male privilege, 237–38; and the power of South African women, 297–98; as shaping wartime migration, 233–41
Gluckman, Max, 104
Giddens, Anthony, 254–55, 302, 358n5
Gramsci, Antonio, 256
Greenhouse, Carol, 25, 218, 252, 323
Goffman, Erving, 254, 295
Gondola, 4
Goody, Jack, 226
Gorongosa, 350n5
Gugunhanna, 48; ears pierced to identify with, 82, 305; migration to Bilene, 50; and punishment of witchcraft, 50; 333n3; times of, 48, 195–96

Hall, Margaret, 147
Hansen, Art, 19
Hammond, Laura, 188, 259–60
Harries, Patrick, 339n4
hegemony: Gramsci's definition of, 256; pre-hegemonic, 257; and the social imagination, 324–25
Herskovitts, Melville, 67–68, 91
Hinton, Alex, 345n1
Hirschman, Albert, 283
historiography: of Mozambican civil war, 147–60; of Mozambican labor migration, 39
history: and anthropology, 31–35; construction of, 32; life course, 332n11. *See also* narratives
Holy Spirit, 296; as combating *mambos,* 99, 160; as protecting against *uloi,* 74, 328
Holy Spirit Movement, 106
hondo. See war, Mozambican civil
Honwana, Alcinda, 39, 219
hoomuchas, 240

households: nuclearization of, 91–92; schismatic tendencies of, 90. See also *nhemba*
Hughes, David, 355n10
Hutchinson, Sharon, 104, 252

identity documents, 279; and employment in South Africa, 80–82; of Machazian women, 299; required for travel by FRELIMO, 130
IDPs, 7; addressed by UNHCR, 187; Angolan, 8; Liberian, 8; images of containment, 7, 8; Sudanese, 7
immobility: and displacement in place, 193–94; as forced by war, 189
inhabiting the sign, 320
intergenerational conflict: as affected by transnational polygyny, 276, 281–82; effects on gender relations, 86; and *lobola* rates, 85–86; and migration, 69–70; as reflected in *muchape,* 73; stimulating church growth, 73; and *uloi,* 71
Internally Displaced Persons. *See* IDPs
International Association for the Study of Forced Migration, 331n8
involuntary migration. *See* forced migration
indigenous labor code, 54. *See also* forced labor
Indra, Doreen, 16, 18–19
Isaacman, Allen, 66, 114

Jehovah Witnesses, 17; repatriation of, 261
Jeremias (transational polygynist), 285–86
Jezequel, Herve, 8
Johannesburg, 4, 26
Joni. *See* Johannesburg
Journal of Refugee Studies, 331n8

Kaplan, Robert, 218
Khartoum, 7
kinetics. *See* migration, forced
Knauft, Bruce, 317–18
Kopytoff, Igor, 341n16
Koser, Khalid, 260–62, 280
Kunz, Egon, 11, 17–18, 158, 218

La cause des armes au Mozambique (Geffray), 149
Lakwena, Alice, 106, 345n1
legitimacy, negative, 257
Liberation Front of Mozambique. *See* FRELIMO
life cycle: domestic, 226; and women's wartime migration choices, 228–31
life projects: as culturally scripted, 19; the progression of social relationships, 222–24, 231; as temporally embedded, 231–32
lifescapes, 192–93
lobola, 66–68; rising prices of, 85–86; payment restructuring, 86. *See also* marriage
locality, 26
location. *See* place
lojas do povo: creation of, 124–25; RENAMO attacks upon, 140. *See also* FRELIMO: economic policies
Louisa (woman in Chimoio), 326–28
loyalty strategies, 283–85
Lord's Resistance Army, 106

maachambas do povo, 125–28. *See also* FRELIMO
Mabudo, 214
Machava, Reverend (pastor), 304–8, 313–14; as having instrumental power, 319; inhabiting the sign, 320–21; moral capital of, 320–23; wanting to be buried in South Africa, 359n1
Machaze: arrival in, 47–48; climate, 63, 337n26; commercial establishments in, 64–65; commercialization of agricultural surplus, 65; designation as labor reserve, 55; historical change in coresidence patterns, 90–92, 343n29; impediments to European settlement, 334n6; infrastructural improvements, 63–65; known as Madanda, 52, 333n4; land seizure attempts, 337n26; place-specific utility of, 285, 307; post-conflict economic conditions in, 267–68; as a staging point for FRELIMO troops, 139; sociospiritual status challenged, 307–8
Machel, Samora, 121
Macuane, 180–81
Madanda. *See under* Machaze
madodas, 97, 166
Mageo, Jeanette, 317–18
Makonde, 39–40
Malangatana, V. N., 216–17
Malkki, Liisa, 6, 16–17, 187, 259–60
Malmberg, Gunnar, 191
Manning, Carrie, 152, 154

mark of Samora (marca de Samora), 134, 298, 349n19
marriage: as described by Banda Simango, 85; the effects of prolonged war upon, 231–41; and fear of *uloi* in South Africa, 239–40; and identity management in South Africa, 239; and intergenerational conflict, 85, 281–82; with Machazian women in South Africa, 299–301; self-marriage, 312–13, 319; with South African women, 100–1, 236–41; 298–99; transformed meanings of, 275–77, 281–82; and war-time immobility, 212–14; widow remarriage, 279; in women's life strategies, 222–24; and women's war-time migration choices, 228–31; of young men in *aldeias communias,* 212. *See also* divorce; *lobola;* polygyny; transnational polygyny
Martin, Reiner, 20
Marx, Emmanuel, 192
Matsangaissa, Andre, 148, 349n2, 350n10; death of, 350n5. *See also* RENAMO
Matsangaisse. *See* RENAMO
McGregor, JoAnn, 150–51
McLaughlin, Bridget, 159
Mecupe, 122, 347n10, 337n25
mefundisses. See pastors
Merton, Robert, 24, 256
Mfecane, 48
mfukwa: as activated by ill will, 70; changes in beliefs about, 339n13; as created by wrongful war-time deaths, 175–77; effects of having one in the family, 176–77; as harming relatives, 175–76, 339n13; as a state of spirit, 339n9. *See also* reign of the *mambos; uloi; vadzimu*
migrant script, 287–89
migration: and domestic strife, 93–95; as moral performance, 287–89; 319–20
migration, forced: in African social history, 4; as categorically distinct from labor migration, 45–46; as an institutionalized subfield of study, 19, 331n8; as involuntary, 15–21, 45–46; kinetic theories of, 17–18; as a self-evident decision, 5, 20. *See also* displacement; migration, Machazian war-time; refugees
migration, labor, 5; causing ethnic tension, 18; as causing socioeconomic differentiation, 89–90; closing of WENELA posts, 130, 134, 182; early reports about, 334n5; effects of Rhodesian border war upon, 129; effects of traveling papers upon, 130; failed, 88–89; illegal foreign recruitment, 53; informal strategies of, 81; and intergenerational struggles, 67, 69–75; risks involved, 88–89; mortality rates, 339n4; and political consciousness, 346n7; reintensification of, 136; the shift from mine to nonmine, 60–62. *See also* mining
migration, Machazian war-time: demographic distribution of, 351n18; and displacement, 213–14; drought-induced, 201–2; as empowering, 214–15; reflecting local logics of violence, 183–84; socially differentiated patterns of, 194–96, 331n9; into Zimbabwe, 201–3. *See also* migration, forced
migration, return. *See* repatriation
migration, women's: effects on gender relations, 236–38; 356n7; hindered by spouses, 235–41; post-conflict, 277–80; to refugee camps, 233–35. *See also* migration, Machazian war-time
migratory performance, 287–89; 319–22
milicias, 129; abuse of power by, 172–73; convoy ambushes, 200; as a war-time option for men in *aldeias communais,* 212
mining, 53, 337n20; contract conditions, 58–59; South African recruitment policy changes, 347n14; wages, 53, 57–58. *See also* migration, labor
Mondlane, Eduardo Chivambo, 115
moral capital, 320–23, 359nn3–4
moral community, 300–1
moral economy, 41; of migration, 288, 358n2
moral performance. *See* migratory performance
moral causality, 164–65
Mossurize, 67, 335n13
motorized transportation, 64, 68–69, 339n7, 335n12
Mozambican National Resistance. *See* RENAMO
muchape, 73, 344n37. See also *uloi;* reign of the *mambos*
Mueda massacre, 40, 114
Mutare, 4, 25

Nandy, Ashis, 102
Naparama, 106

NAR (Nucleo de Apoio ao Refugiado), 263
narratives: and authorizability, 316–20; construction of, 30–34; origin, 333n2; about predatory South African women, 298–99; of replacement, 314–16
national order of things, 6–7, 9, 27; in defining refugees, 6; in defining war, 6; in the study of violence, 103
Nhamunda, Reverend (IURD pastor), 314–15
Nhamunda family: in Machava's story, 305–6; origin story, 48
nhamussoros. See *nyangas* and *nhamussoros*
nhembas, 69. *See also* households
nonmigrants, 19. *See also* immobility
Nordstrom, Carolyn, 9, 12–13, 27–28, 30, 35, 39, 219–20
Nucleo de Apoio ao Refugiado (NAR), 263
nyangas. See *nyangas* and *nhamussoros*
nyangas and *nhamussoros,* 339n10; active in South Africa, 296; negotiating with ancestors, 295–96; roles in traditional conflict resolution, 71, 166–67; targeted by FRELIMO, 121. See also *uloi; vadzimu*

Onde Está a Minha Mãe, os Meus Irmãos, e Todos os Outros? (Malangatana, painting), 216–17
Organization of Mozambican Women. *See under* FRELIMO

pastors: conflict with *régulos,* 98; as job brokers, 94–95; letter-writing for migrants, 97–98. *See also* churches
peasant intellectuals, 302–3, 319–20
PIDE (Portuguese Secret Police), 118; concerned about Zionist churches, 346n6
Piot, Charles, 332n14
place: as defined by human geographers, 191, 353n1, 353nn2–3; in Machazian lifescapes, 192–93; as a metaphorically extended concept, 192; and place-specific utility, 353n1
political culture: of disengagement, 65; Machazian, 152–56, 164–65
polygyny, 343n28; church prohibition of, 90; South African women's rejection of, 239; and wartime social schisms, 225–27. *See also* gender relations; marriage; transnational polygyny
Portaria Provincial No. 5639, July 29, 1944, 96. See also *régulos*
Portuguese Secret Police. *See* PIDE
power, epistemic and instrumental, 317–18
Pretoria, 4
profetas, 166, 295–96, 307

rain ceremonies, 122, 347n10
Ranger, Terence, 4, 274
Raul (transnational polygynist), 286–87
Refuge: Canada's Periodical on Refugees, 331n8
refugee camps: establishment in Zimbabwe, 203; families assisted by men into, 233–35; forced resettlement into, 203–4. *See also* Chambuta; Tongogara
refugees: agency of, 5, 16–21; as bare humanity, 6, 16; discursive constitution of, 6–7, 16–21, 259–60; as economic migrants, 262–64; as exemplary victims of war, 187; repatriation of, 259–61; statutory, 187, 353n1. *See also* displacement; migraton, forced; refugee camps; UNHCR
régulos: basis of authority, 96–97, 121–22; as colonial auxiliaries, 96–97; in conflict resolution, 97, 166–67; in conflict with government officials after the war, 310; in conflict with pastors, 97–98; and *muchape,* 344nn37–38; as politically differentiated, 151; role in rain ceremonies, 122; targeted by FRELIMO, 119–21. *See also* reign of the *mambos*
reign of the *mambos,* 98–99; beginnings of, 343n36, 344n37; and the burning of graves, 133. See also *mfukwa; régulos; uloi*
RENAMO, 2; attacks on *lojas do povo,* 140; called Matsangaisse, 350n10; characterized as "armed bandits," 351n21; creation and foreign support of, 137–40, 349nn2–3; destruction zones, 109; electoral results, 148, 351n20; gender-differentiated treatment of civilians, 354n4; hearts and minds campaign, 143–44; and the intensification of violence during drought, 198–200; as issuing a declaration of war against Zimbabwe, 203; as misrecognized by Machazians, 152–56; Ndau-dominated leadership, 182; popular legitimacy of, 149–56; recruitment in

Machaze, 149; and settlement patterns in the bush, 196; targeting civilians, 199; targeting of government officials, 144–46, 173; taxation by, 197–98
repatriation: compulsory, 205–6, 355n10; discourses of, 259–60; men's understandings of 266–74; non-return, 277–78; sedentarist assumptions, 265–66; and transnational polygyny, 273–74
revolving door syndrome, 263–64. *See also* UNHCR; refugees
Rhodesia, Southern, 104–5; 128–29. *See also* Zimbabwe
Richards, Audrey, 73
Richards, Paul, 12, 106–7, 109, 136, 161–62, 186
Riches, David, 10
Richmond, Anthony, 19
Robben, Antonius, 11
Roesch, Otto, 181–82
Ruiz, Hiram, 7
Repartição de Trabalho Indígena, 334n11. *See also* Companhia de Moçambique
Revolutionary United Front, 109
Rwandan genocide, 105, 109

sanctions, 128
Schapera, Isaac, 344n42
Scheper-Hughes, Nancy, 37, 112
Schism and Continuity in Ndembu Society (Turner), 356n3
schisms: of households at time of death, 343n30; wartime social, 226–27
Scott, James, 66
Scudder, Thayer, 221–22, 247
secretarios, 119; in conflict resolution, 168; conflict with *régulos* after the war, 310; targeted by RENAMO, 172–78
Section 10. *See under* apartheid policies
Sena, 29
settlers, European: attempting to seize land in Machaze, 337n26; Companhia de Moçambique plans for, 51; flight after decolonization, 116–17; lacking in Machaze, 63; numbers in Mozambique, 62–63, 338n28; in Rhodesia, 350n8; September 8th coup, 116
Shahrani, Nazij, 17
Shangaan: tensions with Ndau, 182; traditional authorities in South Africa, 81
Sharpeville. *See under* townships
shooting straight, 79. *See also* apartheid policies
Sierra Leone, 109
Sigauke (RENAMO operative), 143–44
Sikkisiranye. *See under* droughts
Simango, Banda: on household schisms, 343n30; on kraal coresidence, 91; on marriage, 85; on migration, 85; personal history of, 67–68; on *vadzimu,* 339n13; on witchcraft, 70
Sitatonga, 139, 148. *See also* RENAMO
Smith, Ian, 128
social capital, 359n3
social fertility, 241. *See also* fertility
social imagination, 256, 313–30, 328–30; and structures of sentiment, 324–25, 329–30
social navigation, 22, 37, 218–19
social networks, fragmented, 227–31
social relations: affected by wartime dispersal, 227–31; importance over life-course, 222–23; individuals theorized as, 332n14; temporal dimensions of, 231–32; as a wartime priority, 247
social worlds, 192; created by displacement, 4, 25–26; and repatriation, 261
socioeconomic differentiation, 89–90
sociospiritual worlds, 69, 163–65, 175–78, 347n1
Somers, Marc, 216
South African Chamber of Mines, 347n14
spousal separation, 242–43
Stewarts and Lloyds, 80, 269
strategic research sites, 24, 256
Strathern, Marilyn, 332n14
Strauhbhaar, Thomas, 20
structural violence. *See* violence, structural
structuration, 255. *See also* agency: Giddens's theory of
structures of sentiment, 329
Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo, 11
survival-utility, 18

taxation: of labor migrants, 337n21, 341n18; by RENAMO, 196–98
Taylor, Christopher, 105, 109
Thelma (failed social innovator), 311–13, 319, 323
time-embedded life projects, 241. *See also* fertility
token transnationality, 287

Tonga, 48
Tonga, Gwembe, 19–20
Tongogara, 203–9, 355n11. *See also* refugee camps, UNHCR
Tonkin, Elizabeth, 32–33
townships, South African: and conjugal opportunity 100–1; Evaton, 83; hostels, 88; housing, 82–84, 88; men's fears about Machazian women's presence in, 235–41; population density, 343nn25–26; Sharpeville, 83–84; Toplocation, 83; women's economic activity, 235–36. *See also* crime; employment; identity documents; unemployment
transnational polygyny: effects upon women, 275–80; incipient forms of, 100–1; increasing divorce risk, 281–82; narratives of deferred (or contingent) return, 293; and narratives of "intended return," 294; post-war growth of, 270–71; and post-conflict return, 273–74; providing leverage with the state, 275; resisted by parents, 281–82; as a risk-diversification strategy, 275; and socially diverted migrants, 287–92; strategies of loyalty, 284–85; strategies of voice, 285–301; symbolic (or proxy) return, 291–92, 305–6; and the transformation of marriage, 274–75. *See also* gender relations; marriage; polygyny; repatriation
tsetse fly, 335n14
Tsonga. *See* Tonga
tuck shops, 269, 351n14
Turner, Victor, 104, 356n3
25th of April Revolution, 116

uloi, 70; as a cause of migration, 93; caused by Machazian women in South Africa, 240; and church membership, 94; as described by Banda Simago, 333n36; feared by women in Chimoio, 326–27; intensifying, 71, 73; as mitigated by the Holy Spirit, 74, 99; as motivating repatriation, 285; and *muchape,* 73, 344n37; and narratives of return, 291–94; ontological premises of, 164–66; Portuguese exempt from, 348n15; and resistance to villagization, 142; in Tongogara, 208; and transnational polygyny, 282–82. See also *mfukwas; muchape;* reign of the *mambos*
unemployment, post-conflict: in Machaze, 268; in South Africa, 269
UNHCR: concerned with economic migrants, 263–64; and forced repatriation from Zimbabwe, 205–6, 355n10; mandate, 187; the South African repatriation, 262–66; *See also* refugee camps; refugees; Tongogara
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. *See* UNHCR
Utas, Mats, 8, 22, 219
Uvin, Peter, 37, 111–12,136, 345n1
uwavi, 164–65, 348n15, 348n17

vadzimu: as ancestral agents, 69–70; as audience for narratives of return, 294–95; avoiding the reproach of, 339n8; becoming one in South Africa, 305–6; as elders 74, 341n16; and the management of social animosity, 165; motivating revenge-killing in war, 173–74; reproaching moral failings, 69–70; preferring to be refugees, 307–8. See also *uloi*
Vecor, 80, 269
Verwoerd, Henrik, 79
Vigh, Henrik, 219
villagization, forced: FRELIMO's political objectives for, 141; planned by the Portuguese for Machaze, 346n5; the political effects of in Mozambique, 149–50; by the Portuguese, 115–16; resisted in Machaze, 142–47
violence: and agency, 248–50; and collective trauma, 11; and creativity, 219–21, 248; as disordering, 11; sensationalizing effects of, 14; and the social imagination, 325–27; as a socializing frame, 28–29; study of, 35–38; 109, 162–63. *See also* violent things
violence, structural: 37–38, 107–8; and blurred distinctions between war and non-war, 157–60; definitions of, 109–13, 345nn1–2; in postcolonial Machaze, 136, 345n2; in redefining displacement, 213–14
violence, wartime: and the agency of warscape inhabitants, 246–50; as dramaturgy, 109, 345n1; in the Dzedza-Angonia borderland, 182–83; in Gaza, 181–82; as gender-differentiated, 354n5; intensified because of drought,

198–201; local logics of, 163, 175–78, 183–84, 352n4; as multivocal, 184–86; in Nampula, 180–81; seen as meaningless, 161–63; as social action, 36; and the study of war as a social condition, 248, 324–25; used to pursue local social agendas, 21–22, 162–63, 180–86
violent things, 10–13
voice strategies, 283, 318–20
Voz de Africa Livre, 139–40. *See also* RENAMO

wages: disparities between mining and manufacturing, 79–80; disparities between Mozambique and South Africa, 53, 57–58, 334n9, 336n19; as paid entirely in South Africa, 76; and socioeconomic differentiation, 89. *See also* migration, labor; mining
war: across the globe, 1; anthropological studies of, 103–9; de-socializing effects of, 12–13; as fragmented, 183–84, 352n6; national framings of, 26–30, 103; new wars, 12, 106–7, 161–62, 186; as normal context, 1; ordered as a violent thing, 9–13; as organized violence, 1, 10; as political struggle, 1, 9, 14, 161–62; with Rhodesia, 128–29, 347n13; as social action, 107; as a social condition, 1, 12–15, 23–25, 217–18, 252–56, 324–26
war, Mozambican anti-colonial: effects on Machaze, 63–65; 114–16; launching of, 63, 114
war, Mozambican civil: destruction of infrastructure, 2; as fragmented, 180–84; Mozambican General Peace Accord, 251; Naparama movement, 106; as unexpectedly prolonged, 232–33
warzone cultures, 12, 219; as created by violence, 27–28; as shared, 29
Warren, Kay, 35
warscapes, 7, 12, 23, 323
WENELA, 61, 81, 134, 182, 334n8
West, Harry, 39–40, 141, 164–65; 348n15, 348n17
Whitehead, Neil, 35
Wilson, Ken, 17–18, 106, 109, 261
witchcraft. See *uloi*

xenophobia, 297–98

Young, Crawford, 156, 273–74

Zimbabwe: border militarization, 203; government refugee policies, 203–4; resettlement within, 255n10
Zimbabwe African National Liberation Army. *See* ZANLA
Zimbabweanas, 312–13
ZANLA, 105, 128
Zione. *See under* church denominations

ANTHROPOLOGY

Fought in the wake of a decade of armed struggle against colonialism, the Mozambican civil war lasted from 1977 to 1992, claiming hundreds of thousands of lives while displacing millions more. As similar conflicts across the globe span decades and generations, *Culture in Chaos* calls for a new point of departure in the ethnography of war that investigates how the inhabitants of war zones live under trying new conditions and how culture and social relations are transformed as a result. Drawing on over a decade of fieldwork in Mozambique and South Africa, Stephen C. Lubkemann's challenging study is a critical reexamination of the concept of displacement and of social existence in violent settings—while his engagement with broader theories of agency and social change will be of interest to anthropologists, political scientists, historians, and demographers, and to anyone who works in a war zone or with refugees and migrants.

"Sharp, eloquent, and utterly persuasive, this remarkable ethnography changes the way we look at violence and war. In Lubkemann's skillful hands, we are witness to not just resilience but the constant forging of new social fabric in the most improbable of human conditions." Caroline Bledsoe, Melville J. Herskovits Professor of African Studies, Northwestern University

"This should be required reading for anyone who wants to understand the Mozambique conflict, and indeed conflict and displacement more generally. Lubkemann's work is empirically rich and theoretically innovative, seeking to understand how and why particular forms of violence emerge as part of the 'social condition' of war. It reinforces the point—often ignored—that war and displacement evolve in different ways, with often unexpected outcomes." Richard Black, Co-Director, Sussex Centre for Migration Research, University of Sussex

"Lubkemann makes a compelling case for a new kind of anthropology of war. This book will be widely read, cited, and debated not only by regional scholars, but also among academics and policymakers—in Africa and beyond—seeking to better understand the complexities of war and human displacement." Harry G. West, School of Oriental and African Studies

STEPHEN C. LUBKEMANN is associate professor of anthropology and international affairs at The George Washington University and associate editor of *Anthropological Quarterly*.

Cover design: Isaac Tobin
Cover image: *Onde Estao os Meus Pais, Meus Irmaos e Todos os Outros* by Ngwenya Malangatana

ISBN-13: 978-0-226-49642-9
ISBN-10: 0-226-49642-2

9 780226 496429

99990

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
www.press.uchicago.edu