



Spring 2018

Understanding Violence Against Foreigners in Cape Town: Conceptions of Autochthony and Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Mary L. Casey
Gettysburg College

Follow this and additional works at: https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship

 Part of the [African History Commons](#), [African Studies Commons](#), [Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons](#), and the [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#)

Share feedback about the accessibility of this item.

Casey, Mary L., "Understanding Violence Against Foreigners in Cape Town: Conceptions of Autochthony and Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa" (2018). *Student Publications*. 723.
https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/student_scholarship/723

This open access student research paper is brought to you by The Cupola: Scholarship at Gettysburg College. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator of The Cupola. For more information, please contact cupola@gettysburg.edu.

Understanding Violence Against Foreigners in Cape Town: Conceptions of Autochthony and Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Abstract

Examining the correlation between the history of colonialism and structures of Apartheid in South Africa and the current xenophobic violence experienced by Black African immigrants settling in Cape Town. This thesis explores theories of autochthony and belonging in the context of Cape Town, Black South African relationships and ownership of land, access to resources and opportunities for employment, and the continued disenfranchisement of Black South Africans in the wake of Apartheid. These components of the issue of xenophobia in Cape Town are factored into an analysis of how and why violence persists against immigrants in the city.

Keywords

Cape Town, South Africa, Xenophobia, Autochthony, Belonging, Colonialism, Apartheid

Disciplines

African History | African Studies | Anthropology | Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies | Social and Cultural Anthropology

Comments

Written as a senior thesis in Anthropology.

Creative Commons License

Creative

Commons

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

License

Understanding Violence Against Foreigners in Cape Town: Conceptions of Autochthony and
Xenophobia in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Mary Casey
Department of Anthropology
Gettysburg College

Honors Thesis
Spring 2018

Acknowledgements

I would be remiss if I did not extend an innumerable thanks to Stewart Chirova, Emma Arogundade, and Tabisa Dyonase, academic and coordinating staff at SIT's Multiculturalism and Human Rights headquarters in Cape Town, South Africa, for providing me with the guidance and opportunity to grow both personally and intellectually, and for providing me with the tools to approach topics within the context of Cape Town intersectionally. Additionally, this thesis is dedicated to the families in Cape Town and Tshabo 2 who welcomed me into their homes. A special recognition must be provided for Tata Mlandel Tsu Tsu, who passed away in April of 2019; my memory of him shall never fade.

I am truly appreciative of the Anthropology faculty members on my honors thesis committee, Dr. Donna Perry and Dr. Mathew Amster, for their time, support, and constructive feedback throughout the research, writing, and revision process of my paper. I would also like to thank the entirety of the department faculty who have all played a significant role in helping me find my passion for anthropology over the course of my Gettysburg College career.

I would like to extend a sincere thank you to the individuals who agreed to participate in my project, and to the individuals I met while in Cape Town, who have continuously provided me with a wealth of knowledge and friendship.

Finally, without the support of my parents, Linda and Jack Casey, the fruits of my academic and personal growth would not be possible. I love you both endlessly.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
A Brief History of South Africa and Cape Town.....	6
Methodology and Ethical Reflexivity.....	13
Autochthony and Xenophobia in Global and Local Perspectives.....	15
Alternative Theories of Violence Against Foreigners in South Africa.....	24
Mitigation Efforts.....	32
Conclusion.....	34
Works Cited.....	37

Introduction

I awoke to a tap on the door, and knew it was time to begin my first day of classes at SIT. Walking down the small corridor of my new home for the next 19 days, I heard gospel music coming from the radio, as Mama stood in the kitchen preparing the plastic tray that held my breakfast. I brought my tray to the table, watching Mama walk to the loveseat and melt down into the cushion. She had taken her vacation, she told me, when she had confirmed the dates for the duration of my stay with the home stay coordinator for the SIT office. We locked our eyes on the eNCA morning news, and I listened as Mama translated from isiXhosa to English for me. A news segment featured a Zimbabwean man who worked as an immigrant laborer on a farm in the Gauteng province. This man spoke while English translations appeared at the bottom of the television screen, as he explained his situation and defeatedly claimed that his income averaged about R20 per week, or approximately \$2.00. Mama shook her head and whispered “shame” underneath her breath, as she looked at me and said that a person would only be able to buy just a loaf of bread and milk with that amount. Her tone of voice then shifted as she began to speak of Somali immigrants in relation to job security in South Africa. Mama was adamant that Somali immigrants were “stealing” jobs away from Capetownian citizens who “worked hard” and were deserving of employment opportunities in post-Apartheid South Africa.

Mama’s sentiments exemplify the xenophobic attitudes held by South Africans as overt and covert violence becomes increasingly common. The intent of this research is to explore local and scholarly perceptions of xenophobia and autochthony in Cape Town. This research will examine the experiences of immigrants who are vulnerable to overt and covert xenophobic attacks in Cape Town, and will attempt to develop a culturally and historically informed

understanding of why xenophobia is perpetuated. Scholars and current online news publications suggest that violence against foreigners, predominantly Black immigrants from various African nations, is perpetuated by Black South Africans in townships in major cities like Cape Town, Johannesburg, and Durban. This paper argues that the historical legacy of structural, economic, and spatial complications of Apartheid that systematically disenfranchised Black South Africans exacerbates this unique form of xenophobia in Cape Town.

This paper will first situate the narrative of South Africa and more specifically, Cape Town, in a timeline that highlights a history of physical and linguistic migration. This information will contextualize the movement and interactions of peoples and languages within South Africa to demonstrate that the immigration of Africans from beyond the South African border is part of a longstanding pattern of spatial fluidity. I will then provide a brief historical overview of significant pieces of Apartheid legislation and implementation that are directly related to my argument that exclusionary politics have played into contemporary ideas of autochthony. I focus on land expropriation, spatial segregation and the creation of townships, as well as the economic and political disenfranchisement of Black South Africans. The intention of this research is to explore how xenophobia and xenophobic sentiment in Cape Town is unique in its origins but also interconnected with global conflict and social movements evident in the rise of autochthonous movements in many parts of the world. Additionally, I will analyze issues of autochthony and belonging as they relate to instances of current violence in Cape Town. I will incorporate the scholarly works of anthropologists, academics, and journalists into my analysis and discussion of theories as to why xenophobic sentiment and issues of autochthony persist in

the city. I will also utilize my personal ethnographic fieldwork experience from the Spring of 2017 to inform my analysis and discussion.

A Brief History of South Africa and Cape Town

A brief overview of the history of South Africa and Cape Town is a necessary foundation for my analysis of why South Africa is experiencing anti-immigrant sentiment and violence. The current socio-economic, political, and cultural milieu have been molded by South Africa's history of precolonial ethnolinguistic migrations, colonialism, Apartheid, and the formation of a democratic South Africa. I will utilize the diachronic approach regularly in my analysis and interpretation of the present xenophobia and violence in Cape Town.

Prior to colonial occupation and the geographical mapping of imperial borders to solidify territories, the South African region experienced heightened movement and conflict between ethnolinguistic groups during the great Bantu migrations. Populations of ethnic groups living in the region of western Africa began migrating south around 1,000 B.C.E. The Bantu language split further as populations continued into what is now present-day South Africa, to form the Nguni languages, shared between Xhosa and Zulu peoples. The San and the Khoi peoples were already inhabitants of the south western territory of what is now Cape Town in the Western Cape province of South Africa. I insert this brief overview of ethnolinguistic migration to suggest that the migration and interactions of peoples in southern Africa and in South Africa in particular, is not a recent phenomenon, and only began to be restricted and regulated with the formation of nation states and established borders in the late 1800s.

Population flows continued into the colonial era. The Cape of South Africa, the southern most point of the continent, was officially subjected to Dutch political and economic rule in the year 1652, with the establishment of a refreshment and service port owned and operated by the Dutch East Indian Trading Company. The port brought with it increased European presence in

the Cape of South Africa as it was considered a strategic and convenient location between the Atlantic and Indian oceans for merchant ships to replenish resources and trade goods. This increased arrival of foreign bodies to the Cape led to the creation of settlements near the surrounding port operations. The inhabitants of the land who were present during the establishment of the port, the San and the Khoi peoples, were effectively displaced from their local environments by Dutch colonial rule and settler expansion. In 1795 the British began occupation of the territory and the Cape of South Africa became recognized as the Cape Colony. Dutch settlers, also known as Boers or voortrekkers, migrated north and east outside of British jurisdiction, a migration known as the Great Trek. This migration brought Dutch settlers into contact and conflict with Ndebele, Xhosa, and Zulu ethnolinguistic communities, leading the latter to flee. Different ethnolinguistic groups of peoples have been displaced for various and interconnected reasons throughout the history of South Africa, and I suggest that this history is representative of a continuum of migration, conflict, and conceptions of autochthony in Cape Town.

Although there was much movement of peoples during the colonial era, this period also saw the first implementation of exclusionary policies whereby White colonists attempted to limit population mobility and restrict the entry of Black South Africans into certain spaces. The history of exclusionary policies, which I review here, forms an important backdrop to contemporary xenophobia. British imperial expansion persisted in its efforts to systematically expropriate land from the ethnolinguistically diverse Black populations that occupied the geographic space of the Cape and of South Africa. As territory was increasingly consolidated by the British, and gold was discovered in the Witwatersrand, the Boers and the British colonial

army came into armed conflict with one another (SAHO, 2017). The first Anglo-Boer war broke out in 1880 and ceased in 1881, but tensions and conflict was reinvigorated from 1899-1902 (SAHO, 2017). Following negotiations, the Union of South Africa was established on May 21, 1910, as colonial British authorities and Boers, also known as Afrikaners, agreed to coexist in political unity. The Union of South Africa became a formally recognized entity of the British empire, and the government was comprised entirely of White English and Afrikaans speaking officials. This government was exclusive of Black political representation, and therefore South Africa experienced a continued presence of White politics that sought to expropriate, segregate, disenfranchise, and expand separate from the Black population (Feinberg, 1993).

Segregation legislation ensued after the formation of the Union, and Feinberg (1993) argues that the Native Land Act of 1913, the first piece of significant legislation to actively and systematically expropriate land from, and move, the Black population east, dramatically influenced and laid the foundation for Apartheid. Seven percent of the total geographic space of the Union of South Africa was divided, reserved, and allocated for the Black population (Feinberg, 1993). Effectively, the White minority government and population would be in control of the remaining ninety-three percent of the land available, while also indirectly controlling the reserved areas, as Black South Africans were not legally able to acquire land outside of the reserved areas (Feinberg, 1993). The history of land expropriation in South Africa remains significant as I explore the arguments surrounding current xenophobic sentiment and violence.

The Nationalist Party, primarily made up of Afrikaner nationalists, won the electoral vote in 1948. Apartheid was conceived, intentionally designed, and implemented so as to segregate the ethnolinguistically diverse populations in South Africa, and to secure and promote Afrikaner

and White South African cultural, social, political, and economic agendas. The Electoral Laws Amendment Act of 1940 ensured that Black South Africans were prohibited from participating in political elections (SAHO 2017). This Act made it possible for the Nationalist Party to continue instituting legislation that would lay the foundation for Apartheid, while also essentially protecting the Party from countermovements. Black political organizations seeking to dismantle and liberate the Black South African population from oppressive and racist laws, mobilized discretely to plan and execute retaliation against the state. Organizations like the African National Congress, or ANC, were not recognized by the Nationalist government as a legitimate oppositional political party, but rather as a domestic terrorist organization. While the Nationalist Party sought political domination, additional aspects of Apartheid legislation were intended to systematically segregate, classify, and control populations and spaces within Cape Town and South Africa.

The Group Areas Act of 1950 was a significant piece of Apartheid legislation because it instituted spatial segregation between South Africans on the basis of socially constructed ideas of race (SAHO 2017). The Group Areas Act was conceived so that the White minority government could remain in control of the economic centers of South Africa, and in Cape Town, which were cities and business districts. Land reserves in the Eastern Cape, allocated specifically to Black South Africans, with disregard to the ethnolinguistically diverse communities of Black South Africans, were still in operation. In 1936, the total area of land consolidated for Black South Africans under the Native Land Act of 1913, was increased from seven percent to thirteen percent (SAHO 2017). Issues of overpopulation, land degradation and overuse, and limited economic and educational opportunities persisted on land reservations. Black South Africans

became migrant laborers, traveling to areas outside of the designated homelands, and with the Population Registration Act of 1950, Black South Africans were required to carry a Pass Book for the purpose of identification and regulation.

The Population Registration Act of 1950 identified, categorized, and systemically oppressed different communities of people based on arbitrary characteristics determined by White officials upholding Apartheid law. While the Population Registration Act of 1950 was repealed in 1991, and current conceptions of race are being challenged in South Africa today, the history of “othering,” remains a deeply structural issue in the country and in Cape Town. The process of “othering” is the intentional identification and psychological, legal, or social practice of attributing specific physical, cultural, or ideological characteristics of an individual or community of people for the purpose of separation and distancing. This process of “othering” and the polarization of communities continues in South Africa, post-Apartheid, and remains relevant to my exploration of understanding violence against foreigners in Cape Town.

The exclusionary policies that constitute the historical underpinnings of xenophobia also includes the formation of Black townships in Cape Town. Townships were constructed to house non-White South Africans during Apartheid, as means for spatial segregation, on the basis that racialized communities should develop separately. Townships remain spatially and socially segregated from predominantly White neighborhoods, and during Apartheid it was illegal for Black South Africans to leave without a Pass Book. Historically, the townships’ intended occupants were Black South African men who had migrated from the Eastern Cape in search of employment (SAHO 2017). Male migrant laborers would leave their families in the Eastern Cape and travel to the Western Cape for extended periods of time before sending back financial

resources or returning home. Economic migration severely disrupted the marriage and familial relationships of Black South Africans.

The oldest established township in Cape Town is called Langa, which is an isiXhosa word for “the sun.” This township was erected in 1927 as part of the Urban Areas Act of 1923, which sought to regulate and control the migration of Black South Africans from the Eastern Cape to city centers like Cape Town (SAHO 2018). Langa, like the majority of townships in South Africa, had only one access road to enter and exit, which was intended to maximize security constraints and control (SAHO 2018). Barracks were constructed as living quarters for individual male migrants that emphasized the attempt on the part of the government to regulate migration of Black South Africans into the city. Langa continues to expand as Black South African migrants from the Eastern Cape and immigrants utilize informal settlement opportunities to create temporary housing units outside of city centers like Cape Town. Khayelitsha has become the largest Black township in the Western Cape, while Soweto Township in Johannesburg remains the largest township in South Africa (SAHO 2018). While Langa and Khayelitsha continue to expand, due to the influx of newcomers, including many immigrants, families that have, by now, occupied these townships for generations, feel a strong sense of autochthony within the space. It is typical for families of longstanding residence to expand their own homes by adding additional rooms or floors to accommodate the growth of their families or to renovate their homes with new technology or decor. Townships in Cape Town remain multiethnic, meaning that Black South Africans of Xhosa, Zulu, Tsonga, Venda, or Tswana cultural orientations occupy the same spaces. As mentioned previously, informal settlements

have also become spaces where increased immigrant populations settle temporarily after just moving to South Africa.

Immigrants have historically found their way into South African townships, and found employment at industrial sites like gold mines, oil refineries, and additional factories in demand for intensive manual laborers (Tafira 2011). When the country transitioned from Apartheid to democracy in 1994, South Africa was integrated into globalized flows of labor, capital, and goods, that had been restricted by the previous Nationalist Party (Tafira 2011). With this transition, it is argued that the country experienced accelerated rates of immigration due to the promise of social, economic, and political opportunity in a newly ‘liberated’ South Africa (Tafira 2011). Immigrants and border crossers from countries across the African continent migrate to South Africa and Cape Town for numerous, multi-layered, and subjective reasons. Professor of anthropology at the University of Cape Town, Nyamnjoh (2013), suggests that “migration is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon involving various dimensions of human mobility in claiming and negotiating inclusion and belonging” (669).

To recognize the autonomy in choice that some migrants have is to acknowledge their agency. Morreira (2010) recounts fieldwork and experience working with Zimbabweans in Cape Town in 2007, and the multitude of reasons used to explain or justify their resettlement in South Africa. These explanations were indicative of the circumstances of the time when Morreira (2010) conducted fieldwork. They included the necessity for immigrants to flee political persecution by the ZANU(PF) government, economic disparity and unemployment, social persecution, and violence. Civil war in Somalia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo were also reasons for displacement and the involuntary and voluntary movements of people across

borders into South Africa, a country known for its lenient immigration policy. Violence perpetuated by extremist organizations in different African countries such as in northern Nigeria, has also contributed to the forced migration of peoples from Nigeria to South Africa. The movement of peoples due to conflict, displacement, the search for autonomy, and the promise of opportunity, are reasons suggested for migration into South Africa and surround questions of belonging and the making of belonging (Thompson 2017).

Methodology and Ethical Reflexivity

The methodology for this research paper includes different anthropological techniques informed by traditional anthropological practices of participant observation, living within the community of study for an extended period of time, and taking extensive and detailed anthropological field notes. In this research paper, I reflect on my previous experiences living in Cape Town, South Africa, for a period of three months and fifteen days, by referencing the ethnographic field notes I took over the course of the semester. I also incorporate the responses I gathered while conducting semi-structured interviews with a few acquaintances whom I met while studying in Cape Town, and with two students living in the United States. To inform my theorizing of xenophobia, I gathered literature through scholarly search engines such as Anthrosource, Annual Reviews, JSTOR, Academic Search Premier, and Gettysburg College's MUSCAT and Inter-Library Loan systems.

To ensure the ethical integrity of this research, I was required, as the researcher, to complete the necessary forms for the College's Institutional Review Board. My research was approved, as it is considered to be low-risk and harmless to the individuals who agreed to

participate in interview sessions with me. As the researcher, I intended to create a continuity of collaboration between myself and the individuals with whom I interviewed, providing them with the opportunity to review the sections of this research paper that contained their responses. It was my goal to ensure the agency of the individual participants who contributed to my research, as their stories provided context and an emic perspective in understanding xenophobia in Cape Town.

During my semester in Cape Town, I wrote extensively about my daily interactions with local Capetownians, my daily experiences and schedule, and about my mental and emotional state of being. While I was going about my daily routines, I would jot information and encounters down in the 'Notes' application on my iPhone, and then expand upon my notes and ideas before bed every night. My personal journal is secured and coded to ensure the privacy and confidentiality of those individuals whom I address and write about in my notes. I incorporate the notes and information I've recorded in my journal for the purpose of providing a rich and detailed ethnographic description and interpretation of my experiences and to draw comparisons or contradicts with the research I have completed.

To conduct my qualitative research I utilized the technique of semi-structured interviews, focusing on interpretative narratives. My intention to utilize semi-structured interviews was to create the opportunity for my participants to engage with me in a conversation about their individual lived experiences as well as their own interpretations about the complicated and intersecting world in which they are situated. I decided against conducting a survey that would yield quantitative data, so as to avoid producing or interpreting generalizations about lived experiences and xenophobia in Cape Town. I facilitated each semi-structured interview utilizing

a set of pre-determined questions for the purpose of guiding the discussion, but allowed each participant the agency to expand upon topics that were of interest to them within the theme of xenophobia.

Autochthony and Xenophobia in Global and Local Perspectives

The theory ‘triangle of violence,’ first conceived of by David Riche, will inform my examination of texts and original data because I will be trying to understand the explanations of authors who propose causes of violence and suggest solutions to mitigate and eradicate violence perpetuated against foreigners (Strathern and Stewart 2002). The ‘triangle of violence’ theory examines conflict between a performer of violence, a victim of violence, and a bystander of such violence. As the theory suggests, violence is provoked by claims and contestations of legitimacy and it is through the divergence of claimed narratives that contestations occur (Strathern and Stewart 2002). Utilizing the ‘triangle of violence’ theory will assist in the examination of autochthony and xenophobia in South Africa, as the relationships and circumstances of narratives and lived experiences of perpetrators, victims, and bystanders intersect.

Xenophobia must be understood within the context of autochthonous movements in a globalizing world. Geschiere (2009) defines autochthony as “being born from the soil,” referencing the sense of authenticity and belonging that often characterizes an individual’s relationship to the land. Ideas of autochthony in relation to the land evokes an emphasis on naturalization and individual direct connections to a place. Autochthonous movements appear in different parts of the world to be related and are seemingly part of a globalized phenomenon incited by local politics and factors unique to a specific place. However, anthropologists like

Geschiere suggest that while autochthonous movements are witnessed globally, individual acts may not be linked (Geschiere 2009). Autochthonous movements can harbor attitudes and ideas of belonging that manifest through physical, emotional, spiritual, and cultural sense of self. Individuals can feel physically and spiritually connected to a space or place through their relationships with the land or the geographical space they occupy, whether that be because of agricultural and subsistence practices, or ancestral worship. Through the formation of autochthonous connections with the land, individuals also inform their sense of identity (Ceuppens and Geschiere 2005). While living with and among the extended members of my home stay family, I gathered the narratives of unique perceptions of, and individualized relationships with land. My Mama's nephew explained to me that his relationship with the land deeply embodies autochthony, and his sense of identity has been shaped by his co-dependent relationship with the land his family has occupied in the Eastern Cape for generations.

Autochthony often incites impassioned discourse about security, employment, morality, and opportunity. "Being born from the soil," lays a foundation for authenticity of belonging and originality, which is claimed by Black South Africans in contestations of opportunity, security, and employment, to justify acts of violence against foreigners. My Mama's nephew would insist that his deeply spiritual and emotional relationship with the land constitutes authenticity and 'true' sense of belonging within South Africa. Using the 'triangle of violence' theory then, to understand acts of xenophobia in Cape Town, would be to view the contestations of narratives between a citizen, an immigrant, and a bystander who could be implicated in the violence or involved in the process of mitigation. Land disputes historically rooted in colonial and

Apartheid-era legislation ignite local and national claims of autochthony that incite violence and xenophobic sentiment and action.

Globalization and heightened mobility into and within South Africa has sparked further disputes and controversial claims of autochthony as governments increase efforts to reinforce borders (Nyamnjoh 2013). Neoliberal politics and globalization have accelerated the mobility of people across borders and has created markets for the increased production of communication technologies that allow for greater access and exchange of ideas, news, and information. Mobility in Africa, whether it be the autonomous or forced movement of people, ideas, and material items, enforces or reconstructs the cultural, socio-economic, and political systems already established in the place of resettlement. There is a repositioning of resettled peoples within new cultural communities and this often becomes hierarchical in the process, as narratives of race, socio-economic status, gender, and age, play into the contestations between the citizen and migrant (Nyamnjoh 2013). Ceuppens and Geschiere (2005) reference Appadurai's (1996) theory that suggest that the nation state has been undermined by the "production of locality" alluding to the idea that within sub-national communities, belonging is created in response to globalized interactions (387). The production of locality and conceptions of autochthony are reactionary defenses to globalization, as Ceuppens and Geschiere (2005) argue that accelerated mobility brings with it the need for citizens of a place to "root" themselves in their land of origin. Claims of autochthony are redefined and reorganized as people respond to continuing and changing patterns of globalization and interconnectedness. Instances of xenophobic violence are unique to the specific contestations between perpetrator, victim, and bystander (Ceuppens and Geschiere 2005). Autochthonous claims create security and insecurity at the same time, but as

the ‘triangle of violence theory’ suggests, insecurity is fueled by speeding globalized interactions which increases fear and incites xenophobia (Gambetti 2013).

Geschiere (2009) argues that the democratization of a multitude of African countries during the 1990s created a precedence for citizenship through nation-building projects that either drew from historical contexts or autochthony. I suggest that there is an irony in creating a precedence for citizenship through the use of historical narratives because these histories are often rooted in colonialism. Colonial authorities in South Africa considered ethnolinguistic populations, like that of the Xhosa and Zulu people for example, *allogènes* (‘immigrant’), rather than autochthons of South Africa (Geschiere 2009). It is unique then, that Black South Africans would be the perpetrators of violence against foreigners, because they were, and arguably still are, oppressed peoples living in a post-Apartheid society. The xenophobic sentiments that my Mama in Langa expressed to me, insinuate a strong need for her to internally and externally legitimize her own socioeconomic struggles as a Black South Africa, against the narratives of immigrant’s struggles. I suggest that xenophobic attitudes and violence occur because of the continued need for Black South Africans to assert and validate their own autochthony against a national identity, in a country that systematically contested and denied their identity and sense of belonging for centuries.

The democratization of South Africa in 1994 and the subsequent nation-building practices that the newly formed government engaged in, gave rise to questions regarding a person’s autochthony and whether a person would receive the benefits of, or be excluded from, development projects and the restructuring of the economy (Geschiere 2009). The production of locality as a reaction to globalization is to secure the wealth of production and economic

opportunities for autochthons and to exclude the transnational players (Geschiere 2009). This exclusionary practice of wanting to secure economic opportunities and access to resources for legally recognized citizens or autochthons, from ‘outsiders,’ is the basis for exclusionary tactics of fear and xenophobic violence.

AB, a student at Gettysburg College and a citizen of South Africa, expressed to me in an interview that xenophobia stems from employment (in)securities among the Black South African population (personal communication 2018). AB claimed that there were high levels of unemployment among South African citizens, namely among the majority (Black population), and therefore there is increased competition among individuals, especially in the informal sector, to secure positions of employment. AB’s claims are supported by South African scholar, Desai (2015) who suggests that immigrants migrating to South Africa are often desperately attempting to enter into the informal sector of the economy because they are able to transcend regulatory policies that restrict mobility once they are within the country. Desai (2015) claims that African immigrants migrating to South Africa are considered the reasoning behind decreased wages, as they are more vulnerable and limited in their autonomy within new cultural communities. These immigrants are often quick to accept low-paying employment positions, and this makes immigrants more desirable as businesses do not have to pay their workers fair and reasonable wages, as they would have to pay Black South Africans as required by the Black Economic Empowerment initiative imposed on businesses by the government to ensure Black representation (Desai 2015).

The results of a quantitative survey conducted in 2008 by the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) suggested that of the respondents, White South Africans were calculated as

having greater and more pronounced xenophobic sentiment than that of the Black South Africans surveyed. Those individuals living below the poverty line, or among the working class communities, tended to be more xenophobic in their sentiment and actions (Crush 2008). Unemployment rates and the number of individuals living below the poverty line are higher among the Black South African population, as one of my informants also suggests, that 25% of Black South Africans are unemployed or have temporary positions of employment within the construction and development sector (personal communication 2018). In post-Apartheid South Africa, the creation of employment opportunities remain negligible and immigrants are the assumed reason for the limited resources and access to socio-economic mobility available to Black South Africans (Morris 1998).

I argue that even in a post-Apartheid South Africa, the White population still accumulates and has disposable access to more wealth and economic opportunities than Black South Africans, which creates a heightened sense of urgency and competition for jobs. This structural inequality, stemming from the systemic disenfranchisement of Black South Africans during Apartheid, is a contributing factor to the xenophobic sentiment and violence against foreigners who are viewed by Black South Africans as the greatest competition in the market. Among the responses of my informants, there surfaced a collective perception of xenophobia in South Africa as being a direct result of job security and opportunity.

To suggest that xenophobia is a response to (in)security within the neoliberal and informal sectors of the South African economy, is to analyze xenophobia through a Marxist perspective (Hickel 2014). The Marxist perspective would suggest that neoliberal markets increase competition and accelerate the exploitation of peoples, especially immigrants coming

into South Africa looking for immediate work (Hickel 2014). Hickel does suggest that the underlying socio-political and economic issues apparent in post-Apartheid South Africa are also responsible for reproducing economic insecurity within the country and for Black South Africans in particular. Using the Marxist perspective would shed light on the survey results that Crush (2008) collected and analyzed, that suggested that South Africans believed foreign nationals were responsible for exploiting the limited resources available to the majority of Black South Africans post-Apartheid.

Of those Black South Africans interviewed by Hickel in 2014, job security arose as a factor that contributed to the xenophobic violence persistent within South Africa. The raced and gendered economic migration created by the historical displacement of Black South Africans carries into the present and motivates what is analyzed as xenophobic violence (Hickel 2014). Continuing with the diachronic approach to understanding xenophobia in South Africa, Dodson (2010) and Crush (2008) suggest that the “perfect storm” culminated into violent acts of xenophobia against immigrants living in townships in Cape Town and Johannesburg in 2008.

Violence within townships is often portrayed in the media and news outlets as a continuation of the violence that emerged during Apartheid-era reactionary responses to the oppressive and restrictive policies enforced by police presence (Thompson 2017). The politics of fear and the production of locality persists in Cape Town, among citizens and foreign Black African immigrants. While living in Cape Town, I was exposed to the stereotypes and preconceived ideas held by White South Africans and immigrants themselves, of what townships were like and how they operated. White South Africans and immigrants often expressed their fear of the violence that occurred, and this violence (whether it be between citizens or between

citizens and immigrants) was often inflated and conveyed as the major reality and common lived experience of every township community member. When I would try to catch an Uber from the Cape Town business district to Langa Township to either return home from a school day, or to revisit my home stay family after I had moved out, drivers (who were almost always immigrants from another African country like the Democratic Republic of the Congo or Zimbabwe), were fearful of picking me up or dropping me off within the boundaries of the township. The stereotypes held by White South Africans and immigrants living in Cape Town and in South Africa more broadly, are reinforced by the reality that xenophobic violence is frequent in townships, due to the increased intersection of immigrant and Black South African experiences and narratives.

The accelerated expansion of townships through the expansion of informal settlements, like those found on the outskirts of Langa, Khayelitsha, and Gugulethu, are unquestionable remnants of Apartheid-era policies that effected Black South African mobility and opportunity. Black South Africans migrating from the Eastern to the Western Cape either for labor or familial purposes, will either utilize their system of social networks to find temporary residency, or build an informal settlement that is not regulated by governmental policies (Morreira 2010). Similarly, immigrants coming to Cape Town are utilizing already established social and cultural networks through that of familial or acquaintanceship connections to secure places to stay and potential places of employment. Instances of xenophobic violence against foreigners in townships are often perpetuated by young Black South African males (Hickel 2014). Building on this fact, Hickel offers a culturally specific argument for why young men perpetuate violence against foreigners. Emasculated young Black South African men living in Cato Manor township, who

are unable to pay lobola (bridewealth), or individuals who are living below the poverty line, unable to participate in consistent employment opportunities, attribute their situations to witchcraft and accuse immigrants as being witches (Hickel 2014). This theory also relates to the historical disenfranchisement of Black South African males who were required to migrate to city centers from the Eastern Cape for labor opportunities. Dodson (2010) agrees with Hickel (2014) by suggesting that the gendered violence within South African townships contributes to the current xenophobic sentiment and is deeply rooted in the formation of townships during Apartheid (5).

In addition to the historical and present gendered economic situations of townships in South Africa, witchcraft is understood to incite xenophobic sentiment and violence within townships like Cato Manor, where Hickel conducted fieldwork (Hickel 2014). Cato Manor township is located in Durban, South Africa, so the unique manifestations of xenophobic violence through witchcraft practices are not necessarily replicated within townships in Cape Town. Hickel (2014) also examines the culture of moral economic exchange among Black South Africans living in townships throughout South Africa. A recurrent theme surfaced among the responses of the young, male, Black South Africans living in Cato Manor township, that suggested their attitudes towards immigrants living within the community were tainted by immigrants who did not participate in the local economy, or support businesses operated by Black South Africans. Immigrants moving into townships are often creating their own business opportunities or supporting the business of those immigrants who share common countries of origin (Hickel 2014). Immigrants are viewed by local township community members in Cato Manor as witches because of the continued poverty, economic instability, illness, or other

maladies experienced by Black South Africans (113-114). It is important to examine and empathize with local communities who try to understand immigrants and their own situation in relevance to economics from the emic perspective. In his analysis, Hickel (2014) aims to explain why arson is used in xenophobic violence against immigrants through cultural, social, and historical understandings of witchcraft and the gendered and raced politics and economics of townships like Cato Manor. Hickels' examination is one of emic interpretation and analysis because it is seeking to understand how South Africans understand their world and the people who move through and occupy the spaces that they also claim as autochthons.

Alternative Theories of Violence Against Foreigners in South Africa

This section will examine alternative explanations for why violence is being perpetuated against foreigners in South Africa. These ideas do not fall into the generic model of xenophobia as a backlash to globalization, or models that are based on analysis of global capitalism, but explore more localized and culturally specific reasons for violence against foreigners. The national discussion in South Africa that seeks to understand the reasoning for, manifestation, and mitigation of violence against foreigners in Cape Town and in South Africa suggests that economic disenfranchisement and the remnant of Apartheid-era policies influence xenophobic sentiment and attitudes. However, anthropological arguments have surfaced that suggest that in order to fully comprehend and analyze the violence against foreigners to find effective solutions, the violence must be understood as something different. These new narratives utilize the emic perspective and multifaceted cultural approaches to understand violence perpetuated against the foreigner. Tafira (2011) suggests that the violence occurring in South Africa is not an act of

xenophobia, but an act of racism, what Tafira refers to as the “New Racism” (114). Tafira’s “New Racism” theory suggests that violence is perpetuated by Black South Africans against Black African immigrants, and is fueled by the ethnolinguistic differences represented in communities when immigrants resettle in predominantly Black South African townships. This violence is recognized as both overt and covert micro-aggressions, and replicates the violence perpetuated by White South Africans against the Black population during Apartheid (Tafira 2011). The “New Racism” has its basis in recognizing the differences in culture, nationality, language, dress, and ethnicity (Tafira 2011).

Tafira seeks to define the violence in South Africa as a unique response to increased immigration of Black African migrants, founded on an understanding of the country’s history of Apartheid. The theory of “New Racism” also seeks to separate an understanding of xenophobia as a fear of the ‘other’ and reorganize the debate to focus on the fear of different Black ethnolinguistic communities (Tafira 2011). Tafira agrees with the Marxist perspective presented by Hickel (2014), that seeks to understand xenophobia as a response to the economic disparities present within the country, but also suggests that violence against foreigners be understood as ‘negrophobia’ or ‘Afrophobia.’ Negrophobia is the fear of, or dislike of Black individuals, and Afrophobia is the fear of, or dislike of African individuals, a term that encompasses ‘African’ as being a person from any one of the 54 countries on the continent. Utilizing either term to refer to Black South African and Black African relations, Tafira seeks to suggest that with decolonization, South African relations with foreigners increased and this created conflicts between contesting narratives of autochthony and cultural interaction.

I suggest that this argument feeds into the ideas about continuing discourses of race in South Africa, and the history of race categories during Apartheid. I wonder, however, whether the New Racism can be claimed in post-Apartheid South Africa? When compared to the racism that White minority groups in South Africa expressed and constructed to disadvantage and disenfranchise Black South Africans? Tafira's argument also seeks to distance the conversation about race from the ways in which the global North approach models of race (116). Tafira also brings up a point about internalized anti-Blackness, a product of Apartheid's history, and its' continuance into democratic South Africa, which I discussed with my SIT academic group as a product of colonialism and neocolonialism (117). Tafira believes that more research must be done in order to support this claim about internalized anti-Blackness (120).

Saleh (2015) argues that in order to understand the violence perpetuated in South Africa which is notably termed 'xenophobia,' it is critical to understand the emic perspectives and multifaceted cultural approaches to understanding the 'foreigner.' According to Saleh, using the term 'xenophobic' is Eurocentric and stems from models in the global North. I do agree with Saleh who suggests that it might be necessary to understand violence against foreigners in South Africa through the emic perspective utilizing the ways in which ethnolinguistic groups living within the country understand their own realities and interactions with immigrants (299). The terms used to describe an immigrant or 'foreigner' in the South African context needs to be contextualized in the history of Apartheid and how 'foreigners' were categorized as culturally non-belonging (300). This argument connects well with Gerschiere's argument about autochthony and ideas of occupancy and sense of self and belonging within the nation state (300) although Saleh would deny that this is a generic form of xenophobia. Saleh's argument can also

be supported by Strathern and Stewart's approach to understanding violence as it is reproduced and reinforced by historical institutions and structures, like Apartheid.

Saleh also examines the role that media plays in promoting or inciting public opinions about immigrants and immigration policy within South Africa. He concludes that immigrants's own perceptions of themselves are informed by the attitudes and social, cultural environment of South Africa and directly impacts the ways in which immigrants can acculturate into the host country (301). Saleh seeks to dismantle the Eurocentric approach to understanding violence in South Africa, and suggests that the perceived 'black-on-black' violence is rooted in the unique history of Apartheid and colonialism (302). Saleh's argument aligns with Mapitsa, who suggests that violence against foreigners in Cape Town must be understood as a unique, cultural, and historical phenomenon. To understand the foreigner through an emic perspective that is unique to the cultural perceptions of immigration and foreigners is to also incorporate an analysis of language and the different ways in which language can be used to create understandings of foreigners in South Africa (Saleh 2015). The isiXhosa word "amaKwerekwere" roughly translates into English as "someone speaking an unfamiliar language." Throughout my research I have come across the term "*makwerekwere*" which is a common slang or informal term used by South Africans to label or derogatorily identify immigrants or African nationals (Tafira 2011). "*Makwerekwere*" distinctively identifies the language difference and unrecognizable phonetics of African languages that differ from the Nguni languages of Bantu origin, commonly spoken in South Africa.

Understanding language and its' power to influence cultural perceptions and understandings of foreigners and the violence perpetuated against immigrants can be linked with

the unique history of linguistic migration and recognition within South Africa, predating colonialism, and during Apartheid. While there are currently eleven nationally recognized languages, it is typical for Black South Africans to speak their mother-tongue, and additional languages, especially those languages that stem directly from Nguni languages. Language is implicated in discussions about autochthony, because foreign languages that are unrecognizable, provoke fear and insecurity among autochthons who experience comfort in a specific physical space and through the use of culture, language, religion, etc. In townships throughout Cape Town and South Africa, Black South Africans of different ethnolinguistic backgrounds are interacting and communicating with one another, but these spaces also host immigrants speaking foreign languages as well. It is in these spaces that immigrants can become immediately vulnerable to violence, because of linguistic distinction, and whether the community considers their presence a threat to generational occupancy.

As I have mentioned previously, Tafira's New Racism argument suggests that xenophobia in South Africa should be understood as either negrophobia or Afrophobia. The theory of Afrophobia would address the prejudice against Black African immigrants speaking a different language than one of the eleven nationally recognized ones. Former Police Minister, Nathi Nhleko, has been documented claiming that what is commonly understood and defined as xenophobia in South Africa, should be reexamined and understood as acts of Afrophobia (Ndenze 2015). This sentiment addresses Crush's (2008) survey results that suggest Black South Africans are more likely to perpetuate violence against foreigners, effectively portraying violence as it is "African against one another" (Ndenze 2015). Afrophobia would be instances of

violence that occur against Black African immigrants by Black South Africans in South Africa, or vice versa.

Cape Townian Uber drivers, at least the drivers I encountered while traveling throughout the city and to and from Langa township, were always Black African immigrants from various nations across the continent. One morning, while my room mate and I traveled from Honest Chocolate Cafe on Wale Street, to the SIT classroom in Rondebosch, we rode in an Uber driven by a Black man from Zimbabwe. He had come to live in Cape Town legally, five years ago, and had been driving for Uber for two years. We had only made it about two miles down the road when he asked if we would mind taking a quick detour to the gas station. It was as soon as we drove next to the pump that we heard the Uber driver express his seemingly utter disgust for what he perceived to be “lazy, stupid” Black South African men. These men he was described were sitting by the pay station, on the top of overturned buckets, waiting for our Uber driver to put his car in park. Having witnessed this interaction, I suggest that Afrophobia may also be a condition of internalized anti-blackness, as Tafira suggests. I suggest that further inquiry needs to be made about how histories of colonialism that perpetuated attitudes of anti-blackness, may influence Afrophobia and increasing interactions between Africans in a globalizing world.

The emergence of new nation states in post-colonial African countries during the 1990s, like the democratization of South Africa in 1994, witnessed increased ideologies of exclusion at national and local political levels (Neocosmos 2008). The politics of fear, Neocosmos (2008) argues, has incited xenophobic discourses at the state level, perpetuated by government officials, fueled by a recognizable elitist South African exceptionalism, and conceptions of South African citizenship rooted in ideas of autochthony (587). Remarks from one of my acquaintances living

in South Africa, who agreed to participate in a semi-structured interview that I conducted, claimed that he believed the government promoted statistics that suggested that 65% of foreigners are migrating to, and working in the country illegally, and that immigrants contribute to increased rates of crime and drug use (personal communication 2018). My informants' sentiment suggests that the government is creating and instilling a narrative of fear within South African citizens that creates a sense of personal insecurity at the hands of foreigners. 'AD,' my informant, claims that the South African government is essentially using the present xenophobic attitudes of local community members to justify placing the blame of current socio-political and socio-economic issues on immigrants.

The government of South Africa, under former President Jacob Zuma, has become increasingly intolerant of lenient immigration policies and it has been proclaimed that post-Apartheid refugee and immigration policies guaranteeing protection are too generous (Crush 2017). In the wake of xenophobic violence and sentiment, one of the government's attempts to address and mitigate violence between perpetrator and foreign victim is to address the access to mobility that individuals, namely immigrants, have within South Africa. Crush's (2017) argument counters that of the results his organization, SAMP, gathered, because he suggests that immigrants migrating to South Africa positively contribute to the economic, social, and cultural aspects of South African development. Crush's assertion counter the results of a SAMP survey from 2008, that suggest, of the local South African citizens who responded, opinions about immigrants in the country are negative.

The government is effectively rendering South Africa as an undesirable destination for immigrants, through the implementation of new policies regarding resettlement and access to

resources (Crush 2017). Local authority figures, like that of the Zulu King Goodwill Zwelithini, in 2015, have also been implicit in provoking xenophobic sentiment and violence against foreigners in South Africa, justifying his remarks as necessary to protect the resources and opportunities available to autochthons (Tella 2016). In 2015, after the xenophobic attacks incited by the Zulu King, the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Migration (IMC) began the Operation Fiela, which became effective in cities throughout South Africa (Crush 2017). In Cape Town, authority figures from the local police department, South African Army officials, and traffic and security guards publicly harassed immigrant business-owners at the city's taxi terminal, near the Cape Town train station (Crush 2017). The IMC's intention was to distinguish between immigrants who had entered the country legally from those who had not, and effectively deport them back to their country of origin. The government has attempted to address the situation using methods of intimidation and fear, that consequently, continue to jeopardize the safety and agency of immigrants in Cape Town.

Exclusionary local politics also manifest through xenophobic violence and act as an extension of national governmental procedures situated in the practice of nation building and securing opportunities for autochthons or citizens (Mapitsa 2018). The formation of identity at the local level is also suggestive of xenophobia's roots in structural and institutional entities, and its ability to be manipulated by perpetrators and governmental officials seeking to promote agendas that enhance South African identity and autochthony over allogènes and foreigners (Mapitsa 2018). Dodson (2010) argues that the government is effectively contributing to xenophobic sentiment by publicly claiming that immigrants place a significant 'strain' on state resources. South African politicians, including that of the Premier of the Western Cape Province

(encompassing the city of Cape Town), Helen Zille, has been documented by the press and news media outlets as inciting xenophobic and anti-immigrant sentiment with the use of inflammatory statements that address job insecurity and employment in Cape Town (Neocosmos 2008). I argue that this tactic used by Premier Helen Zille, seeks to redirect the responsibility that politicians and government officials have of addressing and finding solutions to the economic, spatial, and socio-political disparities apparent in post-Apartheid South Africa. By refusing to assume the responsibility of addressing such issues, politicians have essentially pushed the blame onto immigrants, when there should be an extensive reexamination of structural economic and spatial inequality that disenfranchise Black South Africans.

Mitigation Efforts

Immigration, xenophobia, and issues of autochthony will remain at the forefront of the national conversation if strategies focused on mitigation efforts are not effectively instituted and supported by community organizers, political leaders, and community members. The issue of recurrent xenophobic sentiment and violence in South Africa is recognized as an issue in dire need of an effective solution. Efforts to mitigate xenophobic violence in South Africa have already been made as community members seek to address and put an end to the violence against foreigners happening in the city center in townships like Langa. Gift of the Givers (GOTG) was one of the first non-governmental organizations to respond to the xenophobic violence that occurred in Alexandria township in 2008 (Desai 2013). Within one week after the violence, GOTG provided R1 million worth of goods (approximately \$80,000.00), to Alexandra township and other parts of the Gauteng province (Desai 2013). GOTG has since opened up a center in Cape Town, to assist in the efforts to mitigate xenophobic violence within the city. GOTG is a

South African organization that is funded by South African donors (Desai 2013). The fact that GOTG was able to raise R1 million in supplies within one week after the violence alludes to the presence of a network of people living in South Africa determined to respond effectively and quickly to xenophobic violence. Desai (2013) does not provide the demographic information as to who contributed or donated to the efforts of raising provisions for displaced and threatened peoples, but due to the socioeconomic disparities previously discussed, I would assume the middle to upper White South African population contributed significantly because of their access to resources.

A community organization based out of the Western Cape, the Social Justice Coalition (SJC) collaborates to create effective solutions to the issues posed from structural inequalities stemming from the Apartheid-era (Robins 2009). These issues include housing and spatial inequality, access to quality education, access to healthcare facilities and programs, etc (Robins 2009). By addressing the structural inequality that remains apparent in Cape Town and in South Africa more generally, SJC is attempting to understand and respond to the issues that contribute to xenophobic sentiment and violence. It would be most effective for organizations and mitigation efforts to confront the realities faced by perpetrators and victims when trying to end xenophobic violence, because I argue that the spatial and socioeconomic disenfranchisement of Black South Africans contributes to the violence.

The Action Support Center utilizes conflict systems and transformations strategies to address the structural violence implicated in poverty. Conflict systems analysis allows organizations like the Action Support Center to create programs, prevent violence, and facilitate community engagement and learning (Smith 2017). Smith suggests that the structural violence

evident within South African society today is a continuation of the systemic racial violence from the Apartheid-era.

Conclusion

I believe that my inability to be present in Cape Town, South Africa, significantly limited the results of my qualitative research on xenophobia, its' manifestations, perpetrators, and mitigation efforts. I believe that I would have had more success securing interviews and being able to create a more dynamic collaborative relationship with my interview participants had I been in Cape Town, and been able to meet directly with individuals to speak with them about their understanding of xenophobia. As an anthropology student, it is in my training and theory to want be present in the field while conducting research. It is my responsibility to ensure I produce the most accurate representation and interpretation of the peoples whom I've interviewed, as well as the intersecting realities of culture, politics, economics, space, and power within my research site.

My intention was to create a collaborative and 'working relationship' with the individual participants whom I interviewed, and I believe this would have been more efficient and successful had I been in Cape Town, with the ability to communicate in-person. I also believe my presence in Cape Town would have provided more agency to the individuals whom I interviewed, because I would have been able to provide them with a more immediate sense of agency as to the process of interviewing. I was limited by my resources, and I initially contacted six individuals in the ways in which I thought were most appropriate, but not necessarily in the ways in which would have been most convenient to the individuals I contacted.

After critical reflection I also believe that language may have limited my ability to include literary and news sources because I am only able to speak, read, and write in English, and can only speak and read elementary isiXhosa. I believe that while I was living in Langa Township with my home stay family, I was limited in my ability to speak with them in isiXhosa, which was not my Mamas first language but it is the language she and Tata speak at home and in their community. I believe I was unable to engage with them in deep and meaningful ways as I attempted to more fully comprehend how they make sense of their lived experiences and how they relate those experience with the world around them. I sheepishly admit my inability to communicate effectively with my home stay parents in isiXhosa and with AD who also speaks isiXhosa as his home language. As an anthropology student, I have been trained to conduct fieldwork while learning and speaking the common language of the community members of which I am living and conducting ethnographic fieldwork. Had I been living in Cape Town for a longer duration of time, instead of one semester, I believe that I could have improved my knowledge and language acquisition of isiXhosa.

My personal recommendations for further inquiry and exploration of the perpetuation of violence against foreigners in Cape Town would be to expand the number of interview participants in rider to create a larger narrative-based, emic perspective regarding violence and autochthony. I recommend that further discussion include the LGBTQAI experience as it relates to xenophobia in Cape Town, as my positionality prohibited me from exploring that avenue of research effectively. I also suggest that further exploration include perceptions and theory of violence against foreigners from the South African perspective rather than models created by theorists in the global North, to include the arguments of South African scholars as they relate to,

and make meaning from their country's experience with violence. I also wonder if Afrophobia and internalized anti-blackness contribute to the anti-Black African foreigner in Cape Town, as a country still implicated in neocolonial processes of Black disenfranchisement and issues of autochthony and belonging.

The unique manifestation of xenophobic violence present and persistent within South Africa is informed by perceptions of autochthony and fueled by the remaining structural inequality of a post-Apartheid society. For a country trying to heal the traumas of colonialism and systemic oppression, it is unique that Black South Africans, as a formerly, and currently, oppressed group of people, would inflict violence upon Black African immigrants migrating to South Africa. To effectively mitigate and eradicate xenophobic sentiment and violence within the country, the socioeconomic disparities between White and Black South Africans and immigrants must be addressed. The South African government should no longer deny or refrain from addressing the consequences of remaining structural and spatial inequality, nor shift the responsibility of failing to address the issues onto the presence of immigrants. Addressing the question of land repatriation to Black South Africans and trying to close the wide economic disparities between South Africans will mitigate xenophobic violence as a result.

Works Cited

Crush, Jonathan

2008 "South Africa: Policy in the Face of Xenophobia." *Migration Information Source*: 1-10.

2017 "Rendering South Africa Undesirable: A Critique of Refugee and Informal Sector Policy." *SAMP Migration Policy Series* 79: 1-32.

Ceuppens, B. and Peter Geschiere

2005 "Autochthony: Local or Global? New Modes in the Struggle over Citizenship and Belonging in Africa and Europe." *The Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 385-407.

Desai, Ashwin and Goolam Vahed

2013 "Non-Governmental Organizations and Xenophobia in South Africa: A Case Study of the Gift of the Givers." *Alternation Special Edition* 7: 241-266.

Desai, Ashwin

2015 "Migrants and Violence in South Africa: The April 2015 Xenophobic Attacks in Durban." *The Oriental Anthropologist* 15(2): 247-259.

Dodson, Belinda

"Locating Xenophobia: Debate, Discourse, and Everyday Experience in Cape Town, South Africa." *Africa Today* 56(3): 3-21.

Feinberg, Harvey M.

1993 "The 1913 Natives Land Act in South Africa: Politics, Race, and Segregation in the Early 20th Century." *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26(1): 65-109.

Gambetti, Zeynep and Marcial Godoy-Anativia

2013 "Rhetorics of Insecurity: Belonging and Violence in the Neoliberal Era." *Social Science Research Council*: New York University Press.

Geschiere, Peter

2009 "The Perils of Belonging: Autochthony, Citizenship, and Exclusion in Africa and Europe." *The University of Chicago Press*.

Jason Hickel

2014 "Xenophobia in South Africa: Order, Chaos, and the Moral Economy of Witchcraft." *Cultural Anthropology: The American Anthropological Association* 29(1): 103-127.

Mapitsa, Caitlin Blaser

2018 "Local Politics of Xenophobia." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 53(1): 3-19.

Morreira, Shannon

2010 "Seeking Solidarity: Zimbabwean Undocumented Migrants in Cape Town, 2007." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 36(2): 432-448.

Morris, Alan

1998 "our Fellow Africans make our Lives Hell:" the Lives of Congolese and Nigerians Living in Johannesburg. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21(6): 1116-1134.

Ndenze, Babalo

2015 "We Are Facing Afrophobia With Attacks on Foreigners, Says Minister." *The Star*: 4.

Neocosmos, Michael

2008 "The Politics of Fear and the Fear of Politics: Reflections of Xenophobic Violence in South Africa." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 43(6): 586-594.

Nyamnjoh, Francis B.

2013 "Fiction and Reality of Mobility in Africa." *Citizenship Studies* 17: 653-675.

Robins, Steven

2009 "Humanitarian Aid Beyond "Bare Survival: Social Movement Responses to Xenophobic Violence in South Africa." *American Ethnologist* 36(4): 637-650.

SAHO

2017. South African History Online.

Saleh, Ibrahim

"Is it Really Xenophobia in South Africa or an International Act of Prejudice?"

Smith, Richard Melville

2017 "Conflict Systems Perspective Helps Defeat Xenophobic Violence in SA: Life is Cheap Because of Our Violent Past and Present Way the System Works." *Access World News*: Cape Town, SA: Cape Argus: 15.

Stewart, Pamela J., and Andrew Strathern

2002 "Violence: Theory and Ethnography." *Continuum*: New York, New York.

Tafira, Kenneth

2011 "Is Xenophobia Racism?" *Anthropology Southern Africa* 34: 114-120.

Tella, Oluwaseun

2016 "Understanding Xenophobia in South Africa: The Individual, the State, and the International System." *African Studies Association of India: SAGE* 8(2): 142-158.

Thompson, Daniel K.

2017 "Scaling Statelessness: Absent, Present, and Former Liminal States of Somali Experience in South Africa." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 40(1): 86-103.

I affirm that I have upheld the highest principles of honesty and integrity in my academic work, and I have not witnessed a violation of the Honor Code.

Mary Casey