

*International Society for Third Sector Research Conference, University of
Barcelona, Spain, July 9-12, 2008)*

Diaspora Philanthropy and Development: Help and Giving among
Zimbabweans in South Africa

James Muzondidya (Human Sciences Research Council)
Email: jmuzondidya@hsrc.ac.za &

&

Bertha Chiroro (Oxfam, South Africa)
BChiroro@Oxfam.org.uk

Diaspora Philanthropy and Development: Help and Giving among Zimbabweans in South Africa

James Muzondidya and Bertha Chiroro

INTRODUCTION

The impact of diaspora philanthropy on development in Zimbabwe, and Africa in general, is not well researched, as most of the “diaspora-giving” on the continent is under-documented. Yet, the emerging role of diasporas in national development cannot be underestimated. For many countries such as China, Mexico, Ghana and Lesotho, the Diaspora is becoming a major source of foreign direct investment, commercial contacts, political connections, advocacy and technological transfer (Johnson 2007; Higazi 2005). Diaspora philanthropy in these countries and others has become an agent for change and development. Rapid progress in communications technology is providing Africans with new opportunities for networking and enterprise and increasing numbers of Africans in the Diaspora are reconnecting to their home countries in imaginative new ways involving creative development strategies. Africans in the Diaspora from other countries frequently organise into associations based on hometown, ethnic, alumni, or equivalent associations aimed at effecting positive change in their regions of origin (Chikezie: 2005).

Since the beginning of the economic and governance crisis in Zimbabwe around 2000, a large number of Zimbabweans have emigrated to Europe and North America as well as the relatively prosperous neighbouring countries of South Africa, Botswana and Namibia. Many of these Zimbabwean emigrants, forming an incipient Zimbabwean Diaspora, have maintained strong ties with their home country through remittances to families and different forms of philanthropic giving. A study carried out on the development potential of Zimbabweans living abroad or in Diaspora by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in 2005 showed that at least 96% of Zimbabweans in the United Kingdom and South Africa maintain regular social contact with family members (Bloch 2005). The diaspora-giving methods and channels have become diverse. Whilst remittances are sent to families, there is also an amount that is sent as charitable donations towards community development, i.e. to build and rebuild schools, churches and hospital (Bloch, 2005, Maphosa, 2004). A large proportion of diaspora giving is practised informally and privately through personal and kinship ties as well as through direct gifts. This philanthropic giving by Zimbabweans abroad has remained understudied and under appreciated.

This chapter explores the range, contours and characteristics of Zimbabwean diaspora philanthropy and its impact on development in Zimbabwe. It specifically focuses on the estimated 1 to 2 million Zimbabweans in South Africa (Goliber

2004; Polzer 2007: 5; Makina 2007; IRIN, 3.4.08). South Africa is the most important destination for both unskilled and skilled Zimbabweans seeking economic survival outside Zimbabwe because of its proximity and relatively larger economic base in the region. The chapter specifically focuses on the following:

- the context in which diaspora philanthropy takes place, including the historical, cultural and traditional factors influencing diaspora philanthropy;
- notions of philanthropy among both Zimbabweans living abroad and at home;
- political, social and economic factors promoting and impeding diaspora philanthropy;
- the forms and extent of philanthropy among Zimbabwean diasporas
- limitations, challenges and opportunities for diaspora philanthropy on development in Zimbabwe.

The findings in this chapter are based on both fieldwork and desktop research. The desktop research focused on published primary and secondary sources, including newspapers, online sources, books and reports. The fieldwork evidence is based on primary interviews and discussions with both Zimbabweans based in Zimbabwe and those living outside the country. Some of the oral evidence is gleaned through informal conversations with Zimbabweans living in the provinces of Gauteng and the Western Cape, which host the largest numbers of Zimbabweans in the country. The writers have both been living in South Africa for the past 5 years. The study adopts a transnational approach which tries to develop a broader understanding of diaspora philanthropy from the perspective of both diaspora Zimbabweans in their various locations abroad and their associates back home.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Mainstream thinking regards philanthropy as 'the private voluntary transfer of resources for the benefit of the public' (Johnson, 2007:6). The conventional understanding of philanthropy is about charity and voluntarism, meaning that the giving is out of free will rather than obligations (Wilkinson-Maphosa and Fowler 2004). Philanthropy has a lot to do with the public good rather than personal gain, and philanthropic giving could be in the form of money, goods, services, knowledge and skills given for the public benefit (Johnson, 2007:6).

The assumptions implicit in mainstream literature on philanthropy and the notion of 'philanthropy', as understood industrialised western world, are difficult to apply in the African context. To begin with, the patterns of giving and obligation that apply in the industrialised western world and the developing world are fundamentally different. In the western industrialised world, philanthropy is viewed as a voluntary act towards the 'public' inspired by generosity and altruism. Yet the lines between the 'private' and 'public' as well as 'voluntarism' and 'obligations' are not only blurred but also varied. In the developing world,

family and informal networks are highly personalised and giving is more influenced by specific identity categories based on blood, kinship and residence (Everatt, Habib, Maharaj and Nyar 2005: 279).

Second, the term 'philanthropy' denotes 'charity' yet many African societies, Zimbabwe included, do not view helping other members of the community as such. Historically, Africans, as the renowned African philosopher Mbiti (1982) has argued, have been socialised to define themselves by their social obligations to their wider community. The responsibility of citizenry, Dei (1996) adds, included providing communal and individual forms of help, which could be in the form of labour, and material contributions to the needy in society, such as bereaved families in times of death, orphans, widows, the aged and the poor.

Across their ethnic and cultural divide, Africans, like many other groups from across the world, privileged communal solidarity.¹ They generally subscribed to a doctrine of collective responsibility whose "epistemological construct is that the rights of citizenship have matching obligations and responsibilities to the community in which one resides" (Dei 1996: 3). This social philosophy of African culture, known as '*ubuntu*' [humanity] in Southern Africa, encompasses compassion, reciprocity, generosity, dignity and harmony in building and maintaining community (Nussbaum 2004; Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler 2004). The philosophy of '*ubuntu*' or '*hunhu*', as it is known in Zimbabwe's ethno-linguistic culture, requires those who have to take of deprived in the community (Mombeshora 2004).

The historical changes in African society, especially the social and economic changes that have occurred during both the colonial and postcolonial restructuring processes, have indeed affected African value systems, including notions about community, giving and sharing. Africans, like others in the rest of the world, are being transformed into individualistic and inward-looking beings who do not value community responsibility (Kaseke and Dhemba 2007: 91). However, in most African societies, unlike most contemporary Western societies which have been heavily influenced by the commodification of social life under advanced industrial capitalism (Zaretsky 1976), traditions of communal solidarity and mutuality have remained strong (Dei 1996). The power of obligation for both members of the extended family and community in African society, as both Garlick (1971) and Dia (1991) have explained, has remained omnipresent and traditional ethos of communal sharing and solidarity are still observed widely.

Comment [UP1]:

Communal giving and sharing among African communities has particularly become more important in those communities experiencing economic and

¹ Perspectives and practices of African communal traditions varied from one society to another, depending on the organization and historical influences of the society in question. More importantly, communalism is not unique or exclusive to African culture. It is a common phenomenon in many parts of the world, including South Asia and even pre-industrial Western Europe as well other societies where people's survival depends very much on mutual dependence.

political crises, such as contemporary Zimbabwe. Here, groups and individuals have had to depend more on what Goran Hyden (1983) controversially calls the 'economy of affection' (social support networks among African groups connected by blood, marriages, kinship, residence and religion) for their survival. In many of these communities, both rural and urban, giving is shaped by both senses of responsibility and obligation. Helping members of the extended family, the poor, the elderly and other vulnerable groups like orphans continues to be regarded as a responsibility for every member of the group rather than a voluntary act. The line between 'obligations' and 'voluntarism' is thus blurred in African philanthropy, and much of what is regarded in the West as voluntary is viewed in many African communities, as Moyo (forthcoming) and Kuljian (2005: 8) have both noted, as obligatory.

Furthermore, in the developed world, giving is viewed an act undertaken by the rich and wealthy members of the community directed towards the poor and this perception is implicit even in the literature on philanthropy (Everatt, Habib, Maharaj and Nyar 2005: 278). Philanthropy, in this sense, is the expression of the benevolence of the rich towards the poor (Donati (2003), as cited in Everett, Habib and Maharaj & Nyar: 2005). In the Zimbabwean case, and many other parts of the developing world, philanthropy is not located in the domain of the wealthy and powerful and giving is not a linear process where resources always filter from the rich to the poor. There is a lot of horizontal philanthropy that occurs, which includes the poor giving each other resources, and even vertical philanthropy involving the poor assisting well to do households with goods and services (Dzingirai 2001; Mombeshora 2004).

Recent research on philanthropy in South Africa has in fact revealed that giving is more common among the poor than the rich although the rich give greater amounts (Habib, Maharaj & Nyar 2008: 38). The growing body of literature on diaspora philanthropy has also showed that giving occurs among both the skilled and affluent migrants and their economically struggling, unskilled compatriots (Maphosa 2004 & 2008; Copeland-Carson 2007; Deeney 2002). For example, the little research on the livelihood strategies of Zimbabwe's unskilled migrants in South Africa has shown that they organise *stokvels* (rotating credit) to assist each other in times of financial difficulty, such as periods of unemployment, and burial societies to pool money and other resources in order to assist the bereaved and their relatives in both South Africa and Zimbabwe (Muzondidya 2008; Maphosa 2008).

To understand fully the dynamics shaping giving among both poor and wealthy Zimbabweans living abroad, we need to reflect briefly on the concept of diaspora philanthropy and the various influences shaping diaspora groups' engagement with their home countries.

Diaspora philanthropy has many variations, which include homeland philanthropy, migrant philanthropy, and transnational giving. Like other forms of

philanthropy, diaspora philanthropy is expressed in several forms, such as charitable giving from individuals who reside outside their homeland directly to others who have remained behind and giving to causes or charitable organizations in the homeland country (Johnson 2007: 5-6). Another fundamental aspect of diaspora philanthropy is the humanitarian assistance diasporas usually mobilize or give to victims of natural disasters and conflict in their home countries. Somali and Liberian groups living outside of Africa, for instance, have been involved in peace and reconstruction initiatives for their home countries (African Diaspora Policy Centre 2006). Diaspora philanthropy could also be in the form of social investments, such as schools, community centres, clinics and mortuaries, which could be privately owned but are for the public benefit. In central America, where many national economies have collapsed and the state has been struggling to provide basic services to the population, diasporas have been largely responsible for community development projects through their social investments and collective remittances (Johnson 2007: 7; Orozco 2003).

Migrants often send financial contributions to relatives and friends they have left behind and alleviate the suffering of people living in crisis situations. In countries like Mexico, for instance, migrant remittances have become the biggest source of foreign income, and public works that would be considered the province of government elsewhere are financed by Mexican workers' remittances sent to their hometowns (www.limitstogrowth.org/WEB-text/remittances.html). Such charitable giving from individuals who reside outside their homeland, but maintain a sense of identity/connection with the home country, usually occurs as a means for migrants to keep their ties with their country of birth, and with people in the motherland. Transnational relations between migrant donors and those in the country of birth (individuals, groups) are then built or maintained.

However, diaspora philanthropy, like any other forms of giving, does not occur in a vacuum. It occurs within specific historical contexts and complex economic, political, religious, social and cultural influences which shape people's giving behaviour. Changing political and economic environments in both the diasporas' host and home countries also continuously shape diasporas' philanthropy. The political and economic contexts influencing diaspora philanthropy, for instance, could be the political and economic situation in the home country, including government policies that might work against maintaining ties between the diaspora and the home country and making philanthropic investments difficult; the reasons for original migration; and the economic and political situation of the emigrants in the host country. As this discussion shows below, the current political and economic crises in Zimbabwe has significantly affected giving among Zimbabweans in the diaspora.

The cultural context influencing diaspora philanthropy includes a community's traditional and cultural norms. In the case of the 1.8 million Filipino-Americans who collectively send about \$5-billion to the Philippines every year, for example, their philanthropy draws on Philippine social norms and cultural values. It builds

on values of kinship ties, *bayanihan*, and the idea that blessings need to be shared (www.filipinodiasporagiving.org/). Equally, donations of modest gifts to hometown institutions by older generations of Chinese-Americans are very much rooted in traditional Chinese culture. Scholars who have written on Chinese diaspora philanthropy locate it in a long tradition of reciprocity and giving that draws on Confucian ideal of benevolence (*ren*), reinforced by Buddhism and Taoist teachings. These ideals engendered among the Chinese the idea of a corporate personality, not an isolated and individualistic and insular being produced by the modern industrial capitalist system (Lee 1990; Deeney 2002). Against this background, as John Deeney explains, 'Chinese giving is essentially private, personal and informal (as opposed to public and professional), starting with family and gradually extending to institutions that support the family spirit such as schools and churches or temples' (Young and Shih 2003: 17).

HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL BACKGROUNDS INFORMING ZIMBABWEAN DIASPORA PHILANTHROPY

Like in other diaspora groups, the notions of giving and giving behaviour of Zimbabweans living in South Africa is very much rooted in their complex histories, politics, cultures, traditions and societal values. For many Zimbabweans, as in the case of the overseas Chinese, the family and kin remain the primary targets of assistance because the family (*mhuri/imhuli*) represents a deep abiding kinship among both communities and is the basis for society. Family and kinship relationships structure patterns of giving and distribution of 'affection and obligation' in society. The twin concepts of family and kinship in both Ndebele and Shona societies, as in many other African communities, are broad. Family is understood to encompass much more than a nuclear family of the husband, the wife, and children or immediate family members connected to each other by blood. The family unit includes members of the extended family and others who might not be connected to the unit by blood. Giving within the extended family is not conceived as philanthropy or charity but an obligation or a duty. Kinship, especially among migrants far away from home, does not only refer to distant relatives, connected by blood and social ties, but to multi-stranded social relations which often overlap with other types of relations such as a common village of origin. The wider kin group of an extended family can thus be very extensive (Bourdillon 1977; Kaarsholm 1997; Anderson 2001: 101-103).

Philanthropic practices among Zimbabweans living abroad are also drawn from historic traditions of collective action and self-help. These historic traditions include *nhimbe* or *ilima* (interhousehold cooperation) which enabled households not able to perform livelihood activities, such as cultivating, making of crafts and raising of children, or whose labour needs exceeded household capacity to rely on the help of fellow villagers (Mombeshora 2004: 6-7).

Contemporary Zimbabwean diaspora philanthropy further draws heavily on the historic traditions of collective sharing of burdens and fortunes among

Zimbabwean ethno-linguistic groups. Resources, such as food, tools and ideas, are shared for the survival of the community and wealthier members of the community are expected to look after the poor (Dzingirai 2001). More importantly, embedded in the culture of these groups is a moral obligation to give help, *rubatsiro* in Shona and *uncedo* in Ndebele, to relatives, neighbours, friends, orphans, the elderly, the disabled, the ill, strangers, the church and the bereaved. It is customary to help with gifts during happy times, such as when a baby is born. Similarly during times of sadness or illness relatives pay social visits in order to support each other emotionally and financially. At funerals, for instance, food and money is brought in to assist with the burial. The contribution is called *chema* in Shona and *zibuthe* in Ndebele- which is condolences money. This kind of giving is driven by a sense of altruism and the giver does not expect anything in return (Mombeshora 2004).

The principal historical determinant of philanthropy among members of Zimbabwe's contemporary communities, both inside and outside Zimbabwe, is their communal upbringing that emphasises the collective being rather than the individual. As Vupenyu Dzingirai has noted when writing about the rural southern district of Chivi, there is a positive value associated with giving and sharing and people consider giving as a virtue. 'Better off' households are expected to give assistance, in the form of goods or services, to others less privileged. Culturally, when a young Zimbabwean man or woman gets employed or become rich, there is a social obligation to help the other members of the family or kinship group (Munro 2003).

Like elsewhere in Africa and the world, the concept of family and kinship among Zimbabweans has indeed not been static but evolving. The same applies to forms of household linkages and cooperation. The pressures arising from colonial urbanisation and labour migrancy, growing economic hardships during the ESAP and the post-2000 crisis as well as increasing economic demands on individuals have all affected individual views towards family and kinship (Harrison, Stewart, Myambo and Teveraishe, 1997; Munro 2003:6-7). The changing nature of the family has become even more pronounced as more and more Zimbabweans disperse in search of economic livelihoods across the world.

However, traditional forms of giving and receiving have persisted and adapted to wider socio economic changes brought about by colonialism and other global changes. For instance, in the absence of organised social welfare, Zimbabweans continued to rely on traditional or informal social welfare systems based on kinship ties and cultural practices of solidarity for much of the colonial period. The extended family remained an important social welfare system, which provided material and nonmaterial support to its members. Household resources and labour were mobilised in support of the needy, and the system looked after its own destitute, sick, handicapped and elderly (Kaseke 2002: 217). Throughout the colonial period, kinship ties were maintained and remittances came from those who were working in the towns to the rural areas (Munro 2003).

The rural-urban linkages, family and kinship ties as well as other philanthropic networks established during the colonial period were maintained and consolidated in the postcolonial period and beyond, including the current period of unprecedented crisis. Zimbabweans in the Diaspora particularly value, and have often rekindled, family and kinship ties as they seek to survive the harshness of life away from home. Migrants living and working in South Africa, especially the illegal and unskilled, rely heavily on extended family and kinship networks from Zimbabwe for accommodation, employment, savings and remittances to Zimbabwe as well as other forms of support in times of financial troubles, family disputes, sickness or bereavement. These networks are normally activated in times of need such as periods of unemployment when the immigrant would need support in terms of both accommodation, food and transport money to go and look for a job. The networks are also relied on to help migrants to continue to support both their immediate and extended families left behind (Muzondidya 2008; Dzingirai 2007).

The evolving notions of philanthropy among Zimbabweans are also significantly shaped by their experiences in terms of class, race, gender, ethnicity, generation and location, and the following discussion shows how all these differences intersect to inform emigrants' ideas about philanthropy and their involvement in it. A nuanced understanding of both the size, history and composition of this varied social formation is important in understanding patterns of giving among Zimbabweans in South Africa.

Composition of Zimbabweans in South Africa

Zimbabweans living in South Africa, like their compatriots in different parts of the globe, comprise both individuals who have chosen to migrate formally, especially professionals or those with skills or funds and old networks abroad, and others who have been compelled to move by their complex political or economic circumstances. The emerging Zimbabwean diaspora community in South Africa is complex and multifaceted, and this affects its attitude towards philanthropy as well its capacity to give. While a significant number of these Zimbabwean migrants, especially the skilled professionals, have already settled permanently or semi-permanently in South Africa, most Zimbabweans, like their counterparts scattered all over Europe, the United States, and other overseas countries, do not see their stay there as a permanent or semi-permanent. Their presence abroad, like that of many other postcolonial African migrants before them, might turn out to be more permanent, but many still regard it as temporary and see themselves as economic exiles waiting to return to their country when conditions normalise (Chetsanga & Muchenje 2003; Magaisa 2005).

The Zimbabwean community in South Africa comprise both voluntary and forced migrants. It is, in the main, made up of asylum seekers, political refugees, skilled expatriates, students, semi-skilled and unskilled labour migrants,

undocumented/illegal migrants and others who have naturalised (UNCHR 2007). The illegal, seasonal migrants, who occasionally sneak in and out of South Africa, and fit into the category of economic refugees or exiles rather than diaspora, constitute the largest proportion of Zimbabweans in South Africa (Sisulu, Moyo and Tshuma 2007; Chetsanga et al 2003). To remove any ambiguities over the use of the terms 'diaspora', 'exiles' or 'migrants', this chapter uses the word 'diaspora' loosely to refer to all Zimbabweans living in South Africa, whether permanently or temporarily.

Zimbabweans in South Africa can be further categorised into earlier and recent migrants, and the migrants' philanthropic behaviour is also largely influenced by their migration history, social status and settlement patterns. Among the older migrants are, for instance, Zimbabweans who, together with hundreds of thousands of other unskilled and semi-skilled contract labourers from Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique, moved to South Africa to service the labour needs of the South Africa mining industry during colonialism (Crush, Jeeves and Yudelman 1991; Van Onselen 1976). Many of these older migrants were either forced contract workers (*chibalo*) or labour migrants who voluntarily moved across the borders in search of employment and better wages in the mining, commercial agriculture and domestic service sectors (Ranger 1989). They also included others who migrated in search of tertiary education and further training. Some of these older migrants started families in South Africa as they married into local communities and eventually settled permanently.

Older Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa also include white emigrants who initially fled from the 1970s war of independence and later the introduction of black majority rule in 1980 (Selby 2006: 117-118; Simon 1988: 1). But, the larger group of post-independence emigrants consisted of political refugees from Matebeleland and parts of Midlands who came in the early 1980s fleeing the state-inspired, Gukurahundi violence and killings in Matebeleland of 1983 to 1987. Some of the refugees eventually acquired South African citizenship, both lawfully and unlawfully, and settled permanently in South Africa (Sisulu, Moyo and Tshuma 2007: 554; Solidarity Peace Trust 2004). Though alienated from the Zimbabwe state which drove them into exile (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2003; Lindgren 2005; Alexander, McGregor and Ranger 2000), many of these Zimbabwean immigrants continued to look at Zimbabwe as home and to support their home communities in various ways. Some decided to form self-help organizations that appealed to both fellow migrants and foreign donors for support to rebuild neglected and destroyed schools and clinics, while others assist their communities by sending material support directly to relatives and friends left behind or helping them to come and settle in South Africa.

Another important constituent of the older Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa are labour migrants, especially from the drought prone districts of Midlands and Matebeleland, who migrated to South Africa in the 1980s (Mandava 2001; Tevera and Crush 2003). Many of these labour migrants managed to secure jobs

in skilled positions or as general labourers and established themselves in South Africa. Some set up homes and families in South Africa, and continued to lead dual lives, establishing families across both sides of the Limpopo (Solidarity Peace Trust, 2004; Maphosa 2004: 16). Having stable jobs and homes, some of these labour migrants, popularly termed '*injiva*' back home because of their perceived status of being wealthy, continued to help their extended families and communities of origin through regular remittances and occasional donations to schools, orphanages, and clinics.

But the largest constituent of Zimbabweans in South Africa is made up of recent migrants who moved to South Africa from 2000 onwards when political uncertainty and the economic 'meltdown' in Zimbabwe drove hundreds of thousands of Zimbabweans abroad (Human Rights Watch 2006). In some cases, entire families have relocated because of the increasing economic hardships in Zimbabwe and the growing shortages of basic services and commodities. Unlike the earlier migrants, many of the post-2000 migrants have struggled to settle down in the hostile and competitive environment of their host country. The new migrants have struggled to secure jobs on the South African job market, which has, over the years, not been generating enough jobs to absorb both the domestic and foreign supply. In general, recent migrants have had to rely on the support of established migrants for both their accommodation, employment networks and, in some cases, material welfare.

Clearly, the Zimbabwean community in South Africa is a complex social formation, not only in terms of its composition, cultural and class diversity but also its migration history and settlement patterns as well as its tendencies and practices. All these factors influence, in a variety of ways, the ways of philanthropic giving among Zimbabweans living in South Africa.

FORMS AND EXTENT OF PHILANTHROPIC GIVING

Some of the studies that have been done on Zimbabweans abroad suggest that Zimbabweans do not have a strong philanthropic culture of giving back to their communities, and that even for wealthy individuals who can afford to give some of their accumulated wealth, the family and kin remain the primary targets of assistance before the wider community and society. Only 14% of Zimbabweans interviewed by Alice Bloch in the UK and South Africa in her 2005 survey pointed out that they contributed to charities, compared to 74% who sent remittances to support family members (Bloch 2005). Maphosa (2004) also found that while remittances from migrants working in South Africa are contributing much to the alleviation of poverty and the development of households in Matebeleland South, there is very little investment at the community level and most of the giving is on an ad-hoc level. Very few migrants have been involved in community development projects such as building or refurbishing hospitals, clinics and schools.

However, this study found out that although much of the giving among Zimbabweans is not institutionalised, there is a significant level of giving to the communities taking place at the individual level, mainly through informal channels. Since much of this giving is unrecorded, it is difficult to quantify it. Zimbabweans interviewed for this study broadly pointed out that they are quite aware of the numerous economic, health, and educational challenges facing their communities at the moment and they try to help whenever they can. William, who works as a researcher in Johannesburg, for instance, points out that he takes along books for both his former high school and university department whenever he goes home because he is aware that teaching and research institutes are struggling to raise funds to buy reading material (Discussion with William, Pretoria, December 2007). William also adds that he also takes along his old clothes for donation to members of his extended family and other relatives. In some cases, he gives these clothes to his village neighbours, especially those who help his old mother with household tasks such as collecting firewood and drawing water from the communal borehole.

In general, Zimbabweans in South Africa and beyond, especially professionals and entrepreneurs who have more resources and better access to funding networks in the international donor community and global philanthropic world, are contributing to the development of their communities by donating books, computers and other research material to their old schools and universities on an ad hoc basis. Munyaradzi Nyakudya and Munyaradzi Mushonga (2008), explain that the University of Zimbabwe, which is facing difficulty in procuring both local funds and foreign exchange for the purchase of new books, is increasingly relying on former lecturers and students living abroad for books and research equipment. The university has even introduced a scheme where it reimburses shipping costs to Zimbabweans willing to donate books in large quantities (Discussion with University of Zimbabwe Librarian, June 2007).

Some of the struggling schools have found a life-line through the intervention of their former students now working abroad who have donated money to repair leaking roofs or helped the schools to source equipment or donations from international donors. These schools include the more than 200 Zimbabwean schools that had received donated computers by the end of 2007 from the UK-based charity organisations, such as African Schools Online and Computers for African Schools, which provide computers to schools lacking resources worldwide on request from the school representatives or individuals associated with the schools (www.cfes.org.uk/zimbabweschools.asp; www.computersforcharities.co.uk/africanschools). The precise role of the Zimbabwean diaspora in mobilising this kind of help for schools in Zimbabwe is indeed difficult to determine. But, anecdotal evidence based on web-based Zimbabwean discussion forums and email correspondence shows that there is widespread awareness about these programmes among Zimbabweans living abroad, especially professionals. There is also greater sharing of ideas among these Zimbabweans on how communities can access this kind of help, and some

have passed this information directly to their communities while others have applied for such help on behalf of their communities (Email correspondence with Josephine based in the United States, 2005).

By and large, educational institutions, especially primary and secondary schools have been the primary targets of diaspora assistance towards communities, mainly because most Zimbabweans continue to attach great significance to education. As in any other philanthropic activities, this assistance is either self-initiated or in direct response to appeals for help. Much of the assistance given to schools is mobilised either individually or collectively, through alumni associations, which are increasingly playing an important role in the sustenance of many of Zimbabwe's schools. The Bulawayo Convent School, for instance, has managed to retain its teaching staff and maintain its excellent academic and sporting standards by targeting its alumni for help. From October 2007, it launched a media campaign-'Help Save the Bulawayo Convent', to raise money from its alumni abroad. By the end of the year, the campaign had raised nearly 1000 pounds. The money raised from the school's alumni has not only been used to purchase textbooks and other school items, but also to give additional help to the teachers - in the form of fuel vouchers, food vouchers and money (www.savetheconvent.org/).

Many other schools are surviving on help from their alumni based outside Zimbabwe. Some of these schools are Musiso Secondary School in Masvingo province, benefiting from the help of its former students who are now working in the USA, the UK and South Africa who have organised themselves into an alumni association- Musiso Ex-Students Association (MESA), and Marist Brothers Secondary School of Dete, whose former and current students, teachers and other persons connected to the school have organised themselves into Marist Old Students Association (MOSA) South Africa. Registered in Zimbabwe, the association has an executive branch and a bank account in South Africa. (www.mosadete.info.ms/; http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marist_Brothers_Secondary_School_Dete,Zimbabwe). Focussing on assisting the school in its areas of need, MESA has so far donated computers to the school and is currently fundraising for a school bus. The decision to buy a bus for the school followed an accident in 2008 when a pupil died after falling off a lorry transporting pupils to a sports tournament (Discussion with Richard, Johannesburg 28 August 2008).

Zimbabweans abroad, especially the middle and professional classes who have got the means, are also bringing up children who are not their own by paying for their education and their general upkeep (Email discussion with Amanda, 2008). Others are alleviating the suffering of the people in the country by buying groceries and fuel for struggling families, schools, hospitals and charities that help vulnerable groups in Zimbabwe. Some of the giving is done through innovative websites and text messaging services, such as Mukuru.com, Zimshop.com and Zimbuyer, which have, over the last few years, sprung up

enabling the millions of Zimbabweans outside to transfer funds, buy goods, and pay for services for those inside the country (news.24, 13 June 2007; NowPublic, 31 March 2008, www.nowpublic.com/tech-biz/zimbabweans-use-text-and-web-2-0-weather-crisis).

Consciously aware of the growing importance of Zimbabweans abroad as charitable donors, charity organisations working in Zimbabwe have increasingly adopted E-philanthropy for their fundraising activities. Organisations such as the UK-registered Zimbabwe Benefit Foundation, supporting Zimbabweans through education, housing and emergency aid, Zimsoc, a charity organisation mobilising money from whites in the UK and South Africa to support old-age homes in Zimbabwe, Flame Lily Foundation, a racially exclusive social welfare foundation assisting struggling families of white Zimbabweans living in South Africa, and Mthwakazi, raising funds for development projects in Matebeleland, all use internet services, such as paypal and facebook, to raise funds for their charitable activities (www.zimsoc.com/Default.aspx; www.flf-rasa.org/home/index.html; <http://apps.facebook.com/causes/23444>; www.zbf.org.uk/about_zbf.php). The number of people making use of these services to donate to needy families is indeed difficult to tell given that many Zimbabweans hardly talk about their services in giving. Help and giving is done quietly and in many discrete ways because it goes against Zimbabwean culture to publicise one's philanthropic contributions. Contributions through e-philanthropy are restricted to individuals who have credit cards, and not many Zimbabweans have credit cards because of restrictions in the South African banking sector. People are also concerned about accountability of their donations.

Besides offering direct material assistance to individuals and institutions in Zimbabwe, Zimbabwean professionals in strategic positions of influence and authority are contributing to the skills training of young scholars and workers based in Zimbabwe by recruiting or helping to place them in organisations and companies in South Africa and beyond. Others are helping to train them in Zimbabwe by getting them involved into collaborative projects that facilitate their skills training. Examples of such projects include the ongoing Zimbabwe History Project, a collaborative research project between Zimbabwean historians and students in South Africa and their counterparts in Zimbabwe, being spearheaded by two of Zimbabwe's renowned historians now based in South Africa, Brian Raftopoulos and Alois Mlambo (History Book Project Meeting, Cape Town, 14 July 2007). These collaborative research projects not only facilitate skills training but also help Zimbabwean-based scholars with financial sustenance.

Also involved in assisting struggling communities in Zimbabwe are Zimbabwean entrepreneurs who donate directly to charity organisations in Zimbabwe and whose companies are involved in corporate philanthropy that focuses on community development. For instance, the prominent Zimbabwean businessman who now lives in South Africa, Strive Masiyiwa, has been involved in community social investment programmes in Zimbabwe through his mobile telephone company- Econet Wireless, which has branches in both Zimbabwe and South

Africa. The company has established the Joshua Nkomo Scholarship Fund, a funding programme aimed at helping academically gifted Zimbabweans to pursue their high and tertiary studies at local secondary schools and universities. The fund, in memory of the late nationalist and Vice President of Zimbabwe, Joshua Nkomo, gives educational grants to 100 students drawn proportionally from all the country's 10 provinces annually. The Scholarship, according to the Trustees of the fund, 'has a unique vision of instilling ethics of community building and social responsiveness in each beneficiary'. Each recipient of the scholarship is expected to engage in a variety of community building activities as part of his/her active responsiveness to the numerous social challenges in various communities. Recipients are required to show selfless and patriotic service to community and nation (www.econet.co.zw/inside.aspx?pid=24).

The activities of entrepreneurs like Masiyiwa in corporate giving are, however, not fully complemented by other Zimbabwean business persons based abroad. For reasons ranging from political to economic and cultural factors, the other high-profile Zimbabwean entrepreneurs in South Africa are not strongly linked to philanthropy in Zimbabwe. To begin with, many of Zimbabwe's entrepreneurs now based outside have been hounded out of the country by the current government, and are either reluctant to make social investments in the country or will find it difficult to invest in charitable activities without raising government suspicion. A number of these businessmen left the country after falling out of favour with the ZANU PF government, especially those caught in the ZANU PF succession battle in 2004 and were forced into exile, following threats of arrest for alleged illegal business dealings. Some of those forced to leave Zimbabwe because of political harassment include Strive Masiyiwa, newspaper publisher, Trevor Ncube, and banker Nigel Chanakira who all left before 2004 succession crisis and settled in South Africa. Those who left after the 2004 shake-up include mining magnate, Mutumwa Mawere, bankers Mthuli Ncube, all based in South Africa; and Nicholas Vingirai, William Nyemba, Francis Zimuto, Julius Makoni, Otto Chekeche and James Mushore who fled to the UK (*Financial Gazette*, 15 June 2006). Second, Zimbabwe does not offer tax incentives, such as in the US to support a financial environment friendly to individuals wanting to create private foundations and endowments. In addition, Zimbabwean business culture, with its legacy of monopolies, doesn't encourage broad-based giving or social responsibility among companies competing for a share of the market.

Influenced by all these negative forces, Zimbabwe's entrepreneurs are unsurprisingly not strongly associated with corporate social investment. On the few occasions that some of these entrepreneurs have given their resources for public benefit, political motives are imperative. Patrimonial politics, as Bayart (1993), Chabal and Daloz (1999) have argued in their analysis of the African postcolonial state, has dominated Zimbabwe's political scene since 1980 and aspiring politicians always try to bribe the electorate through material 'donations' ahead of every major election (Herbst 1992). Against this backdrop, it was not surprising that Zimbabwean entrepreneurs in South Africa reportedly played a

leading role in fund-raising for the campaign of Simba Makoni, an independent presidential candidate in the 2008 election who tried to bring political and economic change to Zimbabwe through his presidency (Africa Report, No. 160, 14 March 2008; www.talkzimbabwe.com/pdf.php?a=1798).

In an environment where corporate philanthropy is not so strong, the mantle of helping Zimbabweans failing to feed and pay school fees for their children and assisting schools and hospitals battling to provide normal services has fallen on ordinary Zimbabweans. As a growing number of studies on diaspora Zimbabweans have shown, the economic livelihoods of most Zimbabweans at home has increasingly come to depend on remittances and the provision of goods from those Zimbabweans based abroad who have maintained strong ties with their home country. A study carried out on the development potential of Zimbabweans living abroad by the International Organization for Migration (IOM) in 2005 showed that at least 96% of Zimbabweans in the United Kingdom and South Africa maintain regular social contact with family members (Bloch 2005). Another survey carried out in Harare and Bulawayo in 2005 and 2006 showed that 50 per cent of urban households are surviving on migrant remittances for everyday consumables too exorbitant or in short supply at home, such as cooking oil, soap, flour, sugar and salt (Bracking and Sachikonye 2007:1), while research by both Blair Rutherford and Lincoln Addison (2007: 628) and France Maphosa (2004 & 2008) on Zimbabwean migrants working in South Africa noted that money, food items and other consumer products sent back to Zimbabwe are an important source of support for many families and communities.

Indeed, not every migrant sends remittances home (IOM, 2003; Maphosa 2004: 9). Zimbabweans interviewed in Pretoria conceded that the pressures of surviving in a foreign country on meagre earnings, especially those received by, undocumented unskilled migrants, makes it difficult to save (Interview with Mutsai, 28 year old housemaid, Pretoria, 17 August 2007). At the same time, for most young men and women, the excitement of being away from home and the excitement of the 'bright lights of egoli' sometimes makes it easy for migrants to forget their extended family responsibilities (Interview with Tinos Mupira and Magumise, Zaka, Zimbabwe, 9 August 2006). In addition, migrant remittances are primarily destined for relatives and dependants of migrants, and not the community at large.

However, while food, clothing and cash remittances contribute significantly to the improvement of the livelihoods of the receiving households, some of the remitted goods such as mobile phones, bicycles and scotch carts, major forms of transport in these rural areas, benefit the community at large. Scotch-carts, for instance, are used not only as private household transport for daily needs such as fetching water and firewood. They are also used as ambulances and hearses for the community. Equally, villagers who need to communicate urgent messages, such as that of death or sickness in the family, can use the mobile phones of their neighbours and relatives (Maphosa 2008). This can be done for

free or a small fee determined by the service provider, depending on the relationship between the service provider and the beneficiary. But more importantly, major investments made by migrants, such as solar power and boreholes, are used not just by the recipient households but the community at large (Maphosa 2004: 14; 16-17). Such sharing of resources like water is largely informed by customary Ndebele and Shona views which regard them as communal resource even they are privately funded.

Furthermore, even in cases of direct remittances to families, the consumption and distribution of these goods and remittances is often guided by prevailing principles of mutual interdependence, carried over from the past, that exist among the recipients. Both the remitters and recipients are consciously aware that some of the items remitted to Zimbabwe will be shared by an extended network of village friends (*sahwiras*), relatives and neighbours experiencing deprivation. Kavelo and Mutsai, who both live and work in Pretoria, explain that when they send groceries to their parents in rural Zimbabwe they always try to include extras because they know that some of the food and goods, such as salt, sugar and soap, will be shared with neighbours who would have run out of supplies (Interview, Kavelo and Mutsai, Pretoria, 17 August 2007).

Zimbabwean communities, as noted above, have a tradition of caring for the poor and those in distress, which goes back to traditional community set ups. Most communities, both rural and urban, who have developed a strong culture of sharing and assistance over the years find it difficult to abandon their relationships and social networks even in the face of growing economic hardships and diminishing resources. In the current context, assistance between remittance receiving and non-receiving households is based on both direct and delayed reciprocity. While receiving households help the non-receiving households with material support, in the absence of close relatives now living abroad, they rely on moral support of these deprived friends and neighbours when facing social problems, like illness or death in the family. Mrs Ndou, who receives remittances from her two sons in South Africa, explains the reciprocity that exists between receiving and non-receiving households, when she says that she values her personal relationships with her neighbours because they are always there to help her when confronted with social ills such as illness or death since her children work far away. 'If I begin to value goods received from my children more than my personal relationships', she adds, then 'I must also expect those goods to bury me when I die' (Interview, Mrs Ndou, Beitbridge, 4 July 2008).

The health of most Zimbabweans at home has increasingly come to depend on medicine provisions from those Zimbabweans based abroad. Zimbabwe's healthcare delivery system which was one of the best in Africa in the 1980s has been hard-hit by the current economic crisis. Because of foreign currency shortages, the government has not been able to procure essential drugs and maintain health infrastructure. Most government hospitals and clinics no longer

have basic medicines even for primary health (Baldauf 2008; People's Health Movement 2008; Newzimbabwe.com, 24 May 2008). In cases of illness, the poor now increasingly rely on their better-off neighbours, especially those with relatives abroad, for help with both money to go to private clinics or imported medical drugs. Even those without neighbours or relatives abroad, especially patients in need of specialised or expensive treatment both inside and outside Zimbabwe, have also received help from diaspora Zimbabweans when public calls are made for donations to pay for their medical bills (Newzimbabwe.com, 24 May 2008; The Herald, 15 March 2008).

Concerned about the growing need for Zimbabweans outside the country to help their contemporaries at home access health care services, some Zimbabweans abroad have established companies enabling Zimbabweans living abroad to pay for doctor's consultation fees, prescription drugs and surgery for relatives and friends at home. The most established of these companies is Beepee Medical Services, a company founded in 2006 by a UK-based Zimbabwean doctor, after his young brother died of kidney failure after failing to access dialysis in Zimbabwe. Bee Pee's services are available to residents of Harare, Bulawayo, Chitungwiza, Chegutu, Gweru, Kwekwe and Mutare, and its medical services providers in Zimbabwe source medicines from South Africa. Accessed by credit cards and online payment and charging basic consultation fees of 22 pounds, it is mainly utilised by Zimbabwean professionals who can afford the relatively high fees and have access to credit card facilities (www.beepeemedicalservices.co.uk/id5.html; TimesOnline, 27 May 2007. www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/africa/article1845279.ece).

But, professionals are not the only ones helping those living in Zimbabwe with their health needs. Even poor working class Zimbabweans living outside are sending or taking along basic drugs, including the desperately needed HIV-AIDS drugs, to Zimbabwe to assist sick relatives and neighbours. Some of these drugs are expired or contaminated drugs procured on the black market (The Body, 11 September 2007). But, the driving motive for such desperate measures, in many cases, is the need to help sick relatives and neighbours back home who are all battling to get basic medical supplies. These collective efforts by Zimbabweans living abroad to help in the fight against diseases extends to animal health, which has also deteriorated severely due to the economic crisis. Senior, a 33 year old security guard in Pretoria, explains that he buys vaccines and other drugs for his cattle in Mwenezi, which are in turn used by his deprived neighbours. As he explains further, he has to share the vaccines and medicine with his fellow villagers not simply because he wants to help them but also because he knows that his cattle will contract diseases from their untreated cattle in the common pasturelands (Interview, Senior, Pretoria, 25 August 2007) Senior's philanthropy, in this respect, is driven by both altruism and pragmatism.

From their various locations South Africa, Zimbabweans help each other in a number of ways. For instance, established migrants commonly assist recently

arrived migrants by providing them with temporary accommodation. Having been in the country for a much longer period and having been settled economically, the earlier migrants have some established employment networks and know how to survive on the margins of the economy and society. They use their links and experience to assist new migrants secure employment. Migrants interviewed in Pretoria and Johannesburg indicated that they got their jobs through friends or relatives who have been in South Africa for a much longer period than them. Others indicated that even after they found jobs they continued to stay with friends or relatives, sharing room rentals and groceries, in order to cut down on accommodation and food costs (Interviews, Senior (*pseudonym*), Pretoria, 25 August 2007; Manuel, Pretoria, 25 August 2007; Kavelo, Pretoria, 17 August 2007; Professor (*pseudonym*), Johannesburg, 26 February 2006).

In response to their complex socio-economic circumstances, Zimbabweans in South Africa are also reviving some indigenous traditions of collective action and self-help and applying them to alleviate poverty and suffering in their communities. Unskilled migrants, for instance, are developing their own social networks, mainly in the form of burial societies and stokveils, to assist each other in times of trouble, such as those caused by illness and bereavement. There are now a sizeable number of burial societies formed by Zimbabwean migrants in South Africa, including the Johannesburg-based Masasane Burial Society, one of the first burial societies to be formed by earlier migrants who came to South Africa during the political upheavals of the 1980s, the Zvishavane Burial Society which is also based in Johannesburg, and the Maranda and Mberengwa burial societies both based in Pretoria. Members of societies meet once a month and pay monthly subscriptions redeemable when there is bereavement in the family. The burial societies assist in covering funeral costs of their members and dependents, including transporting the body of the deceased back to Zimbabwe, where most Zimbabweans are taken for burial. In cases where a member's relative based in Zimbabwe has died, the burial societies assist the member with burial costs or transport costs to attend the funeral (Interviews, Bigman, Pretoria, 19 August 2007; Professor, Johannesburg, 26 February 2006).

Some burial societies have moved beyond issues of death and bereavement and become agencies of development in Zimbabwe by raising funds for the development of local communities inside Zimbabwe. In the south-western district of Tsholotsho for example, burial society money is being ploughed into the building of a library and a laboratory for a secondary school. As Mlamuli Nkomo, an official of Mthwakazi Forum, a Johannesburg-based, radical diaspora pressure group fighting for Matebeleland self-determination explains, 'burial societies have contributed hugely to their home communities by investing money they raise in exile into basic infrastructure' (Institute for Peace and War, 2007).

The most established diaspora community organisations have been formed by Zimbabweans from the drought-prone and underdeveloped regions of Matebeleland and Midlands who have been marginalised from both the state and

national development since the 1980s. Such organisations include the London-based Mthwakazi Action Group on Genocide, a political pressure group mobilising material and moral support for victims of the Gukurahundi violence of the 1980s, Mthwakazi Arts and Culture Project, a Johannesburg-based NGO set up in 2002 to assist Zimbabwean artists in exile and other struggling and vulnerable Zimbabwean migrants (www.maggemm.org; Mail and Guardian 12 August 2008). There is also Mthwakazi Foundation, a public charity organization registered in the United States of America and Canada but with branches in South Africa and Zimbabwe. The organisation's primary objective is to offer assistance to the peoples and communities of Matabeleland North, Matabeleland South, Midlands and Bulawayo by improving their access to clean water, improving their access to healthcare by providing aid to hospitals by rehabilitate existing hospitals, providing healthcare supplies, and improving their access to education by providing aid to schools by rehabilitating physical structures, providing benches, tables and classrooms and school supplies that include books, pens and pencils (www.mthwakazionline.org/; www.mthwakazifoundation.org).

Overall, Matabeleland has lagged behind in terms of economic and infrastructural development since independence. Much of the economic and physical damage to roads, schools, clinics, communication services and business premises that occurred during the violence and killings of Gukurahundi (1982-1987) has not been redressed (Zwizwai, Kambudzi and Mauwa 2000; Musemwa 2006). Migrants from Matabeleland have maintained links with their communities by participating in community projects and investing in developmental projects in the region, either in response to direct appeals from community and political leaders from the region or out of their own volition (Maphosa 2008). At the moment, a group of Zimbabweans from Bulilima and Mangwe districts who are based in South Africa are building a motel and an office complex in the border town of Plumtree. The same group is also building a morgue in the town and upgrading the long distance bus terminus (*Sunday News* (Bulawayo), 9 March 2008).

Concerned about the lack of robust government initiatives to solve underdevelopment in the region, Zimbabwean migrants from Matabeleland have, over the years, made significant material contributions to Zimbabwean-based foundations working towards the development of their regions. These foundations include the Organisation of Rural Associations for Progress (ORAP), founded in 1981 to mobilise villagers to take charge of their own development; the Community Foundation for the Western Region of Zimbabwe (CFWRZ) established in 1998 through the initiatives of ORAP; the Matabeleland/Midlands Gukurahundi Victims Development Association (MGVDA) established in 1998 and registered in both Zimbabwe and Britain as a charity organisation; and the Matabeleland Zambezi Water Project (MZWP), a community foundation set up in 1993 to mobilise resources for the construction of water pipe line to draw water from the Zambezi river to Bulawayo (Dube 1995: 45; Kriel 1995; www.synergos.org/africa/zimbabwe.htm; <http://www.mgvda.com/2.html>)

A strongly participatory self-help organization, the MZWP, played a decisive role in defining and developing a long-term strategy to source water from the Zambezi River for Bulawayo in the 1990s. It drew significant material and moral support from Zimbabweans as well as from international organizations such as United Nations Environmental Programme, Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD) and Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), before its operations were hampered by political interference from central government from 1996. Accusing it of operating outside a legalized constitutional framework and having a hidden ethno-political agenda, the government forced the MZWP to become part of a new government controlled trust, Matebeleland Zambezi Water Trust, consisting of Central Government, MZWP, Bulawayo City Council, Matabeleland Action Group, Matebeleland Chamber of Industry, Zimbabwe National Chamber of Commerce, Commercial Farmers Union, Zimbabwe Farmers Union, ZANU-PF Bulawayo, ZANU-PF Matabeleland South and ZANU-PF Matabeleland North (Gwebu 2002; The Standard, 6 May 2007).

Until recently when its operations were negatively affected by political infighting among its board members and the deteriorating economic environment which eroded the value of individual member contributions, the CFWR was another successful community foundation focusing on Matebeleland. Unlike most Africa-based community foundations, the CFWR did not simply rely on outside funding.² While international philanthropic and donor organizations, such as Synergosh, Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa, W. K. Kellogg Foundation, New Zealand AID and the Netherlands' Bernard van Leer Foundation, all played instrumental roles in the founding of the CFWR and continue to provide key funding for its activities, the organization benefits from inputs from Zimbabwean communities based both locally and abroad. For instance, more than 50,000 community members drawn from the region contributed approximately US \$8,000 as seed capital for the endowment of the foundation (www.synergosh.org/africa/zimbabwe.htm; www.westfound.com).

Utilising the traditional Ndebele principles of *Qogelela* (collective savings), *Ziqoqe* (mobilise yourself) and *Zenzele* (do it yourself), the CFWR mobilises financial resources and technical assistance for local initiatives by serving as a co-financer, broker, and builder of partnerships between communities and the existing development actors in the region. It concentrates on five programme areas- education, HIV/AIDS, women's economic empowerment, youth development, and water and agriculture (www.westfound.com). The CFWR's heavy reliance on individual contributions was initially a source of strength, helping it to deal with issues of sustainability, as individuals warmly embraced it as an avenue through which they could pool their resources to fund

² According to the 2005 Global Foundation Status Report, community foundations in southern Africa in 2004 relied on 55% of their funding on international donors, 35% corporate sponsors and only 10% on individual contributions.

developmental projects in their areas. But the ongoing economic hardships in Zimbabwe and the increasing demands on Zimbabwean migrants to support their immediate families has seriously affected individual members' ability to contribute while hyper-inflation has eroded the value of financial contributions from those individuals. Due to the prevailing political polarisation in the country, the foundation's external donors have withdrawn their support. For instance, the Ford Foundation, a key source of the foundation's external funding, withdrew its support because one of the founding Board members is a senior member of ZANU PF (Moyo, forthcoming).

The above problems which have negatively affected the operations of the CFWR are not unique to this organisation alone. The philanthropic sector in contemporary Zimbabwe has been experiencing a number of problems and challenges. The proceeding section discusses some of the challenges and opportunities influencing giving and help in Zimbabwe.

CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

There are a number of both historical and contemporary factors influencing giving among Zimbabweans living in South Africa. Among some of the factors promoting philanthropy among Zimbabweans in South Africa are their historically and culturally inherited values of giving and sharing instilled among many Zimbabweans as they grow. These cultural ethos instilled back home have continued to shape the behaviour of many migrants, and explain their greater willingness to share the fruits of their labour with their kin. The challenges of being away from home and close members of the family, at the same time, has also made it possible for a revival of some of the collective ethos which were increasingly getting undermined by the rapid urbanisation and pressures occurring in Zimbabwe after independence (Dzingirai 2008; Muzondidya 2008). In coping with the social and economic pressures of living away from home, the extended family has become an important factor in social security for both migrants and those remaining at home.

For some Zimbabweans, being in South Africa which is geographically close to Zimbabwe, has not only made it possible for them to stay in touch with developments at home but also relatively easier for them to continue playing a positive role in its economic and social development. Being in South Africa has also made it possible to effectively network and mobilise resources from international organisations and donors for their community development. South Africa is not just the hub of economic activity on the continent, but it is also the central nerve for most philanthropic and donor agencies. Living in South Africa has thus made it relatively easy for some Zimbabweans to reach the relevant decision-makers. Zimbabwean professionals employed in some of these organisations have also been able to use their influence to steer resources towards the funding of community development projects in their home country.

However, diaspora philanthropy, especially towards formal charity organisations, has been hamstrung by other problems. These include the logistical problems associated with mobilising material and human resources among widely dispersed communities. Zimbabweans in South Africa are spread all over the country, in the major cities of Johannesburg, Pretoria, Cape Town, Durban and farms of Messina. This dispersal makes it difficult to organise them for organised programmes and activities, such as charity balls. Moreover, unlike other African migrant communities with a much longer history of postcolonial migration, such as the Congolese and the Nigerians, Zimbabweans have not been able to come together in sufficient numbers and establish social organisations representing their interests and others at home. Members of the professional and middle classes who live in isolated spaces in suburbia have remained isolated from their compatriots, while most migrants are faced with the day-to-day problems of survival outside, and have no time or little space in their lives for organised activities beyond the burial societies and stokvels.

Another major difficulty in mobilising resources for charity among Zimbabweans in South Africa arises from their economic status. The majority of Zimbabweans living in South Africa are economically vulnerable migrants living on the margins of the economy and society (Ranchod: 2005, 14; Chetsanga and Muchenje: 2003). For instance, undocumented migrants who have no recourse to the law, are severely exploited by farm owners who capitalize on migrants' vulnerability. They are sometimes paid wages far below the minimum wage of R885 and subjected to a wide range of exploitation and abuse that include racism, sexual abuse and poor working and living conditions (Rutherford and Adisson 2007: 625, 627 & 629; Human Rights Watch 2006). Some of these migrants remain out of employment for a long time such that they have to rely on the benevolence of fellow migrants for survival. These Zimbabweans therefore have very little resources to give to charitable organisations or community foundations, other than what they give through their extended family and kinship networks. Besides, most of these Zimbabweans have no strong history of involvement in the Western style kind of formally organised philanthropy which has what Annsilla Nyar (2004) describes as 'connotations of elitism and paternalism'.

The argument here is not that Zimbabweans have not been involved in organized philanthropy in the past. As discussed in the first part of this chapter, organized philanthropic giving has always been part of Zimbabwean life since the pre-colonial era. Examples of this organized philanthropy included the *Zunde raMambo* (Chief's Garden/Granary)-a traditional, village collective effort aimed at assisting orphans, widows and other needy in the village. The *Zunde raMambo* in the traditional set-up would see a chief donate a field and members of the community (usually women) who would come together to tend the field. The produce is used to support the needy in the community or to be used by the whole community in an event of drought or famine (Kaseke 2006: 1).

During the colonial period, black Zimbabweans were involved in a number of philanthropic activities. The late Jairos Jiri is one of the greatest Zimbabwean philanthropists who established the Jairos Jiri Association for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled and Blind in the 1950s to help Africans living with disabilities to fend for themselves. Started as a personal initiative to help Africans with disabilities, the Jairos Jiri Association became part of a larger self-help movement in colonial Rhodesia. As Devlieger (1995) has correctly argued, the Jairos Jiri initiative was about developing a liberating philosophy about self-help among Africans rather than charity. The movement's modus operandi was to establish independent African-controlled schools and black-run business ventures in an effort to uplift Africans. From its beginning, the Association's operation budget was raised from both its own income generating projects, such as craft shops selling goods produced by the disabled, factories and farms, and donations from both African and non-African philanthropists at home and abroad. By the end of colonial rule in 1980, the Association had developed into the largest service provider to people with disabilities. By the 1990s, it was running 16 centres across the country and serving more than 10 000 disabled Zimbabweans annually through outreach and follow-up integration programmes (National Association of Societies for the Care of the Handicapped 2006; Civicus 1997; Jairos Jiri Association Mission Statement 2007).

The idea of giving help to communities through institutionalized bodies has, however, never been popular among Zimbabweans, especially among members of the working class who have always been seen as beneficiaries rather than contributors in the evolution of organized philanthropy in both colonial and postcolonial Africa. Because the Western concept of organized philanthropy is not rooted in the cultural lives of many working class Zimbabweans, their contributions to communities are either made directly to individuals in need, schools, clinics, hospitals and other institutions or indirectly through their church contributions. Those who donate to local churches do so because they, as Adam Habib et al (2008) also note in the case of South Africa, trust that churches will use the donations for their intended benefits.

Generally, Zimbabweans mistrust formal philanthropic organizations because some of them have misused donated funds at the expense of the causes they are supposedly supporting (The Herald, 8 May 2008). One of the main problems arising from the Zimbabwe Crisis is the mushrooming of bogus political and social organizations, including charity organizations, falsely purporting to be concerned about national problems, such as human rights abuses, HIV/AIDS and growing poverty, when they serve the selfish material interests of their officials. Some of these organisations have turned out to be 'brief-case' organizations led by one person or a close clique of people interested in self-aggrandizement (Muzondidya 2006). Others have abused fund raising and used donated funds for selfish needs. In 2004, for instance, the BBC reported on how Zimbabweans in the UK lost their money to a fraudulent Zimbabwean Community charity group

which raised funds among Zimbabweans ostensibly to help destitute Zimbabweans in the UK (*SW Radio Africa* (London), 15 November 2007)).

CONCLUSION

The concepts and practice of giving and volunteerism are widespread among Zimbabweans living in South Africa who, like other Zimbabweans abroad, have remained committed to their country in spite of the worsening political and economic crisis. The poverty, economic and social insecurities experienced under the current crisis have generated a greater need for patterns of mutual service and benevolence among Zimbabweans. The giving from Zimbabweans abroad is what has helped Zimbabweans to survive their current social and economic challenges, as migrants are playing an important role in supplying Zimbabweans at home with basic provisions like food and medicine. As in the case of Chinese philanthropy, Zimbabwean diaspora giving progresses from remitting money to relatives to social investment in communities of origin.

Much of the giving occurring is taking place through the traditional forms of giving which emphasise giving through extended family and kinship ties as well as personal relations based on friendships and residence rather than formally organised philanthropic organisations. But remittances and goods sent through these networks filter to broader sections of society through the prevailing organisational structure of communities and livelihood networks. For both the givers and recipients, especially among rural households, giving and sharing is a part of their everyday life experiences. In this regard, remittances sent to family members cannot be excluded from discussions about diaspora philanthropy because the remittances are for both the immediate family and the public benefit. Both the giver and the recipient know that whatever they receive has got to be shared by the wider social group in one way or the other.

Giving is not guided by the amount of resources available. Both skilled and unskilled migrants are sending remittances home and assisting their compatriots at home in a variety of ways. However, when migrants help their communities, relatives and kin, as Moyo (forthcoming) has correctly argued elsewhere, they do not view themselves as philanthropists. They see themselves as responsible members of their families and communities practising an old-age African tradition of communal responsibility for family and community (Discussion with Obert, Johannesburg, 8 June 2008; Email discussion with Amanda). Yet their giving is a "different manifestation of philanthropy; one that has roots in the family and the community" (Moyo, forthcoming). In line with tradition and culture, very little of the philanthropy taking place is widely publicised. In an environment where philanthropy is mainly envisaged through Western lenses, it is quite important to take note of this cultural dynamic when programming philanthropic activities in the country.

This chapter has also demonstrated that giving is usually done at the individual level rather than group level. Organised philanthropy seems to be more prevalent among Zimbabweans from the western regions of Matebeleland and Midlands. Most of these Zimbabweans have had a much longer history of living in the Diaspora than their compatriots whose migration to South Africa has been more pronounced in the post-2000 period. Zimbabweans from the western parts of the country have had a much longer history of suffering from government neglect in development, marginalisation from both the economy and politics. As a result, they learnt to rely on themselves earlier than the rest.

What is also clear from this discussion is that Zimbabwean diaspora philanthropy has a developmental potential. Some of the investments that have so far been made by the migrants in their villages, such as boreholes and water pumps, have the potential to lift the lives of whole communities. What remains to be done is greater support and coordination of some of the investment activities.

REFERENCES

African Diaspora Policy Centre, 2006. Diaspora and Peacebuilding in Africa. Conference Report, Felix Meritis, Amsterdam, 6 December 2006. [www.diaspora-centre.org/DOCS/Conference Report .pdf](http://www.diaspora-centre.org/DOCS/Conference%20Report.pdf)

Alexander, J., McGregor, J. & Ranger, T. 2000. *Violence and Memory: One Hundred Years in the 'Dark Forests' of Matabeleland*. Oxford: James Currey.

Anderson, 2001. Rural urban networks in Zimbabwe. In M. Bruijn, R. Dijk, D. Foeken, *Mobile Africa: Changing Patterns of Movement in Africa and Beyond*.

Baldauf, S. 2008. Inside Zimbabwe's healthcare crisis. *The Christian Science Monitor*, May 30, 2008.

Bayart, J.F. 1993. *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. London: Longman.

Bloch A. 2005. The Development Potential of Zimbabweans in the Diaspora. No 17 IOM Migration Research Series.

Bourdillon, M. 1977. *The Shona Peoples: An Ethnography of the Contemporary Shona*. Gweru: Mambo.

Bracking, S. & Sachikonye, L. 2007. 'Remittances, poverty reduction and the informalisation of household wellbeing in Zimbabwe', (Living on the Margins Conference, Stellenbosch, 26-28 March 2008)

Chabal P and Daloz, P. 1999. *Africa Works: Disorder as Political Instrument*. Oxford: James Currey.

Chikezie, C.E. 2005. Accountability, Africa and her diaspora. www.opendemocracy.net/globalization-accountability/africa_2869.jsp, 26.09.05.

Civicus 1997. Sustaining Civil Society: Strategies for Resource Mobilisation.

Cohen R. (1997) Global Diasporas: An Introduction, London UCL press.

Copeland-Carson, J. 2007. Kenyan Diaspora Philanthropy: Key practices, trends and issues. Research Report for The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc and The Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University.

Crush, J. and Yudelman, D., 1991. *South Africa's Labor Empire: A History of Black Migrancy to the Gold Mines* (Cape Town: David Philip)

Deeney, J., 2002. 'A neglected Minority in a Neglected field: the emerging role of Chinese-American Philanthropy in US-China Relations '. in M. E. Sharpe, *The Expanding Roles of Chinese Americans in US-China relations*. New York: Armonk.

Devlieger, P., 1995. From Self-help to Charity in Disability Service: the Jairos Jiri Association in Zimbabwe. *Disability and Society*, Vol. 10, No. 1, March 1995, pp. 39-48.

Dia, M., 1991. Development and cultural values in Sub-Saharan African. *Finance and Development*. December 1991, pp. 10-13.

Dube, K. (1995). City looks to the Zambezi for survival and prosperity. In Bulawayo City Council (Ed.), *Bulawayo: A century of development*. Bulawayo: Bulawayo City Council.

Dzingirai, V. 2007. 'The role of kinship in displacement' (Lives for Transformation and Development Workshop, Nordiska Afrika Institute and Centre for Rural Development, Wild Geese Lodge, Harare, 28-29 June 2007)

Dzingirai, V. 2000. Saving to Death: A Study of Group Based and Other Saving Arrangements in Rural Chivi District, Zimbabwe (FAO August 2000). <http://www.fao.org/sd/PPdirect/PPre0071g.htm>.

Donati P. (2003) Giving and Social Relations: The culture of free giving and its Differentiation Today *International Review of Sociology* 13 pp 243-272.

Everatt David, Adam Habib, Brij Maharaj and Annsilla Nyar (2005) Patterns of Giving in South Africa, *Voluntas* Vol.16.No 3. September 2005 pp. 275-291)

Godwin, P., 1984. 'Whose Kith and Kin Now', *London Sunday Times Magazine*, 25 March 1984.

Goliber, T. 2004. "Zimbabwe's Political and Economic problems hinder effective response to AIDS". Available at <http://www.prb.org/Articles/2004/ZimbabwesPoliticalandEconomicProblemsHinderEffectiveResponsetoAIDS.aspx>

Gwebu, T.D. 2002. 'Urban water scarcity management: civic vs. state response in Bulawayo'. *Habitat International*, Vol. 26, no.3, September 2002, pp. 417-431.

Habib Adam and Brij Maharaj (eds) (2008) Giving and Solidarity: Resource Flows for Poverty Alleviation and Development in South Africa. HSRC Press 2008.

Harrison, A.O., Stewart, R., Myambo, K., and Teveraishe, C. 1997. 'Social Networks among Early Adolescent Zimbabweans in Extended Families'. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, Volume 7, Issue 2, April 1997 , pp.153 – 172.

Herbst, J. 1992. *State Politics in Zimbabwe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Higazi, Adam. 2005. *Ghana Country Study: A part of the Report on informal Remittance Systems in Africa, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries*. Oxford: ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.

Hyden Goran (1983) *No Shortcuts to Progress: African Development management in Perspective*. London: Heineman..

Institute for Peace and War, 'Burial Societies' Influential Role in Zimbabwe', *Africa Report* No. 92, 30 January 2007

International Organisation for Migration. 2003. *Mobility and HIV/AIDS in Southern Africa: A field study in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Mozambique*. www.iom.org.za/Reports/MobilityHIVAIDSReport.pdf

Johnson P.D. 2007. Diaspora Philanthropy: Influences, Initiatives and Issues. Research Report for The Philanthropic Initiative, Inc and The Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University

Kaarsholm, P. 1997. Inventions, Imaginings, Codifications: Authorising Versions of Ndebele Cultural Tradition. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 23 (2): 243–258.

Kaseke E and Dhemba, J. 2007. Community mobilization and, volunteerism and the fight against HIV/AIDS in Zimbabwe. *Volunteer and Service Enquiry Southern Africa (VOSESA): Special Issue on Civic Service in the Southern African Development Community*. pp.85-99. www.vosesa.org.za/publications_pdf.

Kaseke, E. 2006. 'The Revival of Zunde raMambo in Zimbabwe', *Focus* Vol. 2. no.1, April 2006.

Kaseke, E. 2002. 'Zimbabwe' in *The State of Social Welfare*. Praeger: Greenwood.

Kriel, M. (1995). Bulawayo must live. In Bulawayo City Council, *Bulawayo: A Century of development*.

Kuljian, C. 2005. *Philanthropy and Equity: The case of South Africa* (Harvard University: Global Equity Initiative)

Landau, L. 2007. Drowning in numbers (Paper presented to Workshop on Migration from Zimbabwe, Centre for Development Enterprise, Johannesburg, 1 November 2007).

Lee, R. 1990. *Guide to Chinese American Philanthropy and Charitable Giving Patterns*. California: Pathway Press.

Lindgren, B. 2005. The Politics of Identity and the Remembrance of Violence: Ethnicity and Gender at the Installation of a Female Chief in Zimbabwe. In Vigdis Broch-Due (ed.), *Violence and Belonging: The Quest for Identity in Post-Colonial Africa*. London and New York: Routledge;

Makina, D. 2007. Profile of Migrant Zimbabweans in South Africa: A Pilot Study (Pretoria: University of South Africa, 25 September 2007)

Mathe, R., 2005. *Making Ends Meet at the Margins: Grappling with Economic Crisis and Belonging in Beitbridge, Zimbabwe* (Dakar: Codesria).

Maphosa, F. 2008. Transnational Experiences of Undocumented Migrants from Zimbabwe's South Western Borderlands. (University of Pretoria, Department of Archeology and Anthropology Seminar, 22 July 2008)

Maphosa, F. 2004. The Impact of Remittances from Zimbabweans Working in South Africa on Rural livelihoods in the Southern Districts of Zimbabwe. A summary of a Report Submitted to CODESRIA, July 2004.

McCormick, Barry & Wahba, Jackline, 2002. Return International migration and Inequality: The Case of Egypt. www.wider.unu.edu/.../conference-2002-4-papers/barry%20mccormick%20and%20jackline%20wahba.pdf

Mohan G. & A. B. Zack-Williams 2002. Globalization from Below: Conceptualizing the Role of the African Diasporas in Africa's Development, *Review of African Political Economy*, No 92, p 211-236.

Mombeshora, S. 2004. Philanthropy of Community in Zimbabwe: Past, Present and Future. (Discussion Paper for the Building Community Philanthropy Project, Centre for Leadership and Public Values, University of Cape Town).

Moyo, B. Dimensions of Philanthropy in Southern Africa: An Overview. In B. Moyo, T. Ainar, and J. Hodgson, eds., *Giving to Help and Helping to Give: Varieties of Philanthropic Experiences in Africa* (forthcoming).

Munro, L.T. 2003. 'A social safety net for the chronically poor? Zimbabwe's Public Assistance in the 1990s' (International Conference on Chronic Poverty and Development Policy, University of Manchester 27 February 2003)

Mushonga, M., and Nyakudya, M. 2008. 'Against All Odds: The Academic 'Brain Drain' and the 'Walking Dead' in Zimbabwe' (Paper Presented at the International Conference on Political Economies of Displacement in post-2000 Zimbabwe, Wits University, Johannesburg, 9-11 June 2008)

Musemwa, M. 2006. Disciplining a 'Dissident' City: Hydropolitics in the City of Bulawayo, Matabeleland, Zimbabwe, 1980-1994. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 32, number 2, June 2006, pp. 239-254.

Muzondidya, J. 2008. Majoni-joni: Survival Strategies among Zimbabwean immigrants in South Africa (Paper Presented at the International Conference on Political Economies of Displacement in post-2000 Zimbabwe, Wits University, Johannesburg, 9-11 June 2008).

Muzondidya, J., 2006. Makwerekwere: Citizenship, Nationhood and Identity among Diaspora Zimbabweans in South Africa', *Zimbabwe Review*, Issue 06/4, November 2006.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. 2003. The Post-Colonial State and Matabeleland: Regional Perceptions of Civil Military Relations, 1980-2002. in R. Williams et al (eds.), *Ourselves to Know: Civil-Military Relations and Defence Transformation in Southern Africa*. Pretoria: ISS.

National Association of Societies for the Care of the Handicapped (NASCOH) 2006. Jairos Jiri Association – A Beacon of Hope for the Disability Sector,

Disability Update, Sept 29 - Oct 06, 2006.
www.kubatana.net/html/archive/disab/061002nascoh.asp?sector=DISAB&year=2006&range_start=1

Nussbaum, B. 2004. Ubuntu: Reflections of a South African on our Common Humanity", *Reflections*, Vol. 4, no.4.

Nyar, A. 2004. Organised Philanthropy: Toward an Understanding of Community Foundations in South Africa (ISTR Sixth International Conference, Toronto, 11-14 July 2004).

Orozco, M. 2003. Home town Associations and their Present and Future Partnerships: New Development Opportunities? Report commissioned by USAID.

www.thedialogue.org/publications/country_studies/remittances/HTA_final.pdf

People's Health Movement, 2008. 'Health in Zimbabwe: PHM Zimbabwe Position Paper June 2008'. www.phmovement.org/cms/en/node/607

Polzer, T. 2007. Responding to Zimbabwean Migration to South Africa-Evaluating Options (Background Document for Meeting of the Lawyers for Human Rights and Wits Forced Migration Studies Programme, Witwatersrand University, 27 November 2007).

Riggs, F. W. 1998. *The Modernity of Ethnic Identity and Conflict*, www.hawaii.edu/~fredr/riggs.htm.

Rutherford, B. and Addison, L. 2007. Zimbabwean Farm Workers in Northern South Africa. *Review of Political Economy*, 114: 619-635.

Safran, W. 1991. Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora* 1 83-99

Selby, A. 2006. Commercial farmers and the state: Interest Group politics and Land reform in Zimbabwe (D. Phil. Thesis, Oxford University).

Simon, A. 1988. Rhodesian migrants in South Africa: Government, media and a lesson for South Africa', *African Affairs*, 87, 346: 53-68.

Sisulu, Elinor, Moyo, Bheki, and Tshuma, Nkosilathi, 2007. 'The Zimbabwean Community in South Africa', in Roger Southall et al, eds., *State of the Nation; South Africa, 2006-2007*, Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Solidarity Peace Trust (2004), No War: An account of the exodus of a nation's People. www.solidaritypeacetrust.org/reports/no_war.pdf

Wilkinson-Maposa, S. and Fowler, A. 2004. A search for Relevant Concepts and Theory: Understanding the Phenomena of 'help' low wealth communities- An Exploratory Study in four Southern African countries. (Paper Presented at the 6th Conference of the International Society for Third Sector Research, Toronto July 2004).

Young, N. and Shih, J., 'The Chinese Diaspora and Philanthropy', (Workshop on Diaspora Philanthropy from China to India, Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University, 2003)

Zaretsky, E. 1976. *Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life*. London: Pluto Press.

Zinyama L(2002) ' International Migration and Zimbabwe: An Overview in D Tevera & L Zinyama (eds) *Zimbabweans Who Move: Perspectives on International Migration in Zimbabwe*, Migration Policy Series No 25, Southern Africa Migration Project, Cape Town.

Zwizwai, B, Kambudzi, A., and Mauwa, B. 2000. 'Zimbabwe: Economic Policy-Making and Implementation: A Study of Strategic Trade and Selective Industrial Policies'. Available at http://www.idrc.ca/en/ev-71257-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html