

NOW THAT WE HAVE THE LAND:

ANALYSING THE EXPERIENCES OF LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL DISTRICT OF THE EASTERN CAPE, SOUTH AFRICA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Sociology

at

Rhodes University

by

Simela Thuleka Msuthu

Supervisor: Mr Kanyiso Ntikinca

January 2020

ABSTRACT

The “land question” in South Africa goes back more than a century to the 1913 Natives Land Act which facilitated the dispossession of African people from fertile land to arid homelands and congested townships. This mass dispossession of Africans from their land was accompanied by an array of legislation aimed at restricting their upward mobility, thus laying the foundations of structural inequality in South Africa. The advent of democracy in 1994 brought about a number of legislative reforms aimed at addressing the injustices that were imposed by the colonial and apartheid governments on the African people. At the forefront of these legislative efforts was the restoration of land to the original inhabitants of the country. Research indicates that, since 1994, the South African government has issued out land to different individuals and communities around the country in an attempt to address structural unemployment and poverty that plague the country. Using the Sustainable Livelihoods Theoretical framework, this study sought to examine the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal district of the Eastern Cape, in order to determine the extent to which the transfer of land to landless people has met the governments’ agenda to alleviate poverty and unemployment in the rural regions of South Africa. The findings in this study show that, successful land reform in South Africa is hindered mostly by two factors. Firstly, the inability of land beneficiaries to access quality education, skills training, finances and formal agricultural value chains. Secondly, land beneficiaries are further placed at a disadvantage by the poor quality of public services in their local municipalities and inconsistent post-settlement support from the state. The conclusion made in this study, is that the government has to be cognizant of the aforementioned structural barriers, when designing and rolling out land reform projects throughout the country. Failure to address these glaring structural barriers, will result in the creation of a peasant class of people living on underutilized land.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my late great Grandmother, Nontombi Msuthu, aunt, Nokhanyo Msuthu, and Grandmother Nomalinde Msuthu. Thank you all for your support while you were alive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Almighty for being with me from the beginning to the end of this thesis. To everyone who assisted me with reaching this milestone in life, I am forever indebted. This dissertation would not be successful without your contribution. Secondly, I would like to whole-heartedly acknowledge the support and love that was given to me by my family. Special gratitude goes to my Mother, my pillar of strength, Thabisa Msuthu, who has effortlessly made sure that all my needs were met and encouraged me to do my best. My grandmother, Nobubele Luke, who instilled in me the love for education. My uncle, Nkululeko Luke, who has supported me in this journey and persuaded me to soldier on. My brother, Luyolo Msuthu, who has contributed to this dissertation.

To my siblings, Ntombi-Zanele, Nomathamsanqa Kock and Akhona Dikgetsi who are my inspiration. To my grandmother, Nomagelegele and Mziseli Msuthu, your prayers have sustained me up until this point. Thirdly, I would like to thank my research supervisor, Mr Kanyiso Ntकिनca for his continuous support and patience throughout the duration of this thesis. Your guidance for the success of this thesis has been incalculable. Lastly, to all the respondents who accommodated me into their homes and took their time to contribute to this dissertation, I am grateful. I would also like to thank the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (Makhanda) for giving me access to the respondents.

ACRONYMS

AFRA	Association for Rural Advancement
ANC	African National Congress
APC	African Peoples Convention
ARC	Agricultural Research Council
BLF	Black First Land First
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CASP	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme
CFSP	Comprehensive Farmer Support Programme
CRDP	Comprehensive Rural Development Programme
DA	Democratic Alliance
DFID	Department for International Development
DLA	Department of Land Affairs
DRDLR	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
EFF	Economic Freedom Fighters
ERP	Extension Recovery Programme
FF	Freedom Front
GEAR	Growth, Employment and Redistribution
GRC	Grahamstown Rural Committee
IDS	Institute for Development Studies
IFP	Inkatha Freedom Party
LAPC	Land and Agricultural Policy Centre

LARP	Land and Agrarian Reform Programme
LRAD	Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development
LRPP	Land Reform Pilot Project
NAFU	National African Farmers Union
NCAR	National Committee Against Removals
NLC	National Land Committee
NP	National Party
PAC	Pan Africanist Congress of Azania
RADP	Recapitalization and Development Programme
RDP	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SLA	Sustainable Livelihoods Approach
SLAG	Settlement/ Land Acquisition Grant
SLF	Sustainable Livelihoods Framework
SPP	Surplus Peoples Project
TRAC	Transvaal Rural Action
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	10
1.1. INTRODUCTION TO LAND REFORM	10
1.1. GOALS OF THE RESEARCH	12
1.2. RESEARCH DESIGN	12
CHAPTER TWO: A SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS APPROACH TO ANALYSING LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA	13
2.1. INTRODUCTION	13
2.2. THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS THEORY.....	14
2.2.1. CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE SLF	14
2.2.2. VULNERABILITY CONTEXT	16
2.2.3. LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES	17
2.3. FORMS OF CAPITAL THAT CREATE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS	18
2.3.1. HUMAN CAPITAL.....	18
2.3.2. SOCIAL CAPITAL	18
2.3.3. PHYSICAL CAPITAL	19
2.3.4. FINANCIAL CAPITAL	19
2.3.5. NATURAL CAPITAL.....	19
2.4. DEFINING LAND REFORM	20
2.4.1. LAND REFORM IN EUROPE	20
2.4.2. LAND REFORM IN AFRICA	21

2.4.3. LAND REFORM IN ASIA	24
2.4.4. LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AMERICA	25
2.4.5. EMERGING THEMES IN INTERNATIONAL LAND REFORM ACCOUNTS	25
2.5. HISTORY OF LAND DISPOSSESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA	26
2.6. THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK OF LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA POST- 1994.....	29
2.7. PROGRAMMES OF LAND REFORM AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT.....	32
2.7.1. LAND RESTITUTION PROGRAMME	32
2.7.2. LAND TENURE REFORM PROGRAMME	34
2.7.3. LAND REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME.....	34
2.8. AGRICULTURAL-RELATED STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMMES OF POST- SETTLEMENT SUPPORT	36
2.9. GRANTS AND SERVICES OF THE LAND REFORM PROGRAMME	37
2.9.1. SETTLEMENT/ LAND ACQUISITION GRANT (SLAG).....	37
2.9.2. LAND REDISTRIBUTION FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (LRAD).....	48
2.9.3. EXTENSION SERVICES	41
2.9.4. INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	41
2.9.5. TRAINING, MENTORSHIP AND MANAGEMENT	42
2.9.6. ACCESS TO FINANCE	42

2.9.7. ACCESS TO MARKETS	42
2.10. CHALLENGES OF LAND REFORM PROGRAMMES IN SOUTH AFRICA	43
2.11. CHALLENGES OF POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT	46
2.12. SOUTH AFRICAN LAND REFORM CASES STUDIES	48
2.13. A SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE EASTERN CAPE	50
2.14. CONCLUSION	51
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN	51
3.1. INTRODUCTION	51
3.2. DATA COLLECTION METHOD	51
3.3. SAMPLING.....	53
3.4. INTERVIEWS WITH LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES	55
3.5. INTERVIEW WITH THE EXTENSION OFFICER.....	55
3.6. CHALLENGES OF THE RESEARCH.....	55
3.7. ETHICS.....	56
3.8. CONCLUSION.....	56
CHAPTER FOUR: LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL DISTRICT	57
4.1. INTRODUCTON	57
4.2. THE BACKGROUNDS OF THE LAND BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION.....	57

4.3. QUALITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION	63
4.4. LAND TRANSFER, UTILIZATION AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION	68
4.5. LIVELIHOODS OF LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION	80
4.6. CONCLUSION	83
CHAPTER FIVE CONCLUSION	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	88
APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – ONE ON ONE INTERVIEWS	99
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS	104
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – EXTENSION OFFICER INTERVIEW	108
APPENDIX 4: CONSENT FORM	110

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION TO LAND REFORM

For centuries, Land has been a highly contested subject matter in the South African political and economic discourse. Dating back to the pre-colonial migrations and tribal conflicts over territory in Southern Africa; to the first European invasions and settlements at the cape coast and subsequent 'trek' to the interior; to the apartheid era, and recently the democratic dispensation, land has remained at the center of political contestation in South Africa. Land yields the promise of abundance, wealth and secured livelihoods. This has been the case for centuries. Prior to Colonialism, African people had their own diverse and productive methods of living off the land (Atkinson, 2007).

Research shows that prior to European invasion, African people had diverse economic systems that sustained them for centuries (Marcus, 1989). The fauna and flora of the African landscape was a source of wealth for the original inhabitants of this region of the African continent. European invasion and settlement changed this state of affairs, as Africans were slowly transformed from a land owning (livestock owning) class to a peasant laboring class in the country of their ancestors (Atkinson, 2007). This dispossession was done through legislative and other oppressive means. Through land ownership and the use of cheap African labour, European settlers built an economic system which facilitated the expansion of their wealth, whilst the Africans remained a peasant class (Visser and Ferrer, 2015).

This turn of events polarized South African society along racial lines. On the agricultural front, White settlers who were interested in farming received various forms of support from the state to ensure their success (Marcus, 1989). The colonial and apartheid government structured South African society in such a way that White settlers developed and secured their livelihoods through various progressive means. From education, to economics, to political and social means, the government of the time built a semi-utopian society for the settlers in South Africa.

Africans were restricted from competing on an equal footing with Whites and were made second class citizens (Atkinson, 2007). It is clear that structural inequality started with the dispossession of land. European settlers were able to build their wealth through the ownership of land and cheap African labour. It is not a surprise that the notion of land remains a highly sensitive and contested issue in the post-apartheid period, because land represents potential for wealth. The democratic government, has prioritized land with the intention to reverse historical injustice and reduce structural inequality and poverty, especially in the rural regions of the country where poverty is rife (Visser and Ferrer, 2015). The land reform programme is an attempt to achieve this above-mentioned desire of the government. Through land, the government is hoping to address the problem of poverty and unemployment.

This idea is noble, as it seeks to restore land to the original owners and reduce the inequality gap in South Africa. To date, the ANC lead government has rolled out and is still rolling different forms of land reform programmes throughout the country (DLA, 1997). This study will be using the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework to analyse the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework focuses on the skills, assets and the approaches that are used by individuals and communities to survive. This approach contends that livelihoods require a combination of assets to be realized. People, especially in developing countries usually require a combination of assets and sources of income to survive.

The Sustainable Livelihoods framework is ideal for this study, as it shows that land or natural capital is one of many forms of capital that are essential to secure livelihoods. This case is even more important in a developing country framework, where people are unemployment and require various forms of incomes just to survive. One of the key contentions for using this framework, is that land alone is insufficient to secure livelihoods. Natural capital requires various forms of alternative investments to be productive and to secure the livelihoods of the owners. This study utilizes a qualitative research methodology (interviews and focus groups) to examine the experiences of the land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District to determine whether the receipt of land has achieved one of the objectives of government, which is to alleviate poverty and unemployment in rural regions of South Africa. This thesis is divided into five distinct chapters.

The first chapter introduces the study, that is, that is, it provides an overview of what the research is about. The second chapter is in the form of a literature review, which is divided into two segments. The first segment of the literature review outlines the theoretical framework that informs the study, whilst the second segment paints the landscape of land reform in South Africa. The third chapter provides an outline of the research methods applied to obtain the data secured in this study. It provides a road-map of how the researcher went about collecting the data through qualitative research methods, that is, focus groups, observations and in-depth interviews. The fourth chapter provides a discussion and analysis of the findings obtained through qualitative research methods. The fifth and final chapter ties the various strands of the research together in the form of a conclusion.

1.2. GOALS OF THE RESEARCH

The primary goal of this study was to analyze the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. In addressing this goal, the study explored the following key areas:

- Socio-economic backgrounds of land beneficiaries
- The state of public services in the Makana Municipal region
- The land transfer processes and associated dynamics
- The nature of post-settlement support from government
- The government's perception of land reform projects in the Makana Municipal region

1.3. RESEARCH DESIGN

This study utilized three qualitative methods, namely: in-depth interviews; focus groups and observation. In-depth interviews are useful, because they make available much more detailed information about the participants' thoughts and experiences than what is made available by other data collection methods (Boyce & Neale, 2006; Matthews & Ross, 2010; Brewer, 2010; Tracy, 2013). Focus groups are useful, in that, they help the researcher obtain detailed information about personal and group feelings, perceptions and opinions. The strengths of participant observation include the depth of knowledge that it allows the researcher to obtain and the perspective of knowledge of social problems and phenomena generated from the level of the everyday lives of those experiencing them. The next chapter provides a comprehensive outline of the Sustainable Livelihoods Theoretical approach and an in-depth discussion on Land Reform in South Africa.

CHAPTER TWO

A SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS APPROACH TO ANALYSING LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA

2.1. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is divided into two main sections. The first section will unpack the Sustainable Livelihoods Theory, as it is the theoretical framework informing this study. The sustainable livelihoods (SL) approach is a holistic approach that tries to capture, and provide a means of understanding, the fundamental causes and dimensions of poverty. In addition, it tries to sketch out the relationships between the different aspects (causes, manifestations) of poverty, allowing for more effective prioritization of action at an operational level. The SL approach aims to help poor people achieve lasting livelihood improvements (Majale, 2001:3). The framework, essentially, focuses on the ways in which people utilize the combination of assets at their disposal to secure their livelihoods.

In this section of the chapter, the framework will be unpacked and discussed within the context of the research objectives and goals. The second section of the chapter discusses the notion of land reform in its entirety, that is, first from an international perspective, and then from a South African perspective. This chapter, essentially, integrates the Sustainable livelihoods theoretical framework with the discussion of land reform. The synergy between these two bodies of work is crucial, as land (natural capital) is seen by the SLA scholars as a key asset in securing the livelihoods of rural populations. The running contention throughout this thesis is that, land (or natural capital) requires a combination of other key assets to secure the livelihoods of the land beneficiaries for the long term. This chapter, therefore, provides an outline of how the theoretical framework merges with the core themes entrenched in the discussion on land reform in South Africa.

2.2. THE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS THEORY

2.2.1. A CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE SLF

This thesis is informed by the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF). “The sustainable livelihoods approach improves understanding of the livelihoods of the poor. It organizes the factors that constrain or enhance livelihood opportunities and shows how they relate. It can help plan development activities and assess the contribution that existing activities have made to sustaining livelihoods” (Serrat, 2017:21). The Sustainable Livelihoods approach places people at the centre of development, as it recognizes the role that people play in securing their own livelihoods through pulling together their pre-existing assets (Ellis-Jones, 1999; Boyd et al. (2000). The Sustainable Livelihoods approach originated in the 1980s as a means of understanding development challenges from a bottom-up people-centered framework, rather than from a top-down neo-classical framework.

The World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) offered one of the first cohesive definitions of the Sustainable Livelihoods approach. The Commission viewed Sustainable Livelihoods as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987:8). This definition has two visible areas of interest. Firstly, it prioritizes the needs of the poorest people in the world. Secondly, it emphasises the importance of removing barriers to the short and long-term goals of poor people to secure their livelihoods.

This definition was criticised by international development agencies for lacking emphasis on sustainability, since it did not offer clarity on how livelihoods were to be maintained in the long term (Scoones, 1998). Additionally, it was criticised for focusing solely on the household. In other words, it was criticised for concentrating on individuals residing under the same roof, without making provision for alternative residing arrangements, for example those belonging in the same household but do not share the same living space. Consequently, a new definition was proposed by Chambers and Conway as: “A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (stores, resources, claims and access) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stress and shocks, maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets, both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base” (Scoones, 1998: 5).

This definition has since been offered by the Institute for Development Studies (IDS) and was later followed by the Department for International Development (DFID). These different interpretations to the sustainable livelihoods concept have, in most aspects, influenced several agencies to apply what is generally known as the sustainable livelihoods approach (SLA) to poverty reduction. Three reasons are given by Krantz (2001) on why the sustainable livelihoods approach has been used for poverty reduction (Gambe, 2015). The first reason is the understanding that, while economic growth may be needed for poverty reduction, there is no necessary relationship between the two, since it is the responsibility of the poor to participate in economic opportunities. Therefore, it is important to get the information from the poor about what prevents or constraints them from bettering their lives, so that appropriate support activities can be made available to them.

The second reason is based on the understanding that poverty as understood by the poor extends beyond the issue of low income. Thus, other aspects such as bad health, illiteracy, absence of social services, state of vulnerability and helplessness should also be considered. Thirdly, there is an understanding that there is a connection between the different aspects of poverty (Krantz, 2001; Gambe, 2015; Dimithri, 2015; Khuzwayo, 2016). For example, if someone earns a low income, he/she will not be able to afford health insurance. Another example is if how the lack of subsidized housing may leave a household vulnerable and exposed to shelter that is not of good quality. It is now widely recognised by international agencies that the poor have a better understanding of their circumstances and needs, thus they should participate in the policy and project designs which are planned to improve their livelihoods (Macfadyen and Corcoran, 2002).

Consequently, numerous development agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), and Development for International Development (DFID) have now adopted this 'livelihoods approach' (Krantz, 2001). The DFID's main objective is to eradicate poverty in poorer countries and the livelihoods approach is anticipated to support this objective by providing a structure to the discourse. Thus, the approach must be comprehended as a checklist to understand poverty in accordance with poor people's views and their own conception of poverty (Kollmair and Juli, 2002). The DFID refers to various core sustainable livelihoods principals, which argue that poverty-focused development activities should be: people-centered, holistic, dynamic, build on strengths, encourage sustainability and macro-micro links (DFID, 2002; Macfadyen *et al.*, 2002;

Tao and Wall, 2009; Khumalo, 2014). The SLF has been used as the main livelihoods' framework in development practice, and it was integrated in the UK's 'Department for International Development' program for development cooperation in 1997 (DFID, 1999). The sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF) has been described as a useful tool for understanding the phenomenon of poverty, that is, its causes, consequences and possible ways of eliminating it. (Ludi and Slater, 2008). Simply put, the framework is used for evaluating livelihoods by understanding vulnerability in a specified context and providing an approach or approaches to protect livelihoods (UNDP, 2017). The sustainable livelihoods framework (SLF) places people at the centre of development (Ludi and Slater, 2008).

It further illustrates how in diverse contexts, sustainable livelihoods are attained through the pulling together of various forms of capitals such as: natural, economic, human, physical and social capitals. Notably, the SLF does not represent all livelihoods perspectives, but offers a unique framework of analyzing poverty and the various means applied by people to overcome it (Scoones, 1998; DFID, 1999; Kollmair and Gamper, 2002; UNDP, 2017). Overall, the framework shows participants to be functioning in a context of vulnerability, where they come to be in contact with certain assets. The social, institutional and organizational environment then influences these assets. The context shapes the livelihood strategies adopted by people (DFID, 2002).

2.2.2. VULNERABILITY CONTEXT

The vulnerability context refers to the external environment that has a direct influence on people's livelihoods. It includes seasonality, trends, and shocks that influence people's livelihoods and assets (DFID, 2002; Kollmair and Juli, 2002). Seasonality refers to seasonality of prices, products or employment opportunities. Trends refer to demographic trends, resource trends and trends in governance. Shocks refer to human, livestock or crop health shocks such as; natural hazards, economic shocks and conflicts in the form of national or international wars (Kollmair and Juli, 2002). These factors are not likely to be influenced by local people, at least in the short and medium term (DFID, 1999). Simply put, in the short and medium term, these factors are not influenced by those sharing a common environment, but rather the external environment. One key focus of this study, is to interrogate whether various coping strategies were introduced (by the land beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District) to reply to shocks, like droughts, high unemployment, poor service delivery which invariably affect the productive and optimum utilization of the land.

By concerning itself with people, the livelihoods approach pursues an understanding of people's ability to use assets at their disposal to survive (Bebbington, 1999). The approach is grounded on the notion that people need different assets to achieve positive long-term livelihood outcomes. Consequently, five forms of capital are recognized upon which livelihoods are built. These include: human, social, natural, physical, and financial capital (DFID, 1999; UNDP, 2017). Policies, institutions and processes function at all levels, starting from the household to the international level, and the private to the public sphere. They effectively determine access (to various types of capital, to livelihood strategies and to decision-making bodies and source of influence), terms of exchange between different types of capitals, and returns to any given livelihood strategies (DFID, 2000). These influence households in two ways. Firstly, households are given the choice to decide whether they will use their assets or not. They also lay down the forms and number of assets that households can access (Ludi and Slater, 2008).

2.2.3. LIVELIHOOD STRATEGIES

Livelihood strategies are the activities and decisions taken by a household or community to realise their livelihood goals (DFID, 2002). For example, members of the same household might reside at different places and work at different places, to meet their needs at different times. Livelihood strategies are directly reliant on policies, institutions and processes (DFID, 2002). This is relevant because it explains that people in a household may diversify into other activities and strategies instead of merely concentrating on a specific strategy. Livelihood outcomes are the results of livelihood strategies for example, more returns, welfare, decrease in vulnerability, improved food security and sustainable natural resources.

Livelihood outcomes are important because they determine whether the strategies and activities which were adopted by a household or community contributed effectively to people's livelihoods (DFID, 2002). Using the SLA, this study analyses the various forms of capital that land beneficiaries have at their disposal to survive. This is done to determine whether the transfer of land has addressed the problem of poverty and unemployment in the rural regions of South Africa. This study does not only examine the assets that land beneficiaries have at their disposal, but also examines the quality of the assets they have at their disposal and whether they lead to the productive utilization of the land they have received.

2.3. FORMS OF CAPITAL THAT CREATE SUSTAINABLE LIVELIHOODS

2.3.1. HUMAN CAPITAL

Human capital are the skills, knowledge, ability to labour, good health, and physical capability that individuals or communities have for the effective pursuit of different livelihood strategies and livelihood objectives (DFID, 1999). At the household level, human capital differs along with household size, skill levels, leadership potential, health status, and so on. Human capital is needed to influence all other forms of capital (UNDP, 2017). Therefore, variations in human capital must be regarded as helpful to the other assets (Kollmair and Juli, 2002). Another focus of this study is to understand whether the land reform beneficiaries have the appropriate skills and expertise to become successful small-holder farmers. For example, having farming skills and expertise which extend beyond official education (grade 1-12) and this includes indigenous farming knowledge (Mago, 2018). This will be determined through analyzing the socio-economic and educational backgrounds of land beneficiaries.

2.3.2. SOCIAL CAPITAL

Within the context of the sustainable livelihoods framework, social capital comprises of the social resources, such as networks, that people rely on to secure their livelihood outcomes. Social resources are important in securing livelihoods, because they provide access to various opportunities, which would traditionally be hard to access individually (Khuzwayo, 2016). In many cases social capital is determined through class, birth, age, or gender. Social capital may cause both positive influences and effects that limit progress (Majale, 2001). For example, being a part of a certain social group may enhance the chances of an individual to access markets and value chains that may allow him or her to trade products and services. On the contrary, being a part of an association may also limit the progress of individuals because they may be expected to adhere to rules, norms and sanctions. Part of this study seeks to determine the types of networks that are available for the land beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. As will be seen further in this chapter, the apartheid and colonial governments offered various economic and production networks for both small and large scale White commercial farmers to make sure they made a profit and a living from their land.

2.3.3. PHYSICAL CAPITAL

Physical capital consists of the basic infrastructure required to support livelihoods. The following are examples of the types of physical capital required to secure sustainable livelihoods: affordability and access to road and transport; safe housing and buildings; access to adequate water and sanitation; clean and affordable energy; and access to information and communication (Kollmair and Juli, 2002; UNDP, 2017). The study seeks to find out from the land reform beneficiaries whether they have access to basic infrastructure for productivity on the farm, since the lack of infrastructure usually impedes on the success of productive agricultural activity.

2.3.4. FINANCIAL CAPITAL

Financial capital refers to the money used by entrepreneurs and businesses to purchase what they need to make their products or provide services. Financial capital can help people adopt different livelihood strategies to secure their livelihoods. There are two main sources of financial capital which are important for securing livelihoods, namely, available stocks and regular inflows of money (Majale, 2001). Available stocks include: capital, capital deposits to the bank, or liquid assets like livestock and jewellery. This form of financial capital is independent from third parties. Regular inflows of money include: salary incomes, welfare payment or any other payments made by the state to people. This form of financial capital is, in most instances, dependent on others (Khuzwayo, 2016). This basically means that regular inflows of money cannot exist without other people. Consequently, this study explores the sources of financial income available to the beneficiaries, as is necessary for the success of agricultural projects. With financial capital, the beneficiaries will have the means to purchase operational inputs, like seeds, fertilizers, and any other resources that may be needed for agricultural projects.

2.3.5. NATURAL CAPITAL

Natural capital refers to natural resources like land, water, wildlife, biodiversity, and environmental resources (Ludi and Slater, 2008). The society can develop extensive services from natural capital. Without access to adequate natural resources, the rural poor is left in a state of vulnerability because they will experience difficulties concerning food, collecting other assets and recovering after natural and market shocks (Hanstad et al., 2004). This means that, in the sustainable livelihoods framework, a close relationship exists between natural capital and the vulnerability

context (UNDP, 2017). There is a linkage between sustainable livelihoods and land reform. For instance, through land reform, beneficiaries will have access to natural resources and are ‘supposed’ to have access to food and sustain their livelihoods by adopting different capitals (assets). This linkage is especially relevant for this study, because it stresses that the government needs to support other forms of capital for the success of the land reform programme. Another focus of this research, is to determine how seasonality, trends and shocks have affected the livelihoods of land reform beneficiaries, i.e. have these constrained their farming activities. In addition, the study seeks to examine whether natural capital (in the form of land) alone is sufficient to secure livelihoods of the beneficiaries. Notably, natural capital is key to this study, since there is a common belief that the transfer of land alone is insufficient to ensure sustainable and profitable use of the land. As this framework indicates, there needs to be a combination of capitals for individuals to secure sustainable livelihoods.

2.4. DEFINING LAND REFORM

Land reform which can also be referred to as agrarian reform, involves the amending of laws, regulations, or customs concerning the ownership of land (Binswanger and Elgin, 1989). According to Deninger (1999), land reform seeks to provide equitable land rights, through restructuring land ownership laws, in a society where land ownership is slanted towards a certain class or group of people. Land reform processes around the world are far from homogenous, as patterns of migration and land dispossession differ from one country to the next (Links, 2011: 7).

2.4.1. LAND REFORM IN EUROPE

Land distribution has been a challenge for many years, dating back to the Roman Empire and the Chinese dynasties. In Europe, the French society was initially separated, and a feudal order was in place. The nobility and clergy formed one group, while the rising business class formed another. Moreover, there was also a small group of the middle class and the majority group of (hereditary) peasants (Acemoglu et al., 2011; Tuma, 2013). Land was often distributed unfairly, and coercion was used to get rent money from peasants. Alternatively, serfs (workers) were expected to pay rent by providing labour services. The peasants were also expected to pay other fees and taxes, while the clergy and nobility were exempted. This imbalance in the distribution of land existed up to the end of the 18th century.

The French Revolution of 1789 put an end to the ancient regime and the feudal order. Moreover, it introduced radical, political, legal and economic land reforms in Europe and areas in Germany (BinswangerMkhize *et al.*, 2009; Acemoglu *et al.*, 2011; Tuma, 2013). Through land reform, feudal tenures, serfdom, feudal courts, and payments not based on real property were abolished. In addition, rent money relating to real property was recovered. After the passing of legislation repealing all these unjust laws, the peasants refused to pay rent and land grabs occurred. In Europe in 1792, all instalments were scrapped. Moreover, common land, land belonging to the clergy and political emigrants was appropriated and auctioned.

However, this often favoured the rich (Tuma, 2013). At the end of World War II, in the international setting, land reform has led to the redistribution of land to the original tiller. This means that tenants became land owners on land that they had formerly used as farm tenants (Manenzhe, 2007). Bernstein (2002: 435) argues that the foundation of land reform was to redress the exploitation of peasants by those with property rights. Acemoglu *et al* (2011) suggest that “the institutional changes imposed by the French Revolution did not have any negative effects, but the positive effects are significantly only in some specifications.”

2.4.2. LAND REFORM IN AFRICA

Colonialism systematically displaced many African populations from their prime agricultural land, where they applied diverse methods to secure livelihoods from the land. After obtaining their independence, newly independent African countries had the burden of addressing the structural dysfunctions left by their erstwhile colonizers. At the heart of these reforms, was the issue of land, as it was perceived as a source of potential wealth for rural populations (Hornsby (2012). In Kenya, President Jomo Kenyatta in 1963 made land policy to address the imbalance of the past. The aim of land reform was to redistribute land to Africans residing in the rural regions of the country, who lost their lands during the colonial era. During the earlier period of independence in Kenya, new political and economic African elites managed to acquire large hectares of land, whilst the poor received patches of land that were too small even for subsistence farming (Kanying, 2009). The elites managed to acquire land through land transfer schemes based on the willing buyer/willing seller. The most popular and well-known land transfer scheme programme was the Million-Acre Settlement Scheme. It advanced all Africans, however at a later stage, more fertile regions were acquired by the wealthy and prominent Kenyans (Rutton, 1997).

Hornsby (2012:787) contends that “land remains a key fault line in Kenya.” This can be attributed to the fact that the reform gave more prominence on equity and economic efficiency. This was based on the speculation that social tension would be reduced if Africans were given access to holdings in the White Highlands. Secondly, the reform was undertaken to suit the interests of Europeans and protect them against the independent government. For example, at the Lancaster House Conference in London, the Maasai claimed that the Europeans would not be evicted in exchange for the rents of the land. Moreover, the Europeans refused to compensate for the loss of land outside the present Maasai Reserves (Rutton, 1997). In essence, Kenyan land reform processes have been riddled with various structural barriers, such as the unequal distribution amongst the upper and lower classes.

In Nigeria and Ghana, major land reforms took place some years after independence. With particular reference to Nigeria, a new land use decree No. 6 was promulgated on March 27, 1978 by the federal military government. The main rationale and philosophy of the land use decree was to remove the serious obstacle on the path of fast economic and social development of Nigeria. Nevertheless, it has not been easy to acquire land for development purposes. Governments, corporate bodies and even individuals, requiring small parcels of land for setting up industries or housing estates were denied the opportunity. Land prices were very high and inconsistent. The various post-colonial land reforms in Africa have been far from smooth or successful, as they have favoured economically and politically connected individuals.

Land reforms in many African countries has seen the transfer of land from the “original owners” or the masses to the capitalists who control various governments of these countries (Fabiya and Adesimi, 1978). The bourgeoisies in the name of government took over all lands in Nigeria, and most likely in other African nation states at the dawn of independence. Acquisition of certificate of occupancy in Nigeria requires some amount of money to be paid, which in most cases is beyond what ordinary man can produce (Fabiya and Adesimi, 1978). In Ghana, there have been many problems with the registration of land in Ghana that can be attributed to the implementation of the system (Asiama, 1998). These include, a long and expensive registration process; coincidence of two different plans existing for the same property because cadastral plans need to be prepared for title registration, which are different from the plan used for the original transaction; the absence of site plans, which can result in two title certificates issued for the same plot; and a lack of logistics

and personnel at land service delivery agencies (Asiama, 1998). In Zimbabwe, the 'Fast Track Land Reform Programme' policy facilitated the transfer of land to more than 220 000 families by 2006. This took place, as White commercial farmers gave up parts of their land to the state who issued them to Black farmers (African Renaissance, 2006: 51). The government gave Black farmers some resources (such as seed packs, fertilizers, chemicals), and other extension services to help them make productive use of their newly acquired land (African Renaissance, 2006: 51). The land reform policy implemented by the ZANU-PF government received a backlash from the British Government, which accused ZANU-PF for violating human rights and the general rule of law pertaining to land reform. As a result of this, the British government implemented sanctions against Zimbabwe, which subsequently put enormous economic pressure on the country (African Renaissance, 2006: 52).

Economic pressures and shortages, led to many Black farmers resorting to subsistence farming, as they could not keep up with commercial demands of commercial agriculture (Mayavo, 2004). These changes in the economy also resulted in large scale losses of jobs in the agricultural sector, thus defeating the original purpose of land reform. An important point to note, is that majority of the 'Fast Track Land Reform' farms were transferred to people with political and economic connections, rather than the rural poor. The land reform policy therefore, had negative and unintended consequences such as mass farm worker displacements, corruption and ongoing private land cases. In many African countries, it is very common for government officials to seize land through various means for their own personal gain. This is not to generalize that all African countries have corrupt land reform programmes, as the continent is diverse, however, the practice is very common. The over-arching theme in Africa, is that the poor people who are supposed to be helped with the land reform programme, remain economically marginalized throughout Africa (Mayavo, 2004).

2.4.3. LAND REFORM IN ASIA

In the 1950, Land reform in China took a radical form as land was distributed in an egalitarian manner (Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz, 2002; Brandt, Huang, Li, and Rozelle, 2002). According to Griffin et al. (2002) the land reform in China was accompanied the following measure: improved access to inputs, liberalisation of output markets and improved terms of trade in agriculture.

As a result of these measures, the Chinese agricultural sector experienced incredible growth and improved living standard in the rural region of the country. China, local officials played a major role in land allocation and in deciding how households were to use it. In Thailand, the land sharing policy was introduced to enable both landowners and peasant communities to share the land. This policy encouraged participation by community members in decision-making and negotiations. The policy called for maximum cross subsidisation to ensure success and enable the poor to afford to buy land. However, the policy has been found to be favouring the well-established communities who are willing to endure lengthy negotiations. The peasant communities do not have the resources to endure the lengthy negotiations. Some families are forced to vacate their plots before reaching any land sharing agreement. At times, they leave without compensation. The disadvantage of the land sharing policy is that it applies only in specific cases.

It requires some families, either with or without compensation, to leave the plot before the land sharing agreement is reached (Payne, 2002). Land reform in India involves the distribution of loans as credit to up and coming farmers. The emerging farmers were encouraged to apply for these loans to assist in farm production. A major barrier to this process was the fact that the interest rates in the loans became too high for small farmers to repay them. The Land Ceiling Act of 1961 was meant to provide peasant communities landless and the poor with an opportunity to possess land. The Land Ceiling Act of 1961 had a few loopholes, such as the big land holders manipulating the land records and retaining large portions of land in various parts of India. Land reform in India has not successfully addressed the issue of landlessness and poverty, as masses of peasant communities remain marginalised and landless (Thapliyal, 2001; Seetharaman, 2002).

2.4.4. LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AMERICA

The land reform in Brazil had both positive and negative aspects. On the positive side, the government offered land beneficiaries with various farming implements and training programmes. In Southern Bahia, some environmental groups were sponsored to train land reform communities in agro-forestry, water issues, wildlife and land-use planning (Cullen, Alger & Rambaldi, 2005). In this case, it is evident that in Brazil the land beneficiaries were encouraged to use the land sustainably, that is, to be productive, yet be cognizant of conservation for the future use of the land.

Robles (2018) argues that despite the three decades of land reform, Brazil remains a highly unequal country in terms of land ownership. The Brazilian government has been accused of prioritizing the interests of multi-national companies, at the expense of poor peasant communities. The state's support of agribusiness has been blamed for these skewed patterns of landownership, as large hectares of land are controlled by transnational corporations at the expense of the poor (Malahlela, 2013). Ever-since the inception of the land reform process in the 1960s, to advance agricultural development, Cuba introduced development of technical-scientific services for agriculture. After a period of ten years in the early 1970s, an actual technical revolution was established in the agricultural sector. This included both services and agricultural research so that a contribution can be made towards development plans founded on a resource-intensive technological model. Additionally, large organizations of technical services were set up with budget funding. Furthermore, various research centres and institutes were established in different areas (Paz, 2011). As a result, the Cuban land reform programme was able to attain greater equity and an increase in agricultural production and greater political stability (O'Conner, 1968).

2.4.5. EMERGING THEMES IN INTERNATIONAL LAND REFORM ACCOUNTS

The international cases of land reform above indicate that the state has an immense responsibility in rolling out land reform successfully. The cases show that state efficiencies or inefficiencies can either facilitate or inhibit land reform. Because, the land beneficiaries are mostly people from disadvantaged backgrounds, they are almost at the mercy of whatever quality of service the state provides to them. In cases, where the state has failed to deliver the necessary assistance or where there is corruption, then the beneficiaries remain marginalized. The cases above also indicate that political interference and corruption in land reform, has resulted in land transfers favouring individual who are economically and politically connected. Land reform is generally intended to address the problem of unemployment and poverty; however, corruption and state inefficiencies hinder the successful transfer of land. Cases where land reform has succeeded, shows an incredible effort from the state.

2.5. HISTORY OF LAND DISPOSSESSION IN SOUTH AFRICA

During the pre-colonial period, African indigenous groups had an almost unlimited access to land and were involved in various agro-centric activities such as stock farming, agriculture, herding, hunting and gathering being used as their main economic activities (Plessis, 2011; Green, 2015 & Maliti, 2019). African people cultivated sorghum and millets, herded cattle, sheep and goats and manufactured iron tools and copper ornaments. Indigenous African tribes varied in how they secured their livelihoods, as others were hunter gatherers and nomadic. These people did not stay in one place, but moved from place to the next, depending on the environmental conditions and availability of water and food. What is important to note, is that African people had their own unique ways of living off the land before the first European invasions on the African shores.

The pre-colonial economic activities were well-coordinated and lasted for centuries before colonialism. What initially started as bartering relationship between European and indigenous African populations evolved into an oppressive master servant arrangement. The primary legislation that brought about unequal landownership patterns on the bases of race in South Africa, dates back to 1652, when the Dutch East India Company settled in the Cape area of South Africa. Historical land dispossession in the country continued for approximately three centuries (Boisen, 2017; Mathibela, 2018; McLachlon, 2019). Compared to other countries in Africa, the system of land dispossession in South Africa took much longer, as it stretched over until the mid-1990s when the country entered its very first democratic elections (Weideman, 2004).

The first official measures of forced relocation in South Africa occurred in 1658. Over the years, the process of using legislation as a method of land dispossession increased and measures to further constrain Africans were introduced. In the 1700s, the “Trek Boers” (migrant farmers) migrated from the Cape Colony and later other surrounding areas and dispossessed the livestock of the indigenous groups (Ruggege, 2004). Consequently, a bartering relationship between the European farmers and the indigenous groups was in existence: the indigenous group provided the European farmers with labour services in exchange for food, lodging, tobacco and guaranteed security against their adversaries (Atkinson, 2007). By 1850, the migrant farmers were settled on their own land and exported products like wool to European areas. Whilst, African farmers produced for both subsistence and commercial purposes through the barter for cattle, marijuana and metals.

The dispute between the migrant farmers and the indigenous groups began when the indigenous groups were restricted from access to land, while the demand for labour services increased. White farmers regarded the Khoisan, Malay slaves and black people as individuals largely destined to provide labour services. This supremacist presumption remained up until World War I and black squatters were responsible for cultivating the land owned by the migrant farmers, herding livestock and shepherding the settler's sheep (Atkinson, 2007). Most of the black farmers who were casual workers on the white farms tried to produce output to make a surplus. This concept of having independent black farmers still resonates today and has laid the foundation for the call for land reform from many black rural people (Atkinson, 2007). According to Baldwin (1975) and Atkinson, (2007) the most primary of systems of land dispossession, was the Glen Grey Act, No. 25 of 1894, which was introduced in the Cape Colony to restrict the movement of Africans and secure cheap labour.

The Act mirrored the interests of settlers by making provision that migrants from “reserve” areas would be labourers and settlers would be their employers. Thus, setting the scene for distinct Apartheid policies that would follow (SAHO, 2019). The history of land dispossession in South Africa played a significant role in the current economic order and land ownership patterns. For instance, patterns of low wage employment were evident from this period, i.e. the farm worker would be paid a shilling a day for his labour and in some instances, was given the option to cultivate a small part of land and keep some of his cattle (Boisen, 2017; Atkinson, 2007). The Union of South Africa was established in 1910 and was accompanied by the establishment of an array of discriminatory laws directed at restricting the upward mobility of African people.

The most notable of these was the Natives Land Act, No. 27 of 1913 which forms the basis of this thesis, and it became a structural turning point in the dispossession of land. The Natives Land Act laid the foundation for structural racism that facilitated the exclusion of indigenous groups from occupying and acquiring prime agricultural land (Terrablanche and Nattrass, 1990; Dodson, 2013; Kloppers and Pienaar, 2014). According to Dodson (2013) the Natives Land Act stems from the Glen Grey Act 25 of 1894. The primary objective of the Glen Grey Act was to force young African men to work on white farms and in the mines. This was achieved by passing laws such as the Mines and Works Act 12 of 1911, the 1911 Black Labour Relations Act, and initiating a labour tax for all young African men who were unemployed (Atkinson, 2007; Leacock, 1910; Mathibela, 2018).

A provision in the Natives Land Act against ‘squatting’ on white farms was made so that cheap black labour could be increased. It was also the primary goal of the Act to alienate Africans in small parts of land (Parnell, 1991). This can be illustrated by how the Act concentrated the African majority to seven percent land ownership, though subsequently increased to thirteen percent of land area (Mathibela, 2018). In contrast, the white minority held 87% of land in secure freehold type regimes (Cliffe, 2000). Other racially discriminatory legislations and administrative actions were developed to further enable land dispossession and segregation in land. These include amongst others the Natives Urban Areas Act 21 of 1923, the Native Trust and Land Act 18 of 1936, the Group Areas Act 41 of 1950, and the Group Areas Act 36 of 1966 (Christopher, 1991; Parnell, 1991; Dodson, 2013; Kloppers and Pienaar, 2014).

This legislature shaped the terrain for racialized economic relations in South Africa. The agricultural sector, amongst others, exhibited these new patterns of racialized employer and labour relations, as Africans were restricted to a peasant labouring class serving White commercial farmers. Large-scale white-owned commercial farms were built through: massive state subsidies (including credit, input and output markets), favourable credit facilities from the Land Bank, Agricultural Credit Board, and sub-sectoral cooperatives; grants; transport concessions; tax relief; and disaster-management (Vink and Kirsten, 2000; Greenberg, 2010; Helliker, 2013). These forms of support improved the socio-economic status of white-owned commercial farms since they were able to have financial capital i.e. the means to purchase operational inputs, like seeds, fertilisers, and any other resources that they needed in agricultural projects.

Additionally, with access to financial capital they were able to invest in new technology and machineries, such as tractors. In other words, they could have physical capital (Mabuza, 2016). The government also injected state support through research, extension and regulatory instruments to guarantee the good-health, protection and safety of natural agricultural resources to boost white owned commercial farms. This means that these farmers had access to human capital through research and extension support. They also had social capital through regulatory instruments. These forms of (support) capital relate to the research goals of the study because they show what could come out of the land reform programme when the different forms of capital are integrated into land reform (Vink and Kirsten, 2000).

The cited racially discriminatory legislations were unjust, and unacceptable, hence the opposition from the different liberation movements, such as the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC). This opposition was later followed by negotiations between the ANC and National Party (NP) from the early 1990s (Kirsten, 2017). The repealing of all these apartheid laws became known as the Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act 108 of 1991 (Ntsebeza, 2011; Kloppers and Pienaar, 2014). “The 1991 Land Acts, the associated White Paper, and the 1993 Provision of Certain Land for Resettlement Act sought to find ways to broaden access to land previously reserved for whites” (Kirsten, 2017: 3). Legislative measures were used to secure wealth for white settlers through access to land and various other state sponsored inputs to make economic success of the land. State support played a major role in success of white farms during both colonial and apartheid eras.

2.6. THE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK OF LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA

POST-1994

The first democratically elected government inherited a highly unequal economic structure and a “dualistic” agricultural sector (Aliber *et al.*, 2009; Aliber and Cousins, 2013; Gwebu and Matthews, 2018 and Cousins, 2019). This ‘dualistic agrarian structure’ “comprises around 35 000 large-scale, mostly white-owned commercial farms occupying most of the country’s agricultural land and producing almost all market output. On the contrary, there is a large number of small-scale black farmers, largely confined to the ex-Bantustans (approximately 4 million, located in around 2 million households)” (Aliber and Cousins, 2013: 142).

The latter group is quite diverse, both in scale and orientation, as most produce mainly for subsistence purposes and as a supplementary source of food, and a smaller number (around 200 000) mainly to generate monetary income (Gwebu and Matthews, 2018). Since these two groups produced for different purposes, the rationale of the ANC-government was to follow an agrarian reform that would reorganize agriculture, substituting the then leading largescale commercial farms with small-holder farms. This empowerment was part and parcel of the ANC’s vision to develop an uncomplicated programme that promotes freedom, quality of life and sustainable livelihoods through the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (RDP, 1994; Cousins, *et al.*, 1999; Turner and Ibsen, 2000; Cousins, 2010; Aliber and Cousins, 2013).

Simply put, it was the responsibility of South Africa's multiparty constitutional negotiators to address the challenges that confronted the country at the time, and various legislations were passed. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act 108 of 1996 became the supreme law of the country. "There are three fundamental rights clauses on land reform written in the constitution" (Links, 2011: 43). This refers to giving all citizens the right to gain access to land without being unfairly discriminated against. Secondly, giving land tenure security to all communities whose tenure of land is legally insecure because of past racially discriminatory laws or practices. Thirdly, giving people and groups who had their land dispossessed after 19 June 1913 because of racially discriminatory laws or practices, the right to restitution of that land or to fair compensation (The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, RSA, 1996).

These clauses gave land reform beneficiaries the legal ground to lay claims on land for redistribution, restitution, or tenure security. Moreover, new policy documents were drafted by the democratic government to see to it that different land reform measures were in place. These new policy documents were in line with the international principles of the United Nations (UN) on safeguarding the rights of all citizens (Links, 2011). The White Paper on Land Policy 1997, sets out the vision and implementation strategy for South Africa's land policy. It states that the land policy should be fair; promote reconciliation and stability; support economic growth and improve household security (DLA, 1997). The land reform programme in South Africa is divided into three respective projects: land redistribution, land restitution, and land tenure reform (DLA, 1997).

According to the Development Facilitation Act No. 67 of 1995 (an Act adopted as the key channel for assisting the required measures of development), extraordinary measures to facilitate developmental programmes related to land should be introduced. Secondly, a Development and Planning Commission should be started. Thirdly, provincial land development tribunals vested with the powers to settle disagreements should be initiated, and support should be made available for land development for farming and residential land development (DLA, 1995). The purpose of the Provision of Land Assistance Act No. 126 of 1993 is to provide for the designation of certain land; to regulate the subdivision of such land and the settlement of persons thereon; and to provide for matters connected therewith (The Provision of Land Assistance Act NO. 126 of 1993).

The Provision of Land and Assistance Amendment Act No. 58 of 2008 was passed to amend the Provision of Land and Assistance Act No. 126 of 1993. The objectives of the Act include to: clarify and extend the application of the provisions on the acquisition; planning, development, improvement and disposal of property; as well as to clarify and extend the provision of financial assistance for land reform purposes. It was also passed to make available property for land reform purposes and to set aside matters connected to land reform. The legislative framework of land reform in South Africa post 1994 was designed to address the history of land dispossession in South Africa. This was achieved by abolishing the coercive legal constraints of the past and promote a transformative legislative framework. For instance, through the constitution, all citizens are given the right to gain access to land, and policies in line with the international principles of the United Nations (UN) form a part of the constitution to safeguard the rights of all citizens.

Furthermore, the White Paper seeks to correct the imbalance of agricultural land through the land reform programme. The Communal Property Associations Act, the Development Facilitation Act, the Provision of Land Assistance Act, and the Provision of Land and Assistance Amendment Act were all passed to assist land reform beneficiaries at the post-settlement support phase of land reform. The RDP highlighted that capital-intensive agricultural policies resulted in large-scale eviction of dwellers from their households. It was therefore suggested that merely repealing Land Acts would not redress the inequities of land distribution. Thus, a national land reform programme was necessary. It was envisioned that the national reform programme would be the most important to address the past injustices of forced removals and access to land, as well as addressing rural development (RDP, 1994; Cliffe, 2000; Hall, 2004; Aliber and Cousins, 2013).

The RDP adopted the World Bank's 'model' that proposed 30 percent of white-owned land should be transferred to 600, 000 black hands in a period of five years (Hall and Williams, 2003). In 1994, the land reform programme became the official land policy in South Africa. It was influenced by NGOs, such as The Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA), The Transvaal Rural Action (TRAC), The Surplus People's Project (SPP) and the Grahamstown Rural Committee (GRC). These NGOs formed the National Committee Against Removals (NCAR) [now known as the National Land Committee (NLC)] in 1985, which supported the resistance of removals and later advocated for land reclaims (Mngxitama, 2005; Ntsebeza, 2011).

These NGOs held a more radical (populist) version of restorative justice land reform, arguing that land should be returned to the poor and landless based on one of the three options: compensation of land to all those without any land access dating back to 1913; a redistribution of land to the dispossessed groups, and lastly, offering property rights to all those in need of land (Cliffe, 2000; Lahiff, 2007). These three options were met with great rejection by several groups. These include, white farming and business interests, agricultural officials, chiefs and the National African Farmers Union (NAFU). NAFU argued that the support of small-scale farming was another tactic to limit black people from acquiring more profitable and competitive large-scale. Chiefs pursued their patriarchal authority over land to oppose the NLC's commitment to democratic procedures, since it gave autonomous land rights to women farming (Hall & Williams, 2003). The ANC-led land reform has been accepted to include three aspects namely, land restitution; land tenure reform; and land redistribution (Deininger, 1999; Cliffe, 2000; Lahiff, 2000; Hall, 2007; Ntsebeza and Hall, 2007; Satge, 2014). The DRDLR offers various grants and services to support the land reform programme (Hall, 2004).

2.7. PROGRAMMES OF LAND REFORM AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT

2.7.1. LAND RESTITUTION PROGRAMME

The Restitution programme is a right based programme that was created under the Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994. The Act provides for the restitution of that property or fair compensation to people or communities who were dispossessed land under racial legislations or practices after 19 June 1913 (Lahiff, 2000; Satge, 2014). The programme focuses on the process of reconciliation, reconstruction, and development (Weideman, 2004). On a legal basis, all restitution claims are against the state. Simply put, legal claims are not against previous or existing landowners. The restitution programme directly challenges the inequalities that existed before and during the apartheid period (Fabricius and de Wet, 1998). "A Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights was established under a Chief Land Claims Commissioner and seven Regional Commissioners" (Lahiff, 2000: 3). These seven Commissioners represented the nine provinces and were responsible for helping claimants in putting forward their land claims, accepting and acknowledging all lodged claims and making recommendations in relation to the progress of land claims (SAHO, 2019).

Owing to the slow pace of land restitution claims, the Restitution Act was amended in 1997, to allow for claimants to approach the Land Claims Court. The Minister of Land Affairs was bestowed with superior powers to settle claims through negotiation (Fabricius and de Wet, 1998: 150). The Land Claim Commission and the Land Claims Court have different objectives. The Land Claim Commission is responsible for the administration of land claims and offering compensation to the existing owners and restitution to the claimants. On the contrary, the Land Claims Court concentrates on disputes that the Land Claim Commission does not have jurisdiction of and arise out of laws supporting the country's land reform initiative. "Thus, the Land Claim Commission screens all land claims, identifies those that qualify in terms of the Constitution of and the Restitution Act, and attempts to solve these claims by administrative or mediation procedures" (SAHO, 2019: 1).

According to Fabricius and de Wet, (1998), Lahiff (2000), and Satge (2014) there is a specific criterion for which the claimant/s must satisfy to lodge a claim. In the periods between 1994 and June 2006, 1 007 247 ha of land were settled (DLA, 2006). The claims that still need to be resolved are those which are complicated. Whereas, those settled are mostly urban claims settled through cash compensation. "Of the settled claims, 59% accepted financial compensation, 5% obtained alternative remedies and 36% involved land restoration" (Manenzhe, 2007: 20). This means that most land claims remain unresolved (Ntsebeza and Hall, 2007). In areas where land is restored, large farms have been transferred to communities now residing on the land. These communities either distribute some parts of land to family members who use the land individually or try to farm together (Ntsebeza and Hall, 2007). In cases where poor communities have insufficient funds to continue with existing operations on commercial farms, they have in some cases joined partnerships with commercial partners who will inject capital and skills. In some cases, these poor communities get into lease agreements with the former landowner (Ntsebeza and Hall, 2007).

2.7.2. LAND TENURE REFORM PROGRAMME

The Land Tenure Reform Programme is rights based programme which "aims to redress the discrimination in terms of the nature of land rights held by Africans, specifically in the contexts of people living on commercial farms, former Bantustans, and elsewhere where people hold land communally" (Lahiff, 2000: 4).

It aims to fulfill the constitutional requirement to guarantee the access to legally secure tenure in land for all South Africans. The Extension of Security of Tenure Act 62 of 1997 (ESTA) and the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act 2 of 1996 (LTA) were passed to secure the rights of farm dwellers. The objective of these two Acts is to determine the link between occupiers and owners so that unreasonable evictions can be avoided. However, government and the civil society have criticised these Acts as being ineffective, since there is still an occurrence of evictions outside the legal framework (Ntsebeza and Hall, 2007). Satge (2014) also supports the scholars by arguing that tenure reform is the weakest link in South Africa's land reform. "Tenure reform is a crosscutting issue and its separation from restitution and redistribution is widely regarded as a mistake" (Satge, 2014: 15). For example, according to a study "between 1994 to the end of 2004, 942, 303 people were evicted from farms out of a total of about 2, 351,086 who had been displaced from farms through various means (including voluntarily exit)" (Manenzhe, 2007: 21). Cousins (2002) argues that these legislations have been ineffective, because poor farm dwellers do not have access to legal services and the state its limitations.

2.7.3. LAND REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME

The land redistribution programme was introduced to address the land inequalities between the 87 per cent of the land owned by white commercial farmers and the 13 percent in the former 'homelands' (Cliffe, 2000; Hall, 2007; Hall and Ntsebeza, 2011; Aliber and Cousins, 2013). The primary objective of the land redistribution programme is to give productive or residential land to those who were previously disadvantaged, that is, those who could not acquire land due to (colonial and apartheid) racist legislation; the poor; labour tenants; farm-workers and new farmers (Cliffe, 2000). The land redistribution programme was also established to grant land and better the livelihoods of land beneficiaries. This programme also emphasizes on prioritising the needs of women (Lahiff, 2000). Another feature of land redistribution is offering grants to municipalities to purchase commonage land, which will be used by the public, more especially the poor livestock owners. By the end of 2002, a third of all land was transferred through redistribution (Hall, 2007). However, lately, commonage has been downplayed and funding for it has declined. This is because the goal of redistribution has predominantly been on transferring land to new farmers through the 'Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development' (LRAD) (Hall, 2007).

Two legislations were passed to facilitate the programme. The first is the 'of Certain Land for Settlement Act 126 of 1993, which was amended in 1998 and is now titled the Provision of Land and Assistance Act. However, this is no more than an enabling Act that empowers the Minister of Land Affairs to make available capital or land purchases (Lahiff, 2000). The second legislation is the Development Facilitation Act 67 of 1995, which introduces extraordinary measures to facilitate and speed up the implementation of RDPs and projects which concern land (Cliffe, 2000). According to the figures of land redistribution, by June 1998, approximately 250 000 people in 279 projects acquired land. The amount of people who acquired land were more in 1998, as compared to the preceding three years combined.

In the first quarter of 1999, approximately more than 50 000 people acquired land through the redistribution programme. By mid-November 1999, 447 redistribution projects were listed to be in the application stage, and according to the records of the Department of Land Affairs, approximately 360 256 people were part of this stage and 714 407 hectares of land were to be transferred (Cousins, 2016). Since, April 2009 to March 2017, approximately 21 517 people benefited from the redistribution programme (DRDLR, 2018). The primary focus of land reform has been redistributing land through a market-led, 'willing buyer, willing seller' land redistribution programme (Hall, 2004). A fiscal review of the agricultural sector was organized by the national DRDLR with the support of the National Treasury and Provincial Treasury. The main aim of the review was to establish the cost drivers and the spending pressures in the sector of agriculture.

The review came to several findings, however the one of interest for this study was that there was inadequate provision for farmer support within the agricultural budget. With the goal of addressing this issue and assisting the sub-programmes of the land-reform programme (i.e. land restitution, land redistribution and tenure reform), various agricultural-related strategies and programmes of post-settlement support were offered by the DRDLR (Masoka, 2014). These include: The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP); the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP); the Recapitalization and Development Programme (RADP); and the Agricultural extension and mentorship post-settlement support and rural development programmes (NDA, 2003; NDA, 2005; DRDLR, 2009; DRDLR, 2011b; DRDLR, 2013a; DRDLR 2013b).

2.8. AGRICULTURAL-RELATED STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMMES OF POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT

In 2004, the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) was introduced to offer support to land and agrarian reform farmers and producers who acquired land privately by providing the following: infrastructure support; training, mentorship and management services; capacity building; access to information; access to finance; and markets (NDA, 2003). Another example is the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) which was introduced in 2009. Through the CRDP, support is provided through economic, i.e. on-farm infrastructure grants and social infrastructure to be used by all members of the rural community (DRDLR, 2009). With these forms of support, rural farmers can have access to agri-food output markets when they have developed infrastructure (Sikwela, 2013).

The recapitalization and development programme (RADP) offers support by providing state and public land like commonages and farms acquired by black farmers outside the land reform programme. The objectives of the RADP are to increase production; to guarantee food security; to graduate small farmers into commercial farmers; to create employment opportunities within the agricultural sector and to establish rural development rangers (DRDLR, 2011b; DRDLR, 2013a; DRDLR 2013b). Through the Land and Agrarian Reform Programme (LARP), it was found that there was a shortage for extension and advisory services, more specifically in relation to commercial farming skills. The Extension Recovery Programme (ERP) 2008/9 was developed to resolve these issues and all other possible limitations to extension services (NDA, 2005).

Training, and or skills are offered through agricultural colleges, mentorship and management programmes. These agricultural-related strategies and programmes illustrated that other forms of capital for example human, social, financial, and physical capitals are needed to create sustainable livelihoods. Therefore, the focus should not only be on natural capital (land). The availability of these forms of capitals in the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) and The Extension Recovery Programme (ERP) gives beneficiaries the opportunity to have appropriate skills and expertise to produce and become successful small-holder farmers. Secondly, CASP gives beneficiaries the platform to have access to networks and contacts so that they may access value chains and markets to ultimately achieve their livelihood outcomes.

The CASP programme also gives beneficiaries access to physical capital that will allow the beneficiaries to have productive agricultural activity. Through the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) and CASP financial capital is made available to give beneficiaries a chance to have capital so that they can be able to purchase what they need to make their products or provide services. The recapitalization and development programme (RADP) natural capital (land) is made available to the beneficiaries so that they can have ownership and access to land. However, there is a clear indication in the programme that land alone is insufficient to ensure sustainable and profitable use of the land. Since, other forms of capital like human, social, financial and physical capitals are needed to reach the goals of increasing production, guaranteeing food security, graduating small farmers into commercial farmers, creating employment opportunities within the agricultural sector and establishing development rangers.

2.9. GRANTS AND SERVICES OF THE LAND REFORM PROGRAMME

2.9.1. SETTLEMENT/ LAND ACQUISITION GRANT (SLAG)

The first to be discussed is the pilot programme known as the Settlement/ Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG), from 1995 to 1999 (Hall, 2007; Rungasamy, 2011; Sotsha, 2017). The aim of the SLAG was “to enhance market-led or investor friendly redistribution” (Sotsha, 2017:4). The grant was set at an amount of R15 000 per household in 1996, which was increased to R16 000 per household in 1998 (Department of Land Affairs, 2003c: 3). During this period, the goal of the land redistribution programme was to transfer 30% of agricultural land over five years (African National Congress, 1994). SLAG was offered to households with a family contribution of less than R1 500 (Department of Land Affairs, 1997b).

Considering the price of land and the size of the grants, many beneficiaries chose to organize themselves into large groups to buy farms on the market. The SLAG model was condemned for the multifaceted group dynamics that were evident. For example, land has been used by a small number of families which were registered on the grant application, or land became too overcrowded and thus unsustainable (Hall and Williams, 2003; Hall, 2004; Hall, 2007). In 1995, a National Conference on Land Policy was organised by the DRDLR. SLAG was generally criticised for ‘dumping’ the poor. The aim of this conference was to outline the DLAs Draft Land Policy Principles.

As at the CLC, community representatives opposed the exclusion of claims for dispossession before 1913, called for the constitutional clause “protecting property rights to be scrapped and pointed out that the SLAG was too slow” (Hall and Williams, 2003: 7). The SLAG model was criticised for failing to contribute to the development of semi-commercial and commercial black farmers. Moreover, it was argued that it did not make any provision for post-settlement support (Prinsloo, 2008). To resolve these issues, in 1999, the Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Thoko Didiza, instituted a moratorium on land redistribution, awaiting an internal policy review. This was then followed in February 2000 by an announcement which took a different direction: The 30 percent target was extended to a period of 15 years, from 2000 to 2015 (; Lahiff, 2000; Kirsten, 2017).

The SLAG can be understood as financial capital, (regular inflows of money) since it is money made available by the state to people so that they can purchase farms on the market and adopt different livelihood strategies, as well as secure their livelihoods. The study will explore whether the SLAG was made available to the land beneficiaries. In circumstances where the SLAG was made available, the focus will be on understanding whether multifaceted group dynamics are indeed evident amongst the beneficiaries and is there a need for social capital. For instance, is there a need for beneficiaries to become part of more formalised groups or associations where they are expected to adhere to formalised rules/ code of conduct to avoid group dynamics and boost their agricultural activities.

2.9.2. THE LAND REDISTRIBUTION FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (LRAD)

A new programme identified as the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) was introduced in 2001, to address the gap of post-settlement support that was evident under SLAG. The LRAD was imagined as the desired connection between land transfers and post-settlement support for new farmers. The programme was developed with the goal of building a class of African commercial farmers, and since then it was developed as the main policy which allows people to acquire land (Lahiff, 2000; Hall, 2004; Hall, 2007; Kirsten, 2017). LRAD was initially developed for people with the means to invest and those with agricultural diplomas. Applicants would be expected to pay an amount between R5 000 and R400 000 towards the cost of the land.

Depending on the amount paid by the applicants, the LRAD would make available grants from R20 000 to R100 000 on a sliding scale. Consequently, there is a contest amongst the underprivileged for access to (limited) resources. The grant would be used to cover expenses including land acquisition, land improvements, agricultural infrastructure investments, capital assets, and short-term agricultural inputs (Ministry for Agriculture and Land Affairs, 2001). However, despite making substantial progress, the LRAD was also criticised for not providing satisfactory outcomes. For example, the finalization of land acquisition took approximately three years, infuriating willing buyers and willing sellers. This also contributed to the slow pace of the land reform goal.

The study also investigates whether the forms of (capital) post-settlement support services, for example expenses to cover land acquisition, land improvements, agricultural infrastructure investments, capital assets, and short-term agricultural inputs were made available to the beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. Ever-since its inception, the land reform programme has been criticised for its inability to “deliver on its multiple objectives of historical redress” (Lahiff, 2008: 1). According to the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform Strategic Plan 2015-2020, from 1994, the government (through the land reform programme) has been successful in making land accessible to those who were previously disadvantaged. Contrariwise, the landless, and reports such as the Medium-Term Review and Final Review of the Land Reform Pilot Project (LRPP) argued that there remains the challenge of post-settlement support in the South African land reform programme (DLA, 1997a; DLA, 1999).

This means that even though there has been an improvement in the second term of the democratic government (1999-2004), it is generally acknowledged that the South African government has not satisfied the criteria for the land reform programme to reach its full potential because the government does not support the other forms of capital (Manenzhe, 2007; Binswanger- Mkhize, 2014). This challenge is attributed to the failure to protect the rights of farm workers and farm dwellers, the adoption of group or co-operative farming, and not enough involvement from the beneficiaries of land reform. Moreover, there are complications in the civil service and most importantly, the lack of attention, late arrival and poor quality towards development and post-settlement support (Binswanger-Mkhize, 2014; DRDLR, 2015).

It also seems to have become common today to argue that there is no policy in place to advise land reform beneficiaries on post-settlement support, and under these circumstances, the land reform programme has not reached its full potential (De Villiers 2003; Hall, 2005). Another critical issue is that the simple transfer of land is largely associated with limited equity, thus there is need for post-settlement support to address this issue (Manenzhe, 2007). The postsettlement support phase of land reform is very important because the success of land reform is determined by the amount of land redistributed, as well as the direction to be taken after people have been resettled on that land. The White Paper on South African Land Policy of 1997, defines post-settlement support as state sponsored assistance to support land beneficiaries in the form of: various productive and sustainable land use; infrastructure support; farm credit; agricultural inputs and access to markets for farm outputs (DLA, 1997b: 16).

2.9.3. EXTENSION SERVICES

Agricultural extension services offered by the state to land beneficiaries include: providing farming related information; training on farming methods and motivating beneficiaries to reach their land-centric goals (Anderson & Feder, 2003). According to the Strategic Plan for South African agriculture, the national and provincial Departments of Rural Development and Land Reform are responsible for the delivery of extension support to the beneficiaries of land reform. “Extension services are particularly important where farmland cannot be expanded easily and, as a result, the existing unit of plot has to be farmed intensively. This is particularly the case among small-scale producers who gained access to farmland through the land reform programme” (Jacobs, 2003).

Agricultural extension officers are in most cases staff members of the DRDLR or may be involved with the Agricultural Research Council (ARC) (Jacobs, 2003). The role of the extension officer is to communicate important information between the Departments of Rural Development and Land Reform and the small-scale farmer. South Africa’s agricultural sector has a two-track extension system, namely: a sophisticated extension support for large-scale businesses of agriculture and facilities for small-scale producers who reside in the former homelands. Each province decides on its own agricultural extension (Jacobs, 2003). Extension services can be understood as human capital. Human capital encompasses making available farming related information, training on farming methods and the ability to labour that when combined, allow individuals or communities

to engage with different livelihood strategies and reach their own objectives. This form of capital is an important part of securing livelihoods and is needed to influence all other forms of capital (UNDP, 2017). With human capital, the nature and extent of post-settlement support provided to the beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District is also interrogated in this study.

2.9.4. INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT

The lack of infrastructure impedes on the success of land reform. In most cases, small-holder farmers are restricted from access to agro-food output markets because of underdeveloped infrastructure (Sikwela, 2013). It is for this reason that on-farm infrastructure grants were introduced. According to the Comprehensive Farmer Support Programme (CFSP), on-farm infrastructure grants should be made available for the beneficiaries of land reform. These grants extend to all emerging farmers. In other words, these grants are not exclusively for beneficiaries of land reform (Mabuza, 2016). The grant is very similar to the LRAD grant. Grants start from R4 000 to R 100 000. To qualify for the grant, applicants are expected to make an own contribution, in cash, or in labour, or even both- from R1 000 to R400 000.

“Sixty percent of the budget is earmarked for large anchor projects and 40% for bulk infrastructure and medium- to small-scale projects. Commercial projects can either be in the form of shared bulk infrastructure projects or individual projects. Overall, the programme aims to foster independence and self-reliance” (Jacobs, 2003: 12). The public sector has the responsibility of financing infrastructure development for roads, electricity, water supply, and health infrastructure to attain “effective and lasting agrarian or residential reform” (Mabuza, 2016: 15). This section is important because it makes provision for the assessment of infrastructure support or physical capital that was provided by the government to the beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. With this, it can be interrogated whether the beneficiaries have access to basic infrastructure for productivity on the different farms, since the lack of infrastructure/ physical capital usually impedes on the success of productive agricultural activities.

2.9.5. TRAINING, MENTORSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

For agricultural projects to be effective and sustainable, it is important that beneficiaries receive farmer training and farmer skills. These training and skills include financial management, marketing, and human resource management (Mabuza, 2016). Training, and or skills are offered through agricultural collages, mentorship and management programmes.

The Farmer Entrepreneur and Incubation Centre (FEDIC) is the main model proposed in the Comprehensive Farmer Support Programme (CFSP) (NDA, 2002). Agricultural colleges will make provision for these training centres, and modules will be set up to accommodate the needs of beneficiaries. Beneficiaries will also be given the choice of being trained according to their language preference. The stakeholders which are expected to assist with these skills, include the provincial departments of agriculture, the Agricultural Research Council (ARC), and the farmer organisation, AgriSA (Jacobs, 2003). This section is important to the research objectives of the study because by interrogating the training, mentorship and management programmes that were offered to the beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District, so too can it be understood whether the land reform beneficiaries are members of any formalised groups which grant them access to the markets, so that they may produce for commercial purposes.

2.9.6. ACCESS TO FINANCE

Sufficient funding is necessary for the success of agricultural projects (Jacobs, 2003: 14). In many cases, beneficiaries are unable to utilize acquired land due to the lack of access to credit. Consequently, their socio-economic status is affected since they are unable to use the land. This means that they will not have the means to purchase operational inputs, like seeds, fertilisers, and any other resources that may be needed in agricultural projects. By having access to finances, beneficiaries may also be able to invest in new technology and machineries, such as tractors and operational inputs, like seeds, and fertilizers (Mabuza, 2016). Access to finance (financial capital) plays a significant role to the research objectives of the study because without adequate financial support, productive agricultural activity is paused, since the beneficiaries are unable to purchase what they need to make their products or provide services.

2.9.7. ACCESS TO MARKETS

The access to markets is very important for beneficiaries, so that they can be able to alleviate poverty and sustain their livelihoods. Therefore, post-settlement support should extend beyond the development of beneficiaries and economic support. Support should therefore be extended by finding possible markets for beneficiaries (Anderson and Feder, 2003). To put it in another way, post-settlement support should offer support to beneficiaries by giving them access to formal and informal markets, arrangements with retail sectors, or contracts with primary agricultural product

associations (Jacobs, 2003: 18). Interrogating whether the beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District have the access to markets (social capital) is crucial to the objectives of this study, because the beneficiaries cannot successfully produce for commercial purposes without being a part of organizations and social groups. In other words, being a member of a certain social group/ groups may improve the chances of the beneficiaries to trade products or services. On the contrary, being a part of an association may work to their disadvantage, since they may be expected to adhere to the rules, norms and sanctions of that association.

2.10. CHALLENGES OF LAND REFORM PROGRAMMES IN SOUTH AFRICA

The current land policy approach has been criticised for failing in many areas. For example, it has fallen far behind from the vision and targets of widespread redistribution as stated in the Freedom Charter, the World Bank, and later the RDP (Aliber and Cousins, 2013). It has failed in restructuring the rural economy and resolving the problem of dualism in the agrarian structure (Ntsebeza, 2011). In 1999, the year in which the 30 percent target was expected to be met, not even one per cent of white owned-land had been transferred to black people. Due to this failure, a moratorium on land redistribution was instituted and the 30 percent target was extended to a period of twenty years, in other words to 2014 (Lahiff, 2000; Hall and Williams, 2003; Cousins, 2013). After 10 years of democracy in South Africa in 2004, approximately three percent of land had been transferred to black people (Ntsebeza, 2011).

In July 2005, a historic land summit was organised by the DRDLR in Johannesburg. The summit was focused on the theme: ‘A Partnership to Fast Track Land Reform: A New Trajectory, forward to 2014, the year to meet the 30 percent target’. At the summit various consensus were reached. These include the following: “the state should be proactive and be the driving force behind land redistribution; the willing seller, willing buyer principle be rejected; the state to have right of first refusal on all land sales; land reform should benefit the poor, particularly women, farm workers and youth and that; land should be expropriated” (Ntsebeza, 2011: 8). However, in 2012, closer to the year to meet the 30 percent target, approximately 8 percent of commercial farmland was redistributed (Aliber & Cousins, 2013). There are several considerations behind these failures. At the forefront of these considerations are: the lack of extension, skills and other post-settlement support given to the beneficiaries of land reform (Hall *et al.*, 2003; Manenzhe, 2007).

The government's fiscal restraint has been identified as another factor which has contributed towards the slow pace of land redistribution. As a result, only 4% of agricultural land was redistributed in 2006 (Venter, 2006). Other factors that constrain land reform and the state's participation towards a successful land reform are the macro-economic perspectives on land policy which were adopted by the post-apartheid government. These include the growth, employment and redistribution (GEAR) macroeconomic strategy and the structural adjustment programmes in the late 1990s (Lahiff, 2007). It is proposed by Lahiff (2007) that these neoliberal policy prescriptions restrain the state from social spending and encourage relationships with the private sector as a way of boosting the effect of limited state programmes to discriminate against the very poor. This meant that the state has been restricted from providing support in the form of "soft loans, tax breaks, state-run cooperatives and single channel marketing and the opening up of South Africa's markets to international competition through the dismantling of tariff barriers" (Hall, 2004: 220).

Moreover, radical analysts have challenged the effectiveness of the current policy and have insisted that the country needs policies that will make possible a radical land redistribution programme exceeding the 30 percent target (Cousins, 2013). All supporters of radical land reform argue that the provision of the property clause in the Constitution, and the acceptance of the willing seller, willing buyer principle remain as barriers to the success of land redistribution (Mnwana, 2019). Therefore, Section 25 of the Constitution should be amended for expropriation without compensation. This view is in line with Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) leader, Julius Malema's motion to adopt the radical policy of land expropriation without compensation.

This policy will make it constitutional for the land to be expropriated in the public interest without compensation (Mathibela, 2018). Additionally, the Black First Land First (BFL) socialist political party argued in its latest manifesto that approximately eight percent of land was delivered to black people in the last 20 years, therefore it is necessary for the land to be nationalised without compensation. The African Peoples Convention (APC) also supported calls for nationalisation of the land. The Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) also holds the position that land should be expropriated without compensation. The Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) has also welcomed the land expropriation without compensation proposal. In its manifesto the ANC argued that it would carry out a sustainable land reform programme involving different measures such as expropriation without compensation (Montsho, 2019).

The parties argue that the current land reform programme has been at a slow pace and has been met with different challenges. For instance, dating back to 1994, approximately 8% of land has been transferred to black people. Their core argument is that without the amendment of the constitution, the slow pace of land reform will remain. The justification of their approach to land reform is that court cases favour those with property (Joubert, 2018). In 2018, the National Assembly adopted the constitutional review committee's report which endorsed that the constitution should be amended to allow for the expropriation of land without compensation. 209 Members of parliament voted in favour of the report, whilst 91 members of parliament opposed it. Following this, public hearings were organised on the review of Section 25 of the Constitution (Montsho, 2019).

On the contrary, a powerful lobby of conservatives, liberals, landowners, and business interests, and some political parties oppose expropriation without compensation. These groups contend that the current land policy should be preserved, although there is a need to increase black participation in the large-scale commercial agricultural sector (Lahiff, 2007; Ntsebeza, 2011; Mathibela, 2018; Prof Hall, 2018). Proponents of this view, such as the Democratic Alliance (DA) argued that the success of the land reform programme has been obstructed by corruption. In addition, the change of the land reform budget to elites, lack of capacity, political will, leadership from the ANC-led government and government officials has been blamed for this ineffective land reform. The Freedom Front (FF) Plus also argues that there is sufficient land available for redistribution, therefore there is no need for expropriation without compensation (Montsho, 2019).

These perceptions can be regarded as hostile to radical land reform, however accepting that an inclusive agricultural sector is necessary for purposes of political stability (Cousins, 2013). The ideological approach of those who oppose expropriation without compensation is attributed the fact that expropriation without compensation will leave many landowners, business interests and many members of political parties such as the DA and FF (predominantly white people) without land and privileges attached to land. For instance, approximately 35 000 commercial farms are mostly white-owned and produce almost all market output. Notably, smallholder farmers are not present from the mainstream discourse on land reform. "Several critiques of the dominant policy discourse, and suggestions for greater emphasis on smallholder production and poverty alleviation have been put forward, mainly by academics and a few local NGOs, but these have had little

influence on the policy process to date” (Lahiff, 2007: 1584). The resurgence of these debates was sparked by the understanding that up until now the 30 percent target has not been met, therefore inequalities remain because of land (Friedman, 2018). There is a belief that historically, the return of land meant that people have both political and economic freedom. In South Africa however, there are patterns that illustrate that there have been economic inequalities because of land. This is because land has been used for commercial purposes by white landowners, whilst small-scale black landowners use the land for mostly subsistence purposes. The primary goal of this study will explore these patterns by analysing the nature and extent of post-settlement support provided to the land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District.

2.11. CHALLENGES OF POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT

Post-settlement support can be understood as ‘settlement support’, ‘post-transfer support’, ‘postdistribution support’, or ‘post-acquisition support’, depending on the framework that is adopted by that country (Tilley, 2007: 2). According to the *White Paper on South African Land Policy of 1997*, post-settlement support is development which includes assistance with productive and sustainable land use, infrastructure support, farm credit, agricultural inputs and access to markets for farm outputs (DLA, 1997b: 16). Simply put, the purpose of post-settlement support is to avail various forms of support to land reform beneficiaries so that planning, implementation and capacity building can take place. Post-settlement support is intended to change the livelihoods of land beneficiaries for the better (Levin, 2000; DLA framework, 2005; Rungasamy, 2011; Masoka, 2014).

Evidence suggests that land reform has had limited positive outcomes on the livelihoods of beneficiaries, because of the insufficient post-settlement support. For example, many of the beneficiaries who acquired land in rural areas through the land reform programme have been unsuccessful in working on the land and using it to its full production potential (Levin, 2000; Weideman, 2004; Binswanger-Mkhize, 2004; Tilley, 2007; Rungasamy, 2011). This is because there has been a lack of assistance with productive and sustainable land use, infrastructure support, farm credit, agricultural inputs and access to markets for farm outputs. Consequently, land reform beneficiaries have not been successful in improving their agricultural development and quality of life and have been forced to have their land repossessed/sold or abandoned (Jacobs, 2003; HSRC,

2003; Wegerif, 2004; van der Elst, 2008; Masoka, 2014). Another challenge to post-settlement support is the inappropriate pre-transfer business planning. For example, inappropriate business planning may demand large amounts of investments, instead of cheap alternatives or basic infrastructure, such as fencing or boreholes (Hall, 2004). As a result, time is wasted on acquiring enough capital to buy expensive infrastructure and the objectives of land reform are attained late or not at all. This means that, for the land reform programme to become a success, there needs to be appropriate pre-transfer planning, so that post-settlement support can be appropriately developed (Lahiff, 2006). Moreover, another challenge is that there is no clear time span and degree of ongoing support (post-settlement support), since the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) insists that it cannot 'nanny' projects indefinitely.

In other words, the duration of post-settlement support remains vague and ambiguous. The problem of post-settlement support also extends to the fact that provincial DRDLR have a shortage of staff to monitor and evaluate projects. In addition, another challenge is that the support services that the provincial departments availed have declined since the deregulation of agriculture in the period of the 1990s (Masoka, 2014). Furthermore, some provincial departments of agriculture have many staff members who are unskilled, although there has been some progress with the employment of extension officers. There have also been political differences between the national, provincial and local governments, and this has impeded on the progress of land reform (Hall, 2004; van der Elst, 2008).

The monitoring and evaluation role of the DRDLR has been criticised to lack expertise in agricultural aspects of projects. The DRDLR has also been condemned for not making any financial plan available for post-settlement support for redistribution projects (DLA, 2002). Moreover, before a project can be approved, beneficiaries are expected to have business plans or development plans drawn by private sector design agents. These plans summarize farming activities and types of support services which are needed for projects. However, after beneficiaries have been settled on land, it is alleged that government agencies and land reform beneficiaries seldomly follow the farming operations and supporting roles set out for the different agencies in these plans (McIntosh and Vaughan 2000; Hall, 2003).

To demonstrate that an intricate relationship exists between land transfers and post-settlement support, case studies will be used to indicate that making post-settlement support available for beneficiaries is vital for the long-term success and sustainability of land reform.

2.12. SOUTH AFRICAN LAND REFORM CASE STUDIES

In Limpopo (Manenzhe and Lahiff, 2007) conducted a study to examine the experience of land beneficiaries after they have acquired land. The results of the research showed that services of post-settlement support (capitals) were provided to the beneficiaries of Munzhedzi. For example, the Limpopo DRDLR provided ‘starter packs’ to all projects settled in the Makhado area. These ‘starter packs’ involved a tractor, a plough and a trailer. Another way of providing post-settlement support was when the regional office of the DRDLR in Makhado employed an extension officer to deliver support to new projects. Additionally, horticulture, broiler production and pig production training has been offered at the Madzivhandila Collage of Agriculture in Thohoyandou.

The Nkuzi Development Association has also provided support at Munzhedzi by assisting in vegetable gardening, piggery and poultry projects. The Association was also able to purchase pipes and other implements for the vegetable garden after being sponsored by the National Development Agency. A building to accommodate piggery and poultry projects was also built (Manenzhe and Lahiff, 2007). However, the land reform project failed because the post-settlement support that was provided was for a short period. Secondly, group dynamics also contributed to the failure of this land reform project (Manenzhe and Lahiff, 2007). These results illustrate that the government needs to support and intensify the different forms of capital to make a success of the land reform programme.

Thus, when analysing the experience of land reform, it is important to examine the quality of the forms of capital (that is, human, social, and physical) that are available for land beneficiaries. A huge component of this study to examine the experiences of the land beneficiaries, in the Makana Municipal District, within the sustainable livelihoods framework which prioritises the collective use of various forms of capital as a means of securing livelihoods for the long term. Weideman (2004) conducted research on the community which purchased the Labuschagnes kraal farm in 1997 through the SLAG. This study showed that, even after a year since the transfer of land had taken place, no farming activities were taking place, and the land was lying bare (Weideman,

2004). This case study draws attention to the need for institutional support and continued monitoring after land acquisition. In the Free State Province, the Sibongile Trust received the SLAG in 1997, and two farms were purchased. This community was able to acquire 1 061 hectares. According to the Development Plan, 69 hectares of irrigated land would be utilized for the cultivation of oats, 504 hectares of dry land for crop cultivation, for instance maize, and 488 hectares for grazing. The proposed plan failed to materialize due to lack of financial capital and limited support from the state (Weideman, 2004). This case study stresses the importance of other forms of capital in land reform projects, such as financial capital. Research on the same subject matter was conducted in the Eastern Cape Province in 2003, through the Siyakhula/ Massive Food programme.

The primary objective of the programme was to promote successful black commercial farmers in the former-Bantustans of the province with grants and loans. However, funds were not disbursed on time, leaving small-scale farmers without post-settlement support (Sikwela, 2013). This case study demonstrates that to make a success of a business, people need access to financial capital and other forms of capital. Another research on the same subject matter was conducted in the Mpumalanga Province. This programme was known as the Masibuyela Emasimini programme and was launched in 2005/06 to 2009/10. Through this programme a total of 175 tractors were provided to assist small-scale farmers. As a result, the farmers were able to produce agricultural crops (Sikwela, 2013). Additionally, post-settlement support in the Western Cape Province has been prioritized.

Statistics reveal that 72% of land reform projects which have received post-settlement support from the Western Cape Department of Rural Development and Land Reform are successful. Land projects in the province have been successful because the provincial DRDLR has supported beneficiaries by providing equipment and infrastructure, mentorship, training, market access contracts, and grants (Ntsaluba, 2019). Many of these case studies identified that the government needs to support and intensify the different forms of capital to make a success of the land reform programme. This is based on the results that there is a lack of planning concerning complementary support services for land reform, and the role of provincial departments and municipalities accountable for post-settlement support remains ambiguous and unresolved. On the contrary, the case studies which produced exceptional results proved that land should be accompanied by other

forms of capital in order for land reform to be successful. The dissertation builds on the concepts interrogated in these case studies, as it analyses the experience of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District.

2.13. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CONTEXT OF THE EASTERN CAPE

The Eastern Cape faces some of the highest rates of poverty and unemployment in South Africa. For example, “in 2004, 72% of the population was living below the poverty line” (Hamann & Tunder, 2012: 28). It is argued by Maliti (2019) that the province suffers the highest unemployment in the country. The rate of unemployment in the province is at 35.4% and is higher if 366, 000 disheartened work seekers are included. Approximately, 1.3 million people are employed, whilst 760, 000 are unemployed. Furthermore, an average of two million people is not economically active (Maliti, 2019). Since, there is a shortage of opportunities for formal employment, many of the residents in the province resort to informal activities to make a living, including the growing dependency on traditional land-based activities (Lahiff, 2003).

Moreover, Lahiff (2003) argues that the lack of basic services and poverty remain central to the lives of most of the residence in the province. Even though substantial progress has been made in many areas by providing water, electricity and housing in urban areas, the ‘deep rural areas’ of the former Ciskei and Transkei have been neglected. The Eastern Cape Province is the second largest province in the country. The province is between the Western Cape and Kwa-Zulu Natal. These two provinces are the major economic hubs of the country. The Eastern is a province with great natural beauty. It has rugged cliffs and rolling green hills. The province is rich in natural resources for example: it has grazing land, forests, and rich farming soils (Maliti, 2019).

The climate of the Eastern Cape allows for different crops, these crops are for pineapples, tea, tomatoes and chicory. All these crops are cultivated successfully in the province. The Eastern Cape has great agricultural base and ranks amongst one of the world’s major foundations of mohair. The Langkloof Valley produces fruit orchards. The province also produces a quarter of the country’s milk. The province has many natural advantages for tourist attraction. For instance, the Addo Elephant National Park has more visitors than East Africa’s Serengeti National Park. Additionally, the Camdeboo National Park, the Mountain Zebra Park and the Garden Route Park are national parks in the Eastern Cape. It further has seven different biomes (Global Africa, 2017).

This study is based on land reform beneficiaries residing in the Makana Municipal District. The Makana local municipality inherited its name from a Xhosa prophet Makana. The municipality has a population of 70 000 people. The Makana local municipality is inclusive of towns and villages such as Grahamstown which was founded in 1812, and this is where the Makana Local Municipality is based. Other areas which are a part of the municipality include Salem, Alicedale, Riebeeck East, Seven Fountains and Fort Brown. 12 Wards are part of the Makana Municipality and 3 of these originate in the rural areas (Lotz-Sisitka *et al.*, 2010; ECSECC, 2017).

2.14. CONCLUSION

This chapter has outlined two major areas, that is, the theoretical framework and the core themes pertaining to land reform in South Africa. The Sustainable theory is the adopted framework informing this study, as it focuses on the ways in which individual and groups use assets at their disposal in order to secure their livelihoods. This theoretical framework is ideal for a study of this nature, as it interrogates the quality of the assets which are available to the land beneficiaries. The framework contends that individuals need a combination of assets in order to survive, and so by examining the quality of assets that the land beneficiaries have available to them, will help determine the real outcome of land reform in South Africa. This chapter also covered key areas that are important for land reform discourse. The primary goal of this study is to analyse the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. In attempting to achieve this goal, the study explores a number of key areas such as: the socio-economic backgrounds of the beneficiaries; the state of public services in the area; the actual land transfer; the usage of land; the quality of state support and the livelihoods strategies of the land beneficiaries. The following chapter outlines the research methodology applied in this research.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this study was to examine the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. A qualitative research methodology was used to collect data in this study. According to Patton and Cochran (2002:2), qualitative research consists of “understanding aspects of social life and its methods that (in general) generate words”. This approach seeks to ask questions such as “what”, or “how” or “why” in a study (Patton and Cochran, 2002). It further permits the interviewer to be immersed in the study. This approach was specifically chosen because it permits for “thick” interpretation of social actions and events (Babbie and Mouton, 1998). This means that the approach permits the research participants to give their own truth, and their own meanings to the research question. To put it in another way, the main reason for the use of a qualitative approach, was that it was appropriate to respond to the research question. This research question is concerned with understanding the experiences and interpretations of land reform beneficiaries.

3.2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS

This study used three qualitative methods, namely: in-depth interviews; focus groups and observation. In-depth interviewing is a qualitative research technique that involves conducting intensive individual interviews with a small number of respondents to explore their perspectives on a particular idea, program, or situation. The primary advantage of in-depth interviews is that they provide much more detailed information than what is available through other data collection methods, such as surveys. They also may provide a more relaxed atmosphere in which to collect information— people may feel more comfortable having a conversation with you about their program as opposed to filling out a survey. In-depth interviews are ideal for this type of study, as it seeks to interrogate the subjective experiences of the research participants on a particular social issue (in this case land reform) (Babbie and Mouton, 1998).

Focus groups share many common features with less structured interviews, but there is more to them than merely collecting similar data from many participants at once. A focus group is a group discussion on a particular topic organised for research purposes. This discussion is guided, monitored and recorded by a researcher (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995). Participant observation is also important, as it can help the researcher provide a visual or tangible sense of the particular social issue (in this case, land reform) being researched (Patton and Cochran, 2002). Marshall and Rossman (1989:79) define observation as "the systematic description of events, behaviors, and artifacts in the social setting chosen for study".

Observations enable the researcher to describe existing situations using the five senses, providing a "written photograph" of the situation under study. Focus groups are also a good addition to qualitative data collection methods used in this study, as the researcher can obtain diverse opinions from participants on a particular social issue (land reform) (Babbie and Mouton, 1998). This chapter will also provide: a brief description of the respondents that were involved with this study; a brief description of the sampling method that was used; outline the challenges in the research; and lastly reflect on the ethical considerations of this study.

3.3. SAMPLING

The researcher utilized a purposive sampling method to identify and select the research participants. Purposive sampling (also known as judgment, selective or subjective sampling) is a sampling technique in which the researcher relies on his or her own judgement when choosing members of the population to participate in the study (Crossman, 2019). Purposive sampling is a non-probability sampling method which occurs when elements selected for the sample are chosen by the judgment of the researcher (Palinkas, 2015). Researchers often believe that they can obtain a representative sample by using a sound judgment, which will result in saving time and money. There are different types of sampling. These include, maximum variation/ heterogeneous purposive sample, homogeneous purposive sample, typical case sampling, extreme/ deviant sampling, critical case sampling, total population sampling and expert sampling. For this study, ten land beneficiaries and one government official (from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform) based in the Makana Municipal District were participants. Some of these beneficiaries were beneficiaries of land redistribution and some from the land restitution claim. Gatekeepers play an important role in ensuring that researchers gain access to potential participants and sites for the research.

Positive influences of the gatekeepers can be valuable to the research process by facilitating the smooth running of research activity to completion. For this research, the gatekeeper is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in Grahamstown. The researcher approached this department to gain access to the land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District and an extension officer who is directly responsible for land reform projects in the region. The researcher explained the nature and objectives of the research and was, subsequently, granted access to the data base of the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries were randomly selected from the data base of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in Grahamstown. The researcher called the beneficiaries and the participants were also told about the voluntary nature of this study, and they subsequently gave their consent to be interviewed. The department also allowed the researcher to interview one of their staff, an extension officer directly responsible for overseeing the land reform projects in the region. A list with the names of the land reform beneficiaries and the extension offer, with some demographic information is provided for below. Pseudonyms were used to protect the identity of the participants. When approached, the researcher explained the nature and objective of the study. The participants were yet again reminded about the voluntary nature of this study, and they subsequently gave their consent to be interviewed on the day of the interviews.

TABLE 1: LIST OF BENEFICIARIES

Name	Age	Race	Number of years since the land was received
Mr Luyolo	63	African	23
Ms Thabisa	56	African	23
Mr Akhona	55	African	23
Mr Luke	n/a	African	23
Mr Twaba	n/a	African	23
Mr Mzisele	62	African	19
Mr Khanyo	77	African	9
Ms nobubele	28	African	did not disclose
Ms thami	25	African	did not disclose
Mr zan	69	African	23

TABLE 2: EXTENSION OFFICER

Name	Interview date	Age	Race
Mr Siphoh	15 November	n/a	African

3.4. INTERVIEWS WITH LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES

Ten land reform beneficiaries (six are land restitution beneficiaries and four are redistribution beneficiaries) in the Makana Municipal region were interviewed. The land restitution beneficiaries were selected from the Salem restitution claim, while the land redistribution beneficiaries were selected from farms within Grahamstown who launched redistribution claims. The beneficiaries were interviewed where they felt most comfortable, that is, in their homes. The interviews were conducted after working hours and whenever the participants were available. The interviews were 30 minutes to an hour depending on the responses of the participants. The interviews were recorded, and the participants were informed about this. Additionally, the interviews were in the language that the research participants were most comfortable, that is, English, isiXhosa, and Afrikaans (the dominant languages in Eastern Cape). The interviews were recorded, and the research participants gave their consent to this.

3.5. INTERVIEW WITH THE EXTENSION OFFICER

An extension officer from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in the Makana Municipal region was interviewed at the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform in the Makana Municipal region. The interview was conducted during working hours. The interview lasted an hour and was recorded, with the permission of the participant. Additionally, the interview was conducted in English and IsiZulu, the languages that the research participant was most comfortable.

3.6. CHALLENGES OF THE RESEARCH

Gaining access to the research participants turned out to be a challenge. Initially the research site for this study was supposed to be at Gallawater farm, located near Whittlesea in the Enoch Mgijima Municipality. However, this research site was changed to the Makana Municipal District.

This change came about because of unforeseen circumstances (i.e. financial and time constraints). However, the research objectives remain, and this did not affect the original project, as the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform made the access to the research participants easier. The research participants did not have a problem with divulging information about their experiences as land beneficiaries.

3.7. ETHICS

All participants were given a consent form to sign and give permission to be interviewed. The researcher also informed the participants that they did not need to answer the questions that they were uncomfortable with. The researcher followed the Rhodes University ethical procedures in the pursuing respondents for the study. This was guaranteed by using pseudonyms for all participants. In other words, privacy, anonymity and confidentiality of the data was of priority.

3.8. CONCLUSION

This chapter described the methods that were used for this study. These methods were used to address the research question. All three qualitative data collection methods which were referred to were used to get a full understanding of the lived experiences of the beneficiaries. The next chapter provides an in-depth discussion of the findings obtained through the research methods outlined in this chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

CASE STUDY OF THE EXPERIENCES OF LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL DISTRICT

4.1. INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the literature review, the South African land reform programme is riddled with evident shortcomings, especially when it comes to post-settlement support. This chapter analyses the experiences of ten land reform beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. Six of the ten beneficiaries fall under the land restitution programme, whilst the remaining four fall under the land redistribution programme. To get a full understanding of the lived experiences of the beneficiaries, the following themes were interrogated: their historical backgrounds; the nature and content of their land reform contracts; their experiences with post-settlement support from the government; the group dynamics amongst the beneficiaries; the quality of the land and the state of public services where the land is located; how the beneficiaries use the land; their living conditions and livelihood strategies. In addition to the beneficiaries' experience of land reform, an extension officer from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (in Makhanda) was interviewed. This interview was conducted to obtain the governments perspective on the land reform programme. This chapter, therefore, provides an in-depth analysis and discussion of the findings from the interviews that were conducted with the beneficiaries and the extension officer (from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform) in the Makana Municipal District. The findings are analysed within the context of Sustainable Livelihoods Framework and core themes of land reform that were outlined in the literature review.

4.2. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUNDS OF THE LAND BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION

Pre-1994, legislation in South Africa was passed to create unequal land-ownership patterns on the base of race. The government of the time used legislation and various other methods to dispossess African people from their land and reduce them to a controlled peasant serving class. The beneficiaries from Salem gave their personal historic account of land dispossession in the region. In their discussion, they referenced an author from Rhodes University, who wrote a book about how people from Salem were dispossessed their land by white settlers. According to these beneficiaries, Salem was originally known as “Ityilarha”, but was renamed by the missionaries who settled on the land. The beneficiaries explained that the settlement of missionaries on the land was met with great resistance by the local chiefs and population. Nonetheless, an agreement was reached, as the missionaries offered to assist the locals with farming equipment and other implements.

The agreement was that they would conduct their missionary duties, whilst helping the local population with agricultural activities. Over time, this arrangement changed however, as the missionaries together with government (of the time) gradually dispossessed the locals, from the good agricultural land, and reduced them to farm labourers. This history of dispossession, which is a common story throughout Southern Africa, was also echoed by other beneficiaries who were interviewed. Although, some do not remember the actual events, however, they have oral knowledge from their grandparents of how their ancestors were removed from their land and made to work on the farms by white settlers. According to the sustainable livelihoods framework, natural capital (or land) is an important asset (amongst others) to securing livelihoods in a sustainable way.

Within the African context, land and livestock are also perceived as a source of potential wealth. Research shows that prior to colonialism, African people used their land successfully. The land took care of their communities and sustained them for centuries. Even with the invasion of white settlers, black people still worked their land and kept livestock so successfully that the government of the time, instituted various legislation to eliminate this competition. An example of this, is that of sharecropping, where the Africans were forced to offer labour on the farms in order to keep their livestock and do some farming. This proved too much for the white settlers, as the Africans still managed to succeed, hence the subsequent implementation of more legislature (such as The

Natives Land Act of 1913) to remove Africans from good land. Land, therefore, can be a great source of wealth for people, especially when combined with other forms of capital. White settlers, through trial and error, and the assistance from the government of the time, were able to make the most of the natural capital at their disposal, and as a result, have secured wealth for generations. This is an important point to note, as it indicates that land alone is not enough to secure livelihoods, but it required a combination of other inputs in order to make it productive and profitable. The beneficiaries expressed that they did not have real access to decent housing and infrastructure while growing up. Most of them explained that they lived in mud houses that were owned by the white farmers. They also explained that these house were very small, and were of a poor quality. Farm worker houses were not big enough to accommodate large families, and they had no alternative form of accommodation. For example, one of the beneficiaries stated that while growing up he used to reside in a one room house. This room accommodated 5 of his family members. Mr Akhona noted that:

“My father used to live at his father-in-law’s house. We all used to live together. Then eventually we moved to this place called [Ikwakheni]. We used to stay in a one room and we were 6.”

The results of land dispossession were tremendous on the African people, as many resorted to farm labour, whilst others migrated to urban areas in the Eastern Cape (and other provinces) in search for better opportunities. During colonialism and apartheid, African people were relegated to work on mines, farms and other industries as blue-collar and low wage workers. They did not have any labour rights and worked for meagre wages. The beneficiaries in the study all shared similar socioeconomic backgrounds. Their parents had low levels of formal education, many not even reaching the seventh grade. Their parent’s experiences with low education is not unique, as the colonial and apartheid systems were structured along racial lines and black people were not allowed to progress and compete with white people. The Bantu education system promoted the unequal distribution of resources (along racial lines) within the education sector. Black people were offered sub-standard education, compared to their white counterparts. The beneficiaries indicated that their parents attended schools on farms, or in the local townships in the nearest town, which is Makhanda. The beneficiaries indicated that Bantu Education, hindered their access to quality education. Mr Zan and Mr Mziseli echoed these sentiments about the apartheid regime. Mr Zan noted that:

“Amongst other things we were not expected to be educated like today. White people expected a black person to have a minimum education. For as long as you could write a letter that was enough for them. You were than expected to work. Back in those days people milked cows. We walked in fields. Our education was sabotaged because of these expectations. Farming was of importance and our destiny or even bad-luck was to work for a white person.”

Limited educational opportunities led to limited job opportunities, and that is why masses of black people found themselves in low wage work. When examining the notion of land dispossession, one can clearly see how African people transform from land owners into peasants in their own land. The beneficiaries indicated that, before white settlers invaded their land, their grandparents kept livestock and planted a myriad of plants that sustained their families and the communities for a long term. As the literature indicates, prior to colonialism, African people had diverse forms of economic activities to secure their livelihoods. Some were pastoralists, whilst some were nomadic moving from one area to another with their livestock and others planted diverse crops for their survival. This is not a distorted nostalgic account of history, but a highlight of the economic activities that African people applied for centuries before white settlers reached African shores.

This is also not to say there were no wars, and tensions amongst African people, however, the point here, is to show that they had ownership of land and secured their livelihoods using diverse agro-centric methods. The arrival of white settlers on African land signaled a long-term change in the lives of the local populations and their descendants. As the beneficiaries noted, that their parents inherited a cycle of rural poverty and landlessness and this was passed down to them. The beneficiaries indicated that their parents mostly struggled to meet ends meet and had to work on the local farms just to survive. Life on the farm was not easy, as their parent’s wages were very low and they had no other alternatives, as they had low levels of education. Similar to their parents, the beneficiaries mostly attended farms or schools in the local township schools in Makhanda.

When asked about their highest level of education, the beneficiaries shared similar experiences as their parents, as many of them did not reach the twelfth grade. A slight change from their parents, is that they were able to progress from primary education into high school, however, they did not complete their secondary education. Reasons cited for this, were the poor quality of the schools in the townships and lack of finances to continue with education. Many of the beneficiaries indicated that they dropped out of high school to contribute to their family’s economic livelihoods.

Research shows that rural populations in South Africa are plagued by landlessness, poverty and unemployment. The beneficiaries experience is no different, as it showed that being born into a cycle of rural poverty, with limited quality educational opportunities, many people dropped out of school to search for employment so that they could take care of their families. One of the beneficiaries discussed that they were often expected to share their food and other essentials with their siblings. Ms Thabisa explained:

“We shared the same blanket while growing up. We ate together, using the same plate and spoon. What I mean is that things were difficult back then, but it made us bond. We care for each other. Our grandparents were struggling, and we grew up as a united family.”

Another beneficiary expressed that his father’s income was not enough to support the whole family and in most instances the family did purchase things that were brand new.

Mr Akhona indicated:

“We were poor and struggling. My father used to earn R12. He could not afford to buy for all his children at once. For example, if he bought me shoes this month, he would have to buy my brother pants the next month. But eventually he would buy for all of us.”

This is important, when thinking about land reform, as the provision of land is not sufficient, without mechanisms in place to address the problem of low education and limited skills. Human capital encompasses the abilities, experience, work skills and the good health that, when combined, allow populations to engage with different livelihood strategies and reach their own objectives. At the household level, human capital is a factor which determines the quantity and quality of the available workforce. This varies according to size of family unit, level of education, leadership ability, health status, and so on. Human capital is an essential part of securing livelihoods. White commercial farmers mostly attended university and agricultural colleges to gain knowledge and skills, whilst those without an education usually worked with their parents and learnt how to run a farm from a young age. African people, on the other hand, even those whose parents work on farms, know only the labour aspect of farming, and not the management and marketing side of it. All the beneficiaries had a bit of farming experience. This can be attributed to the fact that during the pre-colonial period, African indigenous groups had plentiful of land with stock farming, agriculture and herding being used as their main economic activities.

Additionally, many of the beneficiaries are male, therefore farming was a skill that they had acquired from a very young age because of being expected to work in the fields and farms. Another reason that made them acquire this skill was because it was believed that young boys should become cattle-herders, since this was considered an important duty.

Mr Luyolo noted that:

“On Saturdays, my grandfather would take us to town for ploughing. He found a place in town”

Another example is that of Mr Luke (2019), who said:

“I was never really educated. I grew up in a home that owned cattle and farming was in the family.”

This background is important, when analysing the experiences of land reform beneficiaries in South Africa. Education and training is important to make a success of most businesses, and the lack of either can be a huge hindrance to being successful. Financial Capital is also an important part of starting and running a business, and without money it is difficult to make a success of a business. The beneficiaries did not inherit land or money from their parents and so, coming into land reform projects, this poses a serious challenge to making a success of their land. With a low educational background, the beneficiaries also shared similar employment histories, as they were employed in low wage employment. Many of the beneficiaries worked on local farms, whilst others worked in Makhanda to earn a living.

A few beneficiaries noted that they had no employment history, prior to the land reform, and that they were survived on remittances from family members. It is clear, from their responses, that the employment history, prior to receiving the land, the beneficiaries worked in low wage jobs. This employment history is also important when analysing the experiences of land reform beneficiaries. Management experience is an asset when running any kind of business, as one is able to understand how the various segments of a business connect in order to make a profit. Having limited management experience, can prove to be a stumbling block to making a success of a business. Some of the beneficiaries worked as foreman on the farms, however, this is different from managing an entire operation.

Mr Mziseli stated:

“I grew up in these farms at the main flats...I worked for Mr Vrum while staying here. I was a foreman at that farm for many years. I eventually went on retirement in 2017.”

Mr Twaba also noted:

“I relocated to the Natal. In Natal I worked for two years and became the foreman at the mine.”

This is not to say that people without management experience do not make a success of their business, however, having limited management experience can be a barrier. From the above information, it is clear that the land beneficiaries share similar historical backgrounds. Their forefathers were dispossessed by white settlers from their land and were reduced to peasant status, entrapped in a cycle of poverty with limited educational, training and employment opportunities. These limitations should be considered when discussing land reform in South Africa, as many beneficiaries who receive land share similar backgrounds. This also shows that from the onset, they need various forms of assistance in areas that they are lacking, as highlighted above.

4.3. QUALITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION

The first democratically elected government introduced a programme to promote freedom, quality of life and sustainable livelihoods. This programme became known as the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP). The RDP “is a policy framework for integrated and coherent socio-economic progress” (RDP, 1994: 7). This means that the primary objective of the programme is to remove the results of apartheid by promoting a democratic society through the distribution of resources to all citizens. Upon the site visit, it was evident that the areas where the land reform beneficiaries were residing lacked even the most basic public services, such as, roads, electricity (in some areas), quality housing, schools, water supply, police stations, and health infrastructure and municipal services such as toilets, and removal of trash. In some instances, it was obvious that the people were using illegal electricity connections, because of the lack of infrastructure development. According to the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework, ‘physical capital’ comprises the basic infrastructure and producer goods needed to support livelihoods. The infrastructure looks at changes in the environment which affect communication and access to basic services.

Public services are traditionally offered by the government or an official body in order to benefit all the people in a particular society or community. Municipalities render services to meet the basic needs of citizens. Such services include water supply, sewage collection, electricity supply, municipal health services, road and storm water drainage, street lighting and municipal parks and recreation. Public services are meant to benefit all people in a society, however, this is far from the reality for land beneficiaries in the Makana Municipal District. The beneficiaries indicated that basic public services are hard to come by, as they struggle to access various services such as: clean water, properly functioning sewage system, and consistent supply of electricity. The beneficiaries also indicated that they do not have access to services such as clinics (hospitals), schools, police station and other government services that are easily available in the urban areas.

The closest area which has these public services is Makhanda. However, even the quality of services in Makhanda have come under close media scrutiny for being subpar. On the 14th January 2020, the Makhanda High Court ordered the Makana municipality to be dissolved and placed under administration for violating its constitutional mandate by failing to provide basic services to the community. The Makana municipality is undeniably failing to comply with its constitutional duties. Power blackouts and failures to supply water, often for days at a time, are routine. This is (allegedly) due to corrupt management of water and a failure to respond to the effects of climate change. The water is not actually safe to drink because there are frequent instances of Escherichia (E. coli) in the water supply because of poor management of the sewage systems. The infrastructure of existing sewers is dilapidated, and many residents are now forced to live surrounded by raw sewage.

Rampant corruption was exposed in detail by the Kabuso report in 2015. The unemployment rate is more than 70%. Livestock are left to roam the city freely, and, much like in other small South African towns, the roads are riddled with potholes that increase in size and are never attended to. The town has the nickname, "The Pothole". Poor service delivery is not unique to Makhanda. "Constitutionally, South Africa has one of the most advanced local government systems anywhere in the world". Yet service delivery challenges remain apparent. Therefore, despite the existence of a highly progressive constitution, laws and electoral democracy, violent social movement discontent has been rising to the extent that some analysts have labelled South Africa as the

“protest capital of the world”. Service delivery protests continue unabated and the government attempts to improve service delivery have not been sufficient to address the frustration and anger of poor people in South Africa. Many of the beneficiaries are confused by the fact that the government is willing to provide land, yet fail to provide the most basic public services which are essential for human survival, let alone make a profitable success of the land. One of the beneficiaries argued that they approached their local councilor for assistance concerning electricity and water to no avail. Additionally, all the beneficiaries feel like they are not taken seriously by the government, because the promise of service delivery has been made numerous times, yet there are no positive outcomes. Notably, most of the beneficiaries seem to share similar experiences with regards to service delivery and lack of infrastructure and post-settlement support from the government.

The beneficiaries also mentioned that there is a clear need for infrastructure development such as safe housing, access to adequate water and sanitation, clean and affordable energy, as well as healthcare and schools. The beneficiaries explained that many of the schools were closed, because it was found that there a few learners and one teacher is expected to teach more than two grades each. As a result of this, children attend school in local townships in Makhanda, where those schools are confronted with resource and teacher shortages. Another beneficiary said that for services such as hospitals and police stations they usually call Makhanda and 7 Fountains. Both these areas are approximately 20KM away from Salem. The beneficiaries alluded that they need public services in the area to support their livelihoods and the lack of infrastructure impedes on their success. Affordability and access to road and transport; safe housing and buildings; access to adequate water and sanitation; clean and affordable energy; and access to information and communication are crucial for sustainable livelihoods. However, these are resources that the land beneficiaries lack.

Responding to a question about the quality of public services, Mr Luyolo, stated the following:

“We have pit toilets. We build our own houses. We need to burn our own rubbish. We have no running water. The municipality sometimes brings water. We have a local JoJo tank.”

Ms Thabisa, also added that:

“Most schools were closed even though one remained. The school ends in grade 7. There are scholar transports arranged by the government for learners to go and school in Grahamstown. We do not have a local clinic or hospital. We have a mobile clinic that comes to the farm on certain dates every month.”

The land reform beneficiaries complained about the lack of quality water to help them with basic farming activities, such as tending to their livestock and watering their gardens and plots of land. Poor access to quality water is a huge barrier to farming on a whole, and this is no different for land reform beneficiaries. Electricity was another issue that was evident in this study, as the beneficiaries noted that they tended to have running power cuts. One beneficiary complained that he did not have any electricity at all, and this caused him huge problems with trying to make any success with the land. Based on these responses, the most desired service that the beneficiaries seem to long for, is the access to water.

Expressing her frustration about the water situation, Ms Thami stated the following:

“Iyhu, amanzi afumaneka ndzima” (It is not easy to find water). The municipality used to bring us water, but it has been about a year since this happened. We have JOJO tanks, so we can get water when it rains. These tanks are empty now.”

Another beneficiary, Mr Mziseli, echoed similar sentiments about the water crisis:

“There is a borehole here, but it was vandalized by children. I then spoke to Mr Vrum about this...in 2000 the tap used to work, and water was received from an Eskom transformer.”

The beneficiaries also argued that they never received on-farm infrastructure grants, as such they have been unable to afford basic infrastructure, operational inputs and other resources that may be needed in agricultural projects. It can be suggested that because of this, they have had to be dependent on the government for post-settlement support. For example, the beneficiaries said that they could not afford to buy tractors, seeds, fertilizers, feeds and dips. This is what one of the beneficiaries, Mr Mziseli, said:

“The government should assist me with getting a tractor. I wish to have something similar to that farm belonging to Mr Vrum. Not forgetting water.”

Another, Ms Nobubele stated:

“We are reliant on the government to give us ‘dip’...we are currently low on that now.”

This means that without regular inflows of money, the beneficiaries cannot achieve their livelihood objectives or adopt different livelihood strategies. It is also important to note that, because of the lack of infrastructure development (physical capital) and regular inflows of money (financial capital), the beneficiaries are constrained from making a success of the land. In other words, they are unable to work the land without the different forms of capitals. Therefore, they are unable to pursue different livelihood strategies, such as informal trading of goods and services to escape poverty. The lack of public services is a serious stumbling block for land beneficiaries. The lack of quality public services, almost reduces the agricultural activities pursued by beneficiaries to a subsistence level. Not having access to quality public services affects the quality of life of the families of the beneficiaries.

In this study, it was evident that some beneficiaries were living in Makhanda and had some family members taking care of the land for them. The reason they gave for this, was that, the lack of adequate services in the area forces them to live in town, whilst maintaining some form of substance in the land. As stated earlier, a lot of the beneficiaries lives on farms and attended farms schools, which impeded their progress and now they feel that this lack of access to services keeps them in a trap of poverty. Against this backdrop, it is clear that the issue of poor service delivery has a causal impact on the livelihood strategies of the land reform beneficiaries in Makana Municipal District. In addition to this, Makana is experiencing a water crisis and access to good quality water has a great impact on the agricultural sector as a whole.

Big commercial farmers have struggled to remain afloat in the current drought context. Smaller farmers are clearly in an even worse position, as they do not have access to basic services and financial capital to remain afloat. Poor service delivery by the government has a negative impact on the strategies of land beneficiaries, and this needs to be taken into consideration, when examining the success of land reform in South Africa. Having highlighted the poor socio-economic backgrounds of the land reform beneficiaries, poor service delivery only makes the situation worse. The question that should be raised, is how the government expects land reform beneficiaries who have such backgrounds to succeed when public services are not provided to them.

Numerous participatory evaluations of poverty have concluded that a lack of certain kinds of infrastructure represents a core variant of poverty. Without adequate access to services such as water or energy, human health deteriorates with the result that long periods will be spent carrying out unproductive activities such as collecting water or wood for fuel. The opportunity costs associated with sub-standard infrastructure, can likewise impede education, access to medical assistance or income generation. Moreover, service delivery protest includes many other concerns such lack of jobs, poverty and high levels of inequality. Context is very important when analysing the success of land reform delivery in South Africa. There are studies that have focused on the failure of land reform, however, these studies tend to put the blame on the beneficiaries, instead of highlighting the context in which the land transfer takes place. Successful farmers, have access to various forms of capital and hardly struggle with issues such as service delivery. Successful land reform needs a greater focus on the contextual factors and quality of public services to create an atmosphere where the beneficiaries can make a success of the land.

4.4. LAND TRANSFER, UTILIZATION AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION

The transfer of land is a central component of land reform. As indicated in the literature, land reform in South Africa was established to address the injustice of land displacement that took place during colonialism. The South African land reform programme was established to address rural development and ultimately promote sustainable livelihoods for land reform beneficiaries. Therefore, when analyzing the land reform programme, it is important to examine the economic contribution that land contributes to the livelihoods of land reform beneficiaries. As the sustainable livelihoods framework notes, land forms part of natural capital.

Natural capital is the term used to describe the stocks of natural resources from which further resources and services can be developed which may prove useful to livelihoods. A broad variety of resources fall within this category: Land and soils; Food Production; Woods; Marine and forest resources; Water; Air quality; Protection from erosion; Waste disposal; Storm protection; Water supply; Carbon storage and sequestration. Land quality is very important when discussing land reform, as it determines the type of agricultural activities that can be pursued on it. When asked about the land quality, all the beneficiaries thought that their land was of a good quality and had great commercial potential.

Nevertheless, before expanding on the various ways that the beneficiaries have used the land, it is important to start with the actual transfers of the land. As stated earlier in the thesis, the beneficiaries consisted of two groups, that is, the land redistribution and restitution beneficiaries. The land redistribution group had a smoother land transfer process, as they indicated that they obtained land as a group and were given title deeds over the land. The land restitution group experienced a few stumbling blocks with regards with the land transfer. The beneficiaries in Salem experienced the biggest struggle to receive their land. The Salem Community claims that their ancestors resided on that before 1811. They also contend that they had unlimited indigenous ownership rights in the Commonage. The landowners' predecessors were granted the Commonage in the 1800s by two British colonial governors, Sir Benjamin D'Urban and Sir Henry Pottinger. Up until 1940, land was used communally by settlers.

In 1940, the Grahamstown Supreme Court granted the request to have the land combined and separated into distinct parts allowing for individual ownership (Politicsweb, 2017). For the Community, this division marked the beginning of their dispossession. The archival evidence shows that there were approximately 500 black people living on the Commonage in 1941. The Community now comprises 378 households who claim descent from that group. The Community argues that it constituted an independent community that lived on the land according to its own rules and customs. The Community was not consulted nor considered by the landowners or the Grahamstown Supreme Court when it ordered the Commonage be divided in 1940. The Land Claims Commission, Eastern Cape (Commission), investigated the claim and, in 2010, recommended restitution of the land to the Community.

Five properties were transferred when the landowners reached a settlement with the Community. Failing to reach settlement with the other land owners, the Commission referred the dispute to the Land Claims Court (LCC). The LCC considered whether the Community had a valid claim to the Commonage under the Restitution Act. The Court did not consider the feasibility of restoring the land to the Community, or whether any alternative remedy was appropriate. These issues were not an issue on appeal. The LCC held that the Restitution Act's threshold for determining whether a community exists is "deliberately low". It accepted that, there was a group of people with shared rules and practices that had communal rights in land over the Commonage. It held that the Grahamstown Supreme Court order in 1940 had dispossessed the Community of its rights.

It therefore granted a declaratory order in favour of the Community. The landowners, thereafter, appealed to the SCA on the basis, among others, that the claimed land was unoccupied when it was awarded to the landowners' predecessors in the 1800s. Any subsequent residents on the Commonage were living under the authority or with the permission of the landowners and neither had nor could have acquired independent rights under the Restitution Act. The Court dismissed the landowners' appeal by a majority of four judges to one and upheld the decision of the LCC. In the Constitutional Court, the landowners argued that the LCC's and SCA's approach taken in the courts amount to hearsay and historical expert evidence was incorrect. They argued that there was no reliable evidence of a Community possessing rights in the Commonage, or being dispossessed, and that any person living on the Commonage was an employee whose rights in the land were determined by the landowners and Salem's Village Management Board.

The Salem Community and the Commission argued that the evidence, properly approached, established both that there was a community and that it was dispossessed of rights in the land. The Association for Rural Advancement, which was admitted as a friend of the Court, presented an argument on the correct interpretation of historical and expert evidence in land claims, and on the doctrine of 'inter-temporality' – a doctrine that holds that the law which is used to determine whether rights existed historically should be present-day law, and not the law as it existed at the time. In a unanimous judgment penned by Cameron J, in which Zondo DCJ, Froneman J, Jafta J, Kathree-Setiloane AJ, Kollapen AJ, Madlanga J, Mhlantla J, Theron J and Zondi AJ concur, the Constitutional Court weighed the historical evidence in the light of the Restitution Act.

It considered the approach to historical evidence, both documentary and oral, in land claims and the role of experts in interpreting and presenting conclusions on such evidence. In this case, where the parties' experts presented diametrically opposing views, the Court had to consider that understanding history is a value-laden task that requires scrupulous care in acknowledging and taking responsibility for one's own ideological positioning. The Court assessed the expert evidence using ordinary rules applicable to the assessment of expert evidence, guided by the Restitution Act's restorative principles of historical justice. Amongst other findings that were made by the Court, there was evidence to demonstrate that from the periods of 1878 and 1941, a Community of African people resided in the Salem Commange (Politicsweb, 2017). However, both the Community and Commission could not substantially prove that the same community had resided

on the land before 1811. The Court also found that the Community could prove that their ancestors resided on the land; used the land for agriculture; traditional purposes; firewood and burial rights. Another Court finding was that there was evidence indicating that settlers and their descendants had rights to the land for approximately a century (Politicsweb, 2017). The Court held that the division of the Commonage was the beginning of dispossession since the Community had not been consulted during the process. Based on this reasoning, the Court upheld the order of the Supreme Court of Appeal, but stated that the LCC would be responsible for the appropriate remedy regarding the rights to the land of the landowners (Politicsweb, 2017). The two groups of beneficiaries interviewed, however, now have land in their possession and the manner in which they are using it, requires careful consideration.

From the onset, the clear common thread amongst the beneficiaries is that they are all part of groups that received land. They are not individual land owners, and this has brought with it a number of challenges. One of the stand out challenges experienced by beneficiaries, is negative group dynamics that have resulted in disunity and disharmony. The beneficiaries indicated that from the beginning, the group members had different goals with the land. Some group members had big objectives for the land, in terms making a commercial success of it, whilst others within their groups were content with living there or just having the idea of owning land. This division of interests, has led to a break-down of communication amongst the groups. It has polarized the groups according to their different interests and this has resulted in low productivity in the usage of the land.

The beneficiaries indicated that having a huge group of people own a piece of land, is perhaps not the best idea, as the lack of cohesiveness within groups, remains a huge barrier to progress and dedication to the land. In the context of sustainable livelihoods, 'social capital' refers to the social resources which individuals rely on in order to achieve certain objectives relating to their livelihoods. These may include: Networks and connections, be these vertical (hierarchical) or horizontal (between individuals with common interests). The guiding criteria for these is that they should increase the confidence and abilities of populations to work as a group and improve their access to institutions with greater scope for action. These groups include national or civil groups; Participation in more formal groups, which tends to imply adherence to certain rules, norms and sanctions of either mutual or common consent; relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchanges

that facilitate co-operation, reduce transaction costs and safety nets amongst the poor. Social capital is effective when there is a common vision amongst a group of people to succeed. In this case, the beneficiaries noted that recipients tended to have different visions for the land and some preferred to work in isolation and use the land for individual livestock grazing or planting small gardens for themselves and so on. This state of affairs results in disunity and distrust amongst the group, thus the low productivity on the land. These group dynamics, however, cannot be divorced from the context in which the people received the land. As stated earlier, the group of individuals receive land are from a particular background, and also reside in areas with poor service delivery. It is possible that this context can demotivate people from wanting to make use of the land in a productive manner.

Despite the challenge of group dynamics, some of the beneficiaries in this study were using the land in productive ways. The clear commonality amongst the beneficiaries, is that they had dual purposes for the land, that is, both subsistence and commercial. The subsistence part of it, is perhaps the bigger objective for the beneficiaries, as the lack of certain forms of capital limits their ability to make sustained commercial success of their land. Those who utilized the land for commercial purposes, did so in an irregular and highly informal manner. They conducted their farming activities as individuals and used their own resources to farm. The beneficiaries who used land for commercial purposes, did so because they had a little bit more financial capital than others. They obtained this 'financial capital' through various means and were able to sell their products through the informal markets in Makhanda.

What is evident in this case, is the fact that, land beneficiaries mostly use the land for subsistence purposes. The reason for this is not a secret, as many of the beneficiaries come from a cycle of poverty, that is, limited education and training, no financial capital and poor service delivery in the area. This means that the land reform programme is evidently lacking an element of addressing the contextual deficiencies and backlogs that the land reform beneficiaries find themselves in. This is not to say that the government does not provide any form of assistance after transferring land to beneficiaries. The beneficiaries noted that they received various forms of support from the government, based on their unique needs. The clear problem with this support from the government, is that, it is largely inconsistent and not transparent to the beneficiaries. The beneficiaries complained that they had problems with the Department of Rural Development and

Land Reform, because they felt that they were not being heard sometimes. They also explained that the assistance from the government is not enough, as they are unable to make a commercial success of the land. Entrepreneurship is an important part of making a success of any business, however, even the most successful entrepreneur's need assistance, in order to get going. This brings back the notion of context, when analyzing land reform. The backgrounds of the beneficiaries, together with poor service delivery and limited post-settlement support (from the government) are an evident barrier to successful farming. Many of the beneficiaries feel that they were only given land and a bit of support, but not the type of support they need. During the colonial and apartheid era, white commercial farmers received support from the state, as the agricultural sector was highly regulated and centralized. White commercial agriculture was heavily supported by the government through: research and development, infrastructure, extension services, direct subsidies for conservation works and debt relief, and the settlement of white commercial farmers.

In response to this investment, commercial sector agricultural output gradually started to grow, assisted by guaranteed markets and guaranteed prices for most farm commodities. The issue of guaranteed markets, was a result of centralized marketing boards and co-operatives (co-ops). Co-ops are defined as an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly-owned and democratically controlled enterprise. Co-ops are seen to be preferable over traditional profit-driven forms of enterprise as they would ideally increase the bargaining power of participants, foster community participation and development, offer stability through risk sharing and offer greater legal protection for members. State support for agricultural co-ops before the fall of apartheid was substantial.

This resulted in agricultural co-ops making up more than 70% of co-ops. What is apparent here, is that during colonialism and apartheid era, the white farmers were assisted in a coordinated and substantive manner. In this study, it is clear that land beneficiaries are not receiving nearly the amount of help that they require to make an economic success of their farms. This is not to say that all the beneficiaries want to be big commercial farmers, however, even those who want to purpose small scale farming, still need consistent, coordinated and sustainable support from the government. The beneficiaries are not receiving the type of support that white commercial farmers received prior to 1994. The beneficiaries, come into the land with low education, low skills, poor service delivery and limited post-settlement support.

Another element that works against the beneficiaries is the lack of coordinated value chain participation and access to markets. A value chain is a business model that describes the full range of activities needed to create a product or service. For companies that produce goods, a value chain comprises the steps that involve bringing a product from conception to distribution, and everything in between- such as procuring raw materials, manufacturing functions, and marketing activities. As stated above, the apartheid government established a coordinated system for the commercial farmers, both small and large scale. That is why today, a lot of white commercial farmers are part of established agro-value chains with guaranteed long-standing partners, markets and buyers. The beneficiaries are clearly not part of any coordinated agro-value chains. They play the role of producer, transporter, and seller. White commercial agriculture was also assisted by the availability of cheap Black labour.

Today, this is still the same, as farm workers are still one of the lowest paid workers in the country. This is not to justify the use of cheap labour, but this shows how the white commercial farmers were really helped by the government to ensure their success of farming. The beneficiaries cannot afford to formally employ people, and most of them work for themselves, whilst other are helped by their family members. State support for land beneficiaries seems very hap-hazard and there is no clear transparency on to how it is rolled out. For example, the beneficiaries, indicated that they need to beg for support from the state, and when they received it, it is small increments and uncoordinated. Some of the beneficiaries explained that they were given some livestock to get them started, but were not given anything else to ensure that they made a success of their livestock.

Going back to the issue of group dynamics, one beneficiary noted that some members in their group sold the livestock, whilst others slaughtered them. This shows the importance of state involvement and regulations when it comes to land reform. There seems to be a dysfunction in the way that the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform rolls out their land reform and post-settlement support. The government is not considering the special background that the beneficiaries come from, and therefore need extra assistance to make some kind of success of their land, whether small or large scale. The government official that was interviewed for this study was an Agricultural Technician, normally referred to as an Extension Officer. An Extension Officer helps farmers and agriculturists with different duties relating to agriculture. The official stated that, he is involved in the planning of projects, implementation, monitoring, and training to make others

realize the changes in agriculture and marketing of projects. The extension officer, is directly involved with the land reform projects that studied in this study. The conversation with the extension officer, was centered around the land reform programme, more specifically the post-settlement support. This was important, in order to get a sense of how government views the projects, as opposed to the land beneficiaries. The Extension Officer interviewed is responsible for both Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) and Pro-active Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) grant projects. Furthermore, he clarified that he is only involved once land has been acquired and the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) in Port Elizabeth is responsible for the process of land acquisition. He is also responsible for: assessing infrastructure, performing assessments, and addressing all challenges that the land reform beneficiaries may be having in relation to infrastructure.

Moreover, the extension officer contended that the LRAD grants are not being offered anymore, because the grant would need a group of people before being approved, since a budget was attached to the price of land. Similar to what was stated by the beneficiaries, the extension officer argues that, consequently, people with different visions were grouped together and many challenges, or rather group dynamics are evident with these groups. This is what Mr Siphso had to say about the challenges confronting LRAD beneficiaries:

“In some instances, we become some sort of social-workers because we have to deal with social conflicts within communities. There are challenges such as in-fights. Remember people have different interests and visions. Others are interested in working while others are not. However, everyone expects to benefit from the returns of the land since they are beneficiaries. These challenges spoil the whole thing...”

The claim made by the extension officer is that some beneficiaries could not or did not have any interest in dedicating their own resources to the farms. Consequently, this causes conflicts amongst beneficiaries and the progress of the land is usually affected. Accordingly, land has been used by a small number of families which were registered on the grant application, or land became too overcrowded and thus unsustainable. Moreover, because of these group conflicts when the extension officer visits the farms he is expected to intervene and as a result the progress of post-settlement support is decelerated. As expressed by Mr Siphso:

“The main issue is grouping people with different interests together, and this will stall the process of productivity. Generally, only a few are interested in agricultural activities. It starts with passion and commitment. You need to give yourself time. There will be less productivity if only a few are interested. For example, at Sunny-Side only one person is active out of 26 families. And there are 3 others who are active. Some of them form part of the list of beneficiaries and do not reside on the farm. They cannot reach an agreement to have a structured vision and this compromises productivity.”

The response given by the extension officer suggests that the land beneficiaries lack in social capital. Simply put, the beneficiaries cannot effectively pursue different livelihood strategies, since there is no unity, mutual agreements, and the adherence to rules, norms and sanctions. In other words, there is a lack of willingness from the beneficiaries to work as a team and expand their access to institutions which hold comprehensive positions. It is important to note that, for as long as there is a lack in this form of capital, the beneficiaries will not have social resources that they can depend on, to achieve their livelihood outcomes. According to the extension officer, merely grouping people together has not been effective and that is the reason the Pro-active Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) was introduced. He explains that PLAS also groups people together, but it makes provision for land to be acquired by individuals and the results have been quite exceptional.

A few recommendations were proposed by the extension officer to avoid group dynamics and to accelerate productivity on the farms. He argued that, merely nominating someone with no formal skills and education as a chairperson of the CPA, defeats the purpose of the land reform programme. He contended that most of the chairpersons of the CPAs were farm-dwellers and they do not have formal knowledge in relation to agricultural activities. Therefore, someone with formal agricultural knowledge should be employed. The extension officer made an example of how he worked with agricultural graduates on two farms and this has been effective, because products from these farms are on the market. This is what the extension officer had to say about this matter:

“In terms of criteria peoples CVS need to be considered. Farm-dwellers should be the first preference. My recommendation would be that the farm-dwellers can own the land, however an educated person should be employed to run the agricultural activities. Farm-dwellers do not have

formal knowledge in relation to agricultural activities, therefore they do need some sort of assistance even though they know how to work the land. We are complaining of having high unemployment rates, but we are not employing graduates from agricultural schools as persons to administer farms...I have worked with agricultural graduates in two farms. Products are being marketed because there is leadership.”

The beneficiaries also agree that, merely grouping people together, has not been effective. Many of the beneficiaries have referred to the different issues that they were confronted with because of co-operative farming. Based on their responses when they were interviewed, this has prevented them from adopting strategies as a collective. As a result, beneficiaries are adopting livelihood strategies individually. The extension officer stated that the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) has attempted to provide post-settlement support to the land reform beneficiaries annually and there has been continuous support offered. This is contrary to what was said by the beneficiaries. Many of the beneficiaries stated that the support that they received from the government was very limited and haphazard. However, one of the participants did seem to agree that post-settlement support to him and other beneficiaries was continuous.

The extension officer claimed that this post-settlement has been achieved by conducting assessments to determine the lands potential, infrastructure, and upgrades that need to be done. Another form of support has been by providing food security. According to the claims made by the extension officer, the DRDLR has attempted to provide the land reform beneficiaries with physical capital, such as: farming inputs and tractors. The DRDLR has provided beneficiaries with human capital, by providing them with training and skills. Notably, the extension officer argued that most of the post-settlement support offered to the beneficiaries has created a dependency syndrome on the state. He makes the argument that, in some cases people will ask for assistance for things such as diesel, and he believes diesel is not too expensive, and the beneficiaries can afford to buy it as a collective:

“We provide farming inputs, training and tractors. All that the beneficiaries need to do is plough the land. They basically need to work on the land. We provide trucks to take products to the markets. Beneficiaries need to pay the driver and sometimes for the diesel.”

On the contrary, land beneficiaries have suggested that the government has prioritized one form of capital: natural capital and has failed to integrate the other forms of capital. This is based on the belief that post-settlement support is inconsistent, since land beneficiaries do not have adequate skills, education, access to finance and markets and networks and connectedness. The extension officer explained that in the past, there have been challenges with having a white-farmer mentor beneficiaries of land reform. Therefore, he does not believe that the mentoring has been effective, since there was a lack of terms of reference. He argued that the mentoring programme needs to be more structured and there is a need for terms of reference. This view is similar to that of one of the beneficiaries, who said that having a white farmer mentor was not effective, because those who were in support of having the white farmer as a mentor were left stranded, because they lost their livestock, goats and sheep to the white farmer. This is what the beneficiary had to say:

“The white farmer was employed by the government as a mentor. He received money from the government to buy these cows. However, after receiving these cows he would divide the cows so that he can also benefit. He basically used to keep some of these cows for himself. We were sidelined even for meetings...Kobus even went to the extent of changing the members of the CPA. He achieved this by telling people that there was money that they would receive, and their signatures were needed. People signed expecting to receive money, only to find out that he was changing the members of the CPA...those of us who did not join the partnership with Kobus remained with our own livestock. The people who lost their livestock are those who were part of the partnership.” This is what the extension officer also had to say about the notion of mentorship:

“The mentorship needs to be structured to reap results and impact, instead of it being a thing of just mentoring. Some sort of terms of reference needs to be developed. This will allow for achievements and milestones to be realised. When these are achieved it will be easy to measure whether objectives were met or not. In the previous years there was no structure in place to measure whether the mentorship was successful or not.”

Like the claims made by the beneficiaries, the extension officer argued that another challenge involves corruption amongst the land reform beneficiaries. He argues that the beneficiaries resort to corruption, since they are unable to sustain their livelihoods, because of being dependent on the

government for post-settlement support and lack of interest in working the land. For example, others have sold some of the implements that the government provided.

“A lot of complaints have been brought to my attention. People have complained that there is a lot of corruption happening after we have provided support to the beneficiaries. For example, these people used to be workers and they were used to earning an income. So now they find themselves being land owners but there is no production on that land. Since they were used to earning an income, it is impossible for them not to want to make some money no matter how that money comes in. Their main concern is sustaining their livelihoods...”

The extension officer argued that the DRDLR has experienced budget constraints regarding post-settlement support. He explained that in most cases he is mandated to give statistics on the number of land reform beneficiaries. Due to this, the budget made available is dependent on the number of projects presented at strategic meetings. The extension officer argues that budget constraints delay post-settlement support. This is what the extension officer had to say about this matter:

“This compromises the quality of our work. If we were more concerned about the impact instead of statistics, we would have progressed by then.”

Additionally, the extension officer argued that there was a need for social capital. Simply put, there was a need to have more formalised groups in every property that was acquired. Consequently, rules would be followed, there would be shared consent, relationships of trust and collaborations to safeguard the beneficiaries against hardships. The extension officer also added:

“Well most of the challenges happened a while ago and it is up to us to rectify these. For example, the land acquisition criteria need to be restructured. After this we need to make sure that there is proper leadership in every property acquired. I mean a skilled farm manager who will run the property. We can have a project management team to monitor all activities in projects to avoid maladministration and corruption. These people should be employed by both Departments of Land Reform and Agriculture. Social development and municipalities should also be involved as additional stake holders.”

Another challenge according to the extension officer was that the beneficiaries or rather smallholder farmers are not in touch with value chains. He then explained that he has found a way to address this issue, by including them in a programme where they will have access to the markets.

In other words, the beneficiaries will have social resources such as networks and connectedness that they can depend on to attain their livelihoods. Accordingly, the extension officer recommended that a project management team be employed to monitor all activities in projects to avoid maladministration and corruption. He explained that the team should be employed by the DRDLR. Additionally, the Department of Social Development and local municipalities should also be involved as additional stake holders that support land reform. An additional challenge according to the extension officer is that their clientele involves elderly people, because no one is taking initiatives and instilling the love for agricultural science to young people. When comparing the responses from the beneficiaries and from the extension officer, one can see some agreements and disagreements between the two.

There is an agreement between both parties that the issuing of land to large groups of people is a recipe for disaster, as people have different visions and ideas on how the land should be utilized. Both parties agree that group dynamics slow down the productive use of the land. Secondly, there is also an agreement on the lack of a coordinated land reform programme and post-settlement support. Alternatively, there is evident disagreement on the level or effectiveness of support provided to beneficiaries. The beneficiaries clearly do not think that the government support is enough, whilst the extension officer seems to blame the mismanagement of post-settlement support on the beneficiaries.

There is truth to both their perspectives, as the beneficiaries themselves noted that some group members misuse the support or even sell the implements. However, the bigger issue is the poor regulation, and transparency in the manner in which the post-settlement support is issued to land beneficiaries. As stated throughout this analysis, the government is not considering that the beneficiaries come from a disadvantaged position of low education and skills, lack of financial capital, poor service delivery and now inconsistent and un-coordinated post-settlement support. The idea of giving land to people is a noble one, however, farming is more than just having land and a few implements, as it requires so many other factors to thrive. The government clearly needs to take barriers into account when rolling out land reform in South Africa.

4.5. LIVELIHOODS OF LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES IN THE MAKANA MUNICIPAL REGION

One of the qualitative methods that were used in the study, was participant observation. Upon visiting the beneficiaries on their land, several observations were made. The glaring observation was the lack of electricity in some of the houses. The beneficiaries who did not have electricity had to use alternative forms of energy for lighting, cooking and heat. Another observation, was the lack of constant water supply, and the beneficiaries had to use boreholes or water tanks. This can also influence farming activities. One cannot farm effectively without consistent supply of water and electricity. Other observations have already been discussed in the section on ‘the quality service delivery in Makana Municipal District’. Land reform was initially established to address the issue of rural poverty and unemployment. From this study, it became apparent that land reform beneficiaries use a combination of the resources (assets) in order to survive. The main contributor to the livelihood strategies of the beneficiaries are their employment and small entrepreneurship ventures. Through discussions, it became apparent that land beneficiaries were dependent on other forms of income (besides the land) to sustain their lives.

“My salary income is not enough. It supports my family. Things are better if I sell something. But even that is not something permanent that I can depend on. My youngest son receives child grant. However, this is used for his expenses. I do not have any loans. In fact, I am afraid of loans” (Mr Akhona, 2019).

For instance, the beneficiaries are dependent on regular inflows of money and these are generally dependent on other people. For example, one of the beneficiaries expressed that she was dependent on her mother. She explained that her mother’s main source of income is the state pension grant and a fee paid to her for taking care of other people’s livestock.

“We are dependent on our mother. Our mother receives money from the state, an old age state grant. She also receives a few Rand’s from taking care of the livestock of others on the farm” (Ms Nobubele, 2019).

Another beneficiary explained that, he depended on the Taxi Association for a salary income.

“I used to be part of the Taxi Association. I used to be the leader at Ncedo Taxi Association. I usually receive money from assisting the Taxi Association as other means of income” (Mr Luyolo, 2019).

Another beneficiary expressed that, he is also dependent on his wage, as well as the child welfare grant from the state to survive. Additionally, another beneficiary stated that she can buy household things like a flat screen from Stokvel money. She also explained that she gets a monthly allowance from her son and is dependent on her monthly salary as well. Another beneficiary explained that he owns a tyre business.

“I am able to make money because of the business that I own. I also retired from work. All my children are employed at my business. My wife does not work. We both get money from the state: the old age grant. So, most of my income comes from the business” (Mr Twaba, 2019).

However, in as much as most of the participants expressed that they do not solely depend on the land to earn an income, one beneficiary stated the opposite. The beneficiary indicated that he is dependent on the land to make a living. It can be argued that Mr Zan is able to be dependent on the land, because he is from Castle Farm, Salem. Many of the Salem beneficiaries alleged that as compared to the rest of the farms that they acquired, Castle Farm was more privileged in terms of post-settlement support from the government. For example, it is alleged by the beneficiaries that they had an agreement with the government that Castle Farm would be developed first and then development would be started on the other farms. However, this has not been the case, as the government has not proceeded to the other farms, approximately 10 years later. This means that some of the beneficiaries from Salem were not pleased that only one farm seems to be receiving the different forms of capital, whilst the rest of them do not. They argued that this hinders progress, because the rest of the beneficiaries from the same restitution claim cannot benefit from the land without consistent state support. Mr Luke stated:

“Does it make sense to be working on one specific section while excluding others for 10 years? Do you honestly think that such a person is still doing his or her work adequately? When he gets asked about this treatment, he responds by saying that that is how things are done. Had there been accountability someone would have been able to pin point that the way in which the rest of the beneficiaries are treated is unfair.

For example, the ones benefiting from government support can work on the land and sell despite the climate conditions. We on the other hand are unable to because we have no support.”

Most of the beneficiaries have some form of low wage employment to help them to survive. Mr Akhona for example, works on a farm near Kenton, whilst Mrs Thabisa works as a domestic worker near Salem. Whilst others have alternative businesses which are not directly involved with the land. Mr Twaba for example, owns a tyre repair shop in Grahamstown. Other beneficiaries are either pensioners or are unemployed. Those who are unemployed rely on family members for support, whilst the pensioners rely on the state pension grant. An interesting point to note, is that the beneficiaries were able to sell some of their products from their gardens or their livestock to informal markets. However, this was not on a consistent basis, it depended on a number of different issues, such availability of funds, climate (water) and so on. They were not regularly selling their products at all.

The most interesting point when analyzing the livelihoods strategies, was the unanimous statement made by the beneficiaries that they would not be able to sustain their livelihoods with the land alone. They emphasized that they appreciate having land, but they could not survive without their other streams of income. This says a lot about the true success of the land reform programme. It was designed to eliminate unemployment and reduce poverty, but the reality is that the beneficiaries are not dependent on land alone. The inconsistency in post-settlement support, together with poor service delivery hinder the productive use of the land.

The Sustainable Livelihood framework contends that the combination of various assets (financial, natural, social, human and physical capitals) is essential for people to secure their livelihoods for the long term. This study shows that the beneficiaries have been using their various assets to survive. The reality of land reform is that it was designed to eliminate rural poverty and the need for poor people to survive on pension grants, state funds, remittances etc. The land reform programme was designed to make the people financially independent. It was established to help people live off the land, but the reality is that beneficiaries are merely surviving, and land is not the main livelihood asset. The land does not produce enough for them to be financially independent, as they rely on other streams of income: such as employment, remittances, state support and small business.

Although the beneficiaries combine various forms of assets in order to survive, the quality of these assets remain inadequate, as many of them remain marginalized or just surviving, which is not what the government had intended with the land reform programme.

4.6. CONCLUSION

This chapter gave an analysis and discussion on the lived experiences of the land beneficiaries. The chapter revealed that there are several obvious challenges about land reform in the Makana Municipal District. The major challenges have to do with structural and systemic issues within the South African society as a whole. Issues such as: limited educational training, limited access to financial capital, poor service delivery; inconsistent post-settlement support and limited access to agro-value chains and markets are systemic barriers to the land reform project as a whole. These structural barriers have resulted in the land beneficiaries mostly using the land for subsistence or as a way of contributing to their other stable flows of income. Land is not the primary source of income. Those who are using the land as their primary income generator, have access to adequate financial flows and support. This chapter has shown that land reform policies need to take various systemic barriers when rolling land reform projects throughout the country. The following chapter systematically ties the whole dissertation together in the form of a conclusion.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Land reform is an attempt by government to reverse the injustices of land dispossession that took place during colonialism and apartheid. These two systems systematically transformed African people from independent land owners into peasant low wage earners who had limited access to anything that could help them compete on an equal footing as white settlers. The division of land by the colonial and apartheid governments on the basis of race led to the displacement of African people from their land and the systemic inequality that plagues South Africa today. Unemployment and poverty are the main challenges facing the current democratic government, and the idea of land reform was instituted as a way of addressing this phenomenon. Land reform has very noble intentions, yet at a closer examination, there are evident barriers to ensuring its success.

The barriers are not new, as they are a by-product of colonialism, apartheid, and poor implementation of post-apartheid policies by the current government. This study, used the Sustainable Livelihoods Theory, to interrogate the lived experiences of land reform beneficiaries in Makana Municipal District in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. This framework was ideal for this study, as it places people at the center of development thinking. The SLA focuses on the ways in which people utilize the various assets at their disposal in order to secure the livelihoods and survive in difficult times. Within the SLA, land or natural capital, is seen as essential for securing livelihoods, especially for people living in rural areas of the world.

The theory, however, emphasises that individual needs a combination of other assets in order to survive, not just land alone. This theory automatically qualified as a theoretical foundation of this study, as it sought to examine whether the vision of government to reduce poverty and unemployed through land reform, is effective. The study attempted to achieve this by examine the following area: the socio-economic backgrounds of the beneficiaries; the quality of public services in Makana Municipal region; the nature of the land transfer; the use of the land by the beneficiaries; post-settlement support and the livelihoods of the beneficiaries.

By interrogating these different aspects, the study showed that land reform has to take into account various structural barriers which are a product of history and poor implementation of policies by government. The findings of this study revealed that the beneficiaries had similar socio-economic backgrounds. For instance, most of the beneficiaries lacked education and training, therefore produced mainly for subsistence purposes and could not successfully produce for commercial purposes. These low educational backgrounds caused the beneficiaries to have similar employment histories. For example, many of them were working for low wage employment as farm-workers. The findings of the study also showed that the beneficiaries did not have any generational wealth, therefore they did not have financial capital to start and keep track of businesses in circumstances where they produced for commercial purposes.

Another key finding of the study, revealed that even though some the beneficiaries worked as foremen on the farms, they had limited management experience, therefore were unable to understand how the different sectors of a business are linked so that they can attain profits. The primary objective of the RDP is to remove the results of apartheid by promoting a democratic society through the distribution of resources to all citizens. Notably, most of the beneficiaries seem to share similar experiences with regards to service delivery and lack of infrastructure and post-settlement support from the government. The beneficiaries were of the view that, there is a need for infrastructure development such as safe housing, access to adequate water and sanitation, clean and affordable energy as well as healthcare and schools. This view supports the sustainable livelihoods approach which provides a means of understanding the fundamental causes and dimensions of poverty.

These findings show that land reform needs to be implemented in such a way that beneficiaries can make commercial success with the land, hence the need for a combination of natural, human, social, physical and financial capitals. In other words, both the literature and findings in the study revealed that a combination of different capitals is important for the success of land reform. For instance, with human capital, the beneficiaries will be able to accumulate the skills, education and all other expertise needed for them to become successful farmers. By means of social capital, the beneficiaries will be able to have social resources which they can rely on to achieve certain objectives relating to their livelihoods. With physical capital, the beneficiaries will be able to have basic infrastructure and producer goods needed to support their livelihoods.

By means of financial capital, they will be able to have money to purchase what they need to make their products or provide services. The apartheid government was able to help the white farmers through various inputs on a continual basis. The agricultural sector was highly regulated and centralized, even the small-scale farmer managed to make something of the land that they had at their disposal. This shows that they were able to put certain structures into place, in order to ensure that farmers succeeded. Their support was not once off. Land reform does not take place in a vacuum, and so the experiences of the land reform beneficiaries are tied into the broader systemic issues that affect the majority of people in South Africa. The research showed that the beneficiaries were able to survive through various ways, such as: family ties; state welfare; employment and other small business ways. The quality of the sources of support that the beneficiaries receive is inconsistent, and the reality is that, the beneficiaries are merely surviving on the periphery of South African society. The few who make a commercial success, have other forms of consistent support flowing their way. In conclusion, land reform is a noble idea, but needs a complete redesign and take into account the structural barriers that hinder its success.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acemoglu, D., Cantoni, D., Johnson, S., & Robinson, J.A. (2011). The consequences of radical reform: The French Revolution. *American Economic Association*, Vol. 101 (7), pp. 3286-3307.

African National Congress (ANC). (1994). *The reconstruction and development programme: A policy framework*. African National Congress. Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan.

African Renaissance. (2006). The land reform programme in Zimbabwe. *The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Zimbabwe*, Vol. 3 (2), pp. 47-53

Aliber, M., Mabhera, S. and Chikwanha, T. (2009). *Agrarian reform and rural development*. Forth Hare University. Available at: <https://www.parliament.gov.za.pdf> [Accessed 17 December 2019]

Aliber, M. & Cousins, B. (2013). Livelihoods after land reform in South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 13 (1), pp. 140-165.

Anderson, J.R. and Feder, G. (2003). Rural extension services. Working Paper: 2976. Agriculture and Rural Development Department, World Bank Policy Research. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org> [Accessed 8 September 2019]

Asiama, S.O. (1998). *Comparative Study of land Administration systems: Ghana case study*. Unpublished Report. Kumasi: University of Science and Technology.

Atkinson, D. (2007). *Going for broke: The fate of farm workers in Arid South Africa*. South Africa. Cape Town: HSRC Press. Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/20500.11910/6230> [Accessed 10 November 2019]

Baldwin, A. (1975). Mass removals and separate development. *Journal of South African Studies*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 215-227.

Binswanger, H. and Elgin, M. (1988). Agriculture and governments in an interdependent world. Paper presented at the *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference of Agricultural Economists*. University of Oxford, 24-31 August.

Bernstein, H. (2002). Land Reform: Taking a longer view. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Vol. 2 (4), pp. 433-463.

Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., Bourguignon, C. and van den Brink, R. (eds.) (2009). *Agricultural land redistribution: Towards greater consensus on the "how"*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Brandt, L., Huang, J, L.I.G and Rozelle, S. (2002). Land rights in rural China: Facts, fictions and issues. *The China Journal*, Vol. 47, pp. 67-97

Boisen, C. (2017). From land dispossession to land restitution: European land rights in South Africa. *Settler Colonial Studies*, Vol. 7 (3), pp. 321-339.

Boyce, C. and Neale, P. (2006). Conducting in-depth interviews: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews for evaluation input. Pathfinder International. Available at: <https://www.academia.edu/download/33661461/metoolseriesindepthinterviews.pdf> [Accessed 3 January 2020]

Cliffe, L. (2000). Land reform in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 27 (84), pp. 273-286.

Cousins, B. (2002). Legislating negotiability: Tenure Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa. In: K. Jul. and C. Lund. (ed.) *Negotiating property in Africa*, pp. 67-106. New Hampshire: Heinemann.

Cousins, B. (2013). Land redistribution, populism and elite capture: New land reform policy proposals under the microscope. *The Journal of the Helen Suzman Foundation*, Vol. 70, pp.11-19.

Cousins, B. (2016). *Land reform in South Africa is sinking. Can it be saved?* University of Western Cape, PLAAS.

Available at: https://www.nelsonmandela.org/uploads/files/Land_law_and_leadership_-_paper_2.pdf. [Accessed 6 June 2019].

Cornwall, A. and Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social science & Medicine*, Vol. 41 (12), pp. 1667-1676.

Cullen Jr, L., Alger, K. and Rambaldi, D.M. (2005). Land reform and biodiversity conservation in Brazil in the 1990s: conflict and the articulation of mutual interests. *Conservation Biology*, Vol. 19 (3), pp. 747-755.

Deininger, K. (1999). Making negotiated land reform work: Initial experience of Colombia, Brazil and South Africa. *World Development*, Vol. 27 (4), pp. 651-672.

Deininger, K. Hoogeveen, H. and Kinsey, B. (2002). Benefits and costs of land reform in Zimbabwe with implications for Southern Africa. Paper presented at the *Centre for study of African economies*. University of Oxford, 18 March.

De Villiers, B. (2003). *Land reform: Issues and challenges: A comparative overview of experiences in Zimbabwe, Namibia, South Africa and Australia*. Johannesburg: Konrad Adenauer Foundation.

Department of Land Affairs. (1997). *White paper on South African land policy*. Pretoria: DLA.

Department of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform. (2018). *Annual statistical report for selected service delivery programmes of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform*. Pretoria: DRDLR.

Dodson, A. (2013). The Native Land Act of 1913 and its legacy. *Johannesburg Bar*, Vol. 26 (1), pp. 29-32.

Fabricius, C. and de Wet, C. (2002). The influence of forced removals and Land Restitution. Conservation and mobile indigenous peoples: displacement, forced settlement, and sustainable development. *Land Restoration in Southern Africa*, Vol. 10, pp. 149-165.

Fabiyi, Y.L. and Adesimi, A.A. (1978). Agrarian reform in Nigeria: problems of costing agricultural improvements for compensation under the 'land use decree 1978'. *Quarterly Journal of Administration*, Vol. 13 (2), pp.133-146.

Ghimire, KB. (2001). *Land reform and peasant livelihoods: the social dynamics of rural poverty and agrarian reforms in developing countries*. London: ITDG Publishing.

Gjuvsland, K. (2009). *Land reform in post-apartheid South Africa: A case study of challenges and opportunities for land reform beneficiaries in Western and Northern Cape Provinces*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Norway: University of Bergen.

Greenberg, S. (2010). *Status report on land and agriculture policy in South Africa*, 2010. PLAAS, University of Western Cape. Available at: <https://repository.uwc.ac.za/handle/10566/657> [Accessed 11 December 2019]

Griffin, K., Khan, A.R. and Ickowitz, A. (2002). Poverty and the Distribution of Land. *Journal of Agrarian change*, Vol. 2 (3), pp. 279-330.

Gwebu, J.Z. and Matthews, N. (2018). Metafrontier analysis of commercial and smallholder tomato production: A South African case. *South African Journal of Science*, Vol. 114 (7-8), pp.

55-62.

Hall, R. Jacobs, P. and Lahiff, E. (2003). *Evaluating Land and agrarian reform in South Africa: An occasional paper series: 1*. CPLAAS, School of government, University of the Western Cape. Available at: https://repository.uwc.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10566/4423/elarsa_op_1_land_redistribution.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [Accessed 10 July 2019]

Hall, R. (2004). A political economy of land reform in South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 100, pp. 213-227.

Hall, R. (2005). *The impact of land restitution and land reform on livelihoods*. PLAAS, University of the Western Cape. Available at: <http://repository.uwc.ac.za/handle/10566/90> [Accessed 3 January 2020]

Hall, R. (2007). Part two: Perspectives on existing policy and new directions for the future. In L. Ntesbeza and R. Hall (ed.): *The Land Question in South Africa*, pp. 87-106. Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council.

Hall, R. and G. Williams (2003). Land reform in South Africa: problems and prospects. Available at: https://www.academia.edu/2128928/Land_reform_in_South_Africa_problems_and_prospects [Accessed 6 September 2019].

Hanstad, T. Nielsen, R. and Brown, J. (2004). *Land and livelihoods. Making land rights real for India's rural poor. Making land rights real for India's rural poor*. Working Paper: 12. Rural Development Institute (RDI). Available at: <http://agris.fao.org/agris-> [Accessed 3 January 2020]

Hartvigsen, M. (2014). Land reform and land fragmentation in Central and Eastern Europe. *Land Use Policy*, Vol. 36, pp. 330-341.

Helliker, K. (2013). Reproducing white commercial agriculture in South Africa. Paper presented at the *Critical Studies Seminar Series*. Rhodes University, 22 February.

Hornsby, C. (2012). *Kenya: A history since independence*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Jacobs, P. (2003). *Support for Agricultural Development*. Occasional Paper Series: 4. PLAAS, University of the Western Cape. Available at:

http://repository.uwc.ac.za/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10566/4420/elarsa_op_4_support_for_agricultural_development.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [Accessed 10 June 2019]

Khumalo, P. (2014). Improving the contribution of cooperatives as vehicles for local economic development in South Africa. *African Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 14 (4), pp. 61-79.

Khuzwayo, H.A. (2016). *A sustainable livelihood approach to poverty reduction: participatory experiences of women involved in art and craft co-operatives in Bhambayi, Kwa-Zulu Natal*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Kwa-Zulu Natal: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Kirsten, J. (2017). *Reflections on 25 years of engagement with the land question in South Africa*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.

Kloppers, H.J. and Pienaar, G.J. (2014). The historical context of land reform in South Africa and early policies. *Scientific Electronic Library Online*, Vol. 17 (2), pp. 677-697.

Lahiff, E. (2001). Land reform in South Africa: is it meeting the challenge? *Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies*, Vol. 1, pp.1-6.

Lahiff, E. (2003). *Land reform and sustainable livelihoods in South Africa's Eastern Cape Province*. Institute of Development Studies. Available at: <http://repository.uwc.ac.za> [Accessed 3 January 2020]

Lahiff, E. (2005). From 'willing seller, willing buyer' to a people-driven land reform. *Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies*, Vol. 17, pp. 1-4.

Lahiff, E. and Cousins, B. (2005). Smallholder agriculture and land reform in South Africa. *IDS Bulletin*, Vol. 36 (2), pp. 127-131.

Langevin, M. and Rosset, P. (1997). Land Reform from Below: The Landless Worker's Movement in Brazil. *Institute for Food and Development Policy, Food First Backgrounder*, Vol. 4 (3), pp. 1-15.

Leacock, S. (1910). The Union of South Africa. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 4 (4), pp. 498- 507.

Levin, R. (1994). Participatory research and democratic agrarian transformation: The case of the Eastern Transvaal central low veld. *Transformation*, Vol. 25, pp. 34-57.

Levin, R. (2000). Toward a national implementation strategy of land redistribution. In *At the crossroads: land and agrarian reform in South Africa into the 21st century*. Paper presented at the *Alpha Training Centre Conference*. University of the Western Cape, 26-28 July 1999.

Links, H, L. (2011). *An output-based evaluation of delivery of land reform in South Africa over the period 1994-2010*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

Macfadyen, G. and Corcoran, E. (2002). *Literature review of studies on poverty in fishing communities and of lessons learned in using the sustainable livelihoods approach in poverty alleviation strategies and projects*. Working Paper: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/pdf> [Accessed 10 November 2019]

Mago, W. (2018). *Understanding sustainable livelihood strategies of informal traders: A case of Mount Frere, Eastern Cape*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Bloemfontein. University of the Free State.

Majale, M. (2001). Towards pro-poor regulatory guidelines for urban upgrading. Paper presented at the *International Workshop on Regulatory Guidelines for Urban Upgrading*. Held at BourtonOn-Dunsmore, May 17-18, 2001.

Malahlela, T. (2013). *A study of land reform and its impact in the greater Letaba local municipality of the Mopani District in the Limpopo Province*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Limpopo: University of Limpopo.

Manenzhe, T.J. (2007). *Post settlement challenges for Land Reform beneficiaries: Three Case Studies from Limpopo Province*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Western Cape: University of the Western Cape.

Manenzhe, T.J. and Lahiff, E. (2007). *Restitution and post-settlement support: Three case studies from Limpopo*. Western Cape: University of the Western Cape.

- Manji, A. (2014). The politics of land reform in Kenya 2012. *African Studies Review*, Vol. 57 (1), pp. 115-130.
- Marcus, T. (1989). *Modernising super-exploitation. Restructuring South African agriculture*. London: ZED Books
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Masoka, N.S. (2014). *Post-settlement land reform challenges: The case of the Department of Agriculture, Rural Development and Land Administration, Mpumalanga Province*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. North-West: Potchefstroom-Campus of the North-West University.
- Mathibela, N. (2018). Unpacking expropriation without compensation in South Africa. *Pambuzuka News*. 29 June.
- Mayavo, P. (2004). Non-citizens in a democratic space: perspectives on human security in Zimbabwe's large-scale commercial agriculture under the land reform programme: 19802002. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 4 (1), pp. 45-63.
- McLachlon, J. (2019). History of the dispossession of the rights in land of pastoral indigenous communities in the Cape Colony from 1652 to 1910. *Fundamina*, Vol. 25 (1), pp. 100-130.
- Mbokazi, N. (2015). *Understanding policy making and policy implementation with reference to land redistribution in South Africa: Case Studies from the Eastern Cape*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- McIntosh, A. and Vaughan, A. (2000). Experiences of agrarian reform in South Africa: The limits of intervention. Paper presented at *Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century Conference*. Alpha Training Centre, Broederstroom, Pretoria, South Africa, 26-28 July 1999
- Ministry for Agriculture and Land Affairs. (2000). *Land redistribution for agricultural development: A sub-programme of the Land Redistribution Programme*. Available at: http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/phocadownload/Land_Acquisition_Warehouse/land%20redistribution%20for%20agricultural%20development.pdf [Accessed 12 August 2019]

- Mngxitama, A. (2005). *National Land Committee, 1994-2004. A critical insider's perspective*, University of Kwa-Zulu Natal. Available at: [http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/CCS RREPORTS2 REPORT34.pdf](http://ccs.ukzn.ac.za/files/CCS_RREPORTS2_REPORT34.pdf) [Accessed 12 December 2019]
- Moyo, S. (1995). *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Sapes Trust.
- Ntsebeza, L. (2011). *The Land Question: Exploring obstacles to land redistribution in South Africa*. Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.589.4382&rep=rep1&type=pdf> [Accessed 10 July 2019]
- O'Conner, J. (1968). Agrarian reforms in Cuba, 1959-1963. *Guilford Press*, Vol. 32 (2), pp. 169-217.
- Parnell, S. (1991). Sanitation, segregation and the Natives (Urban Areas) Act: African exclusion from Johannesburg's Malay Location, 1897-1925. *Journal of Historical Geography*, Vol. 17 (3), pp. 271-288.
- Payne, G. (2002). *Land, rights and innovation: Improving tenure security for the urban poor*. London: ITDG Publishing.
- Politicsweb. (2011). *The Salem land claim: The ConCourt judgment*. Available at: <https://www.politicsweb.co.za/documents/the-salem-land-claim-the-concourt-judgment>. [Accessed 11 January 2020]
- Powell, R.A. and Single, H.M. (1996). Methodology matters. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, Vol. 8 (5), pp. 499-504.
- Prinsloo, A. (2008). *A critical analysis of the LRAD Sub-Programme in the Gauteng Province of South Africa*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Rungasamy, L. (2011). *The need for settlement support in land reform projects: Focus on sustainable development*. Unpublished Master's Thesis. University of South Africa.
- Rutton, M. (1997). *Land reform in Africa: Lessons from Kenya*. Leiden Repository, Leiden University. Available at: <https://openaccess.leidenuniv> [Accessed 9 December 2019]

Serrat, O. (2017). *Knowledge solutions: Tools, methods, and approaches to drive organizational performance*. New York: Springer Singapore. Available at: <https://www.oopen.org/download> [Accessed 17 January 2020]

Robles, W. (2018). Revisiting agrarian reform in Brazil, 1985–2016. *Journal of Developing Societies*, Vol. 34 (1), pp. 1-34.

Scoones, I. (2005). Sustainable rural livelihoods a framework for analysis. Institute of Development Studies. Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270588972> [Accessed 3 January 2020]

Seetharaman, S. (2002). Land Reforms in India-Performance and challenges in Gujarat and Maharashtra. *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol. 21 (3), pp.437-439.

Sibisi, N. (2015). *Agricultural extension and post-settlement support of land reform beneficiaries in South Africa: The case of Ixopo in the province of Kwa-Zulu Natal*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Kwa-Zulu Natal: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Sikwela, M. (2013). *The impact of farmer support programmes on market access of smallholder farmers in the Eastern Cape and Kwa-Zulu Natal Provinces, South Africa*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. Alice: University of Fort Hare.

Sotsha, K. (2017). Land redistribution and post-settlement support: A missing link. *National Agricultural Marketing Council*, Vol. 8, pp. 1-17.

South African History Online (SAHO). (2019). *Land restitution in South Africa since 1994*. Available: <https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/land-restitution-south-africa-1994> [Accessed 23 November]

Smith, L. (1964). Agrarian Reform in Brazil. *University of Wisconsin Press*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 3-20.

Sparovek, G. & Maule, R. (2009). Negotiated Agrarian Reform in Brazil. In: H. BinswangerMkhize., C. Bourguignon. and R. Van den Brink, R. (eds.) (2009). *Agricultural land redistribution: Toward greater consensus*, pp. 291-310. Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.

- Terrablanche, S. and Natrass, N. (1990). A periodization of political economy from 1990. In: N. Natrass and E. Ardington (ed.) *The Political economy of South Africa*, pp. 6-23. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Thapliyal, B.K. (2001). Land Reforms in India: Intervention for agrarian capitalist transformation in Punjab and Haryana. *Journal of Rural Development*, Vol. 21 (2), pp. 298-302.
- Tilley, S. (2007). *International comparative study of strategies for settlement support provision to land reform beneficiaries*. Research Report: 26. Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), University of the Western Cape. Available: https://repository.uwc.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10566/4396/rr_26_international_comparative_study_strategies_settlement_support_provision_land_reform_beneficiaries_2007.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y [Accessed 15 July 2019]
- Van der Elst, H.J. (2008). *Post-settlement land reform objectives in South Africa: Towards a management model for sustainable development*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. North-West: Potchefstroom-Campus of the North-West University.
- Venter, D. (2006). *Will the rejection of the willing buyer willing seller principle by the government fast track the land redistribution process*. Black Business Quarterly. 1 March 2006.
- Visser, M. and Ferrer, S. (2015). *Farm workers' living and working Conditions in South Africa: Key trends, emergent issues, and underlying and structural problems*. Pretoria: International Labour Organization.

APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – ONE ON ONE INTERVIEWS



RHODES UNIVERSITY
Where leaders learn

**LAND REDISTRIBUTION & POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

SECTION A: INTRODUCTION

Respondent Details

First name	
Surname	
Position / Job title	

Contact details

Home address	
Work telephone number	
Household telephone number	
Cell phone number	

Interview Details

Place of Interview	
Date of interview	__ __ / __ __ /201__
Interview start time	__ __ : __ __
Interview finish time	__ __ : __ __

SECTION B: BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender? (Male or female)
3. What population group do you belong to? (Black, White, Coloured, Indian)
4. What is your nationality? (South African or other)
5. What is your current marital status? (Married; Living together like married partners; Single/Never married; Widower/Widow; Separated/Divorced)
6. Number of people in household?

SECTION C: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

7. Where were you born and where did you spend your formative years?
8. Who raised you and how many people lived in your household?
9. What is your parents education?
10. Describe the type of dwelling you grew up in
11. Discuss some of the main challenges that you and your family experienced growing up?

12. What is your parents educational background?
13. What is your employment history to date?
14. What is your educational background?
15. Discuss your employment history to date.
16. Do you have any farming experience? (DISCUSS)

SECTION D: QUALITY OF PUBLIC SERVICES IN THE AREA

17. Discuss the quality of these public services:
 - (a) Schools
 - (b) Clinics/hospital
 - (c) Police station
 - (d) Municipal services – water, toilets, trash removal

SECTION E: LAND REDISTRIBUTION AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT

18. What do you farm on the land?
19. What do you think about the quality of the land?
20. Are you the sole beneficiary of the land redistribution or are you part of a group?
21. Are you part of any farmers associations?
22. How many people is this land supporting?
23. How/ why did you receive this land? i.e. was it for productive or residential use?
24. Can you discuss the terms and conditions of the land redistribution claim
25. For how many years have you had this land?

26. What have you done with the land since you received it from the government?
(discuss)
27. If it's a group – how have you divided the (a) land (b) labour input (c) resources (for example equipment)
28. What challenges have you experienced in working as a group?
29. Do you have any people employed in the farm? If so, how many? How much do you pay them?
30. Is the land used for subsistence or commercial purposes?
31. If for **commercial** purposes- who is your target market?
32. Do you keep in touch with farming trends?
33. How much income do you generate per annum, and how does this contribute to the farm?
34. Is the farm profitable? (Have you received profitability issues?)
35. What are your short term and long-term plans to growing your business?
36. Who manages your accounts? (book keeper?)
37. Are you part of any farmers associations?

38. If for **subsistence how** does the farm contribute to your livelihoods?
39. What is your opinion about the land reform programme as a whole?

FORMS OF ASSISTANCE:

Government

40. Did you receive a grant from the state? If so, are you satisfied with the contribution of the grant?
41. What other form of assistance have you received from the government, if any?
42. Has the government fulfilled its part of the agreement? If so, how have they done it?
43. Is the government monitoring you, or was it on a one-time basis?

44. Has anyone from the government given you any information regarding excessing loans, information about the programme?
45. Is there an extension officer present to assist you/ or the group with the land?
46. Has the assistance you have received been sufficient?
47. How would you want the government to improve on this assistance?

Is there any other form of assistance besides government support?

48. Would you want to sell the land? (have you received any offers?)

CHALLENGES

49. What challenges have you encountered?
50. How did these affect your farming experience?

SECTION F: LIVELIHOODS

51. What do people in your household do?
52. Describe the house you are currently residing in (number of rooms; bricks or zink etc)
53. What is your water source? What is the quality of this water?
54. What is your energy source? (electricity, gas, paraffin etc)
55. Do you have medical aid? If no, then how do you and your family access health care?
56. Are you able to save money for the long term?

Is there other forms of income in the house besides the land. Are these other forms of income able to sustain your family? (discuss)

- (a) Employment
 - (b) Grant
 - (c) Pension grant
 - (d) Loans? If yes, discuss the nature of the loan/s (e) Stokvel
57. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEWS



LAND REDISTRIBUTION & POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Please briefly introduce yourself
 - (a) Where you are from
 - (b) Educational background of parents and beneficiary
 - (c) Gender
 - (d) Employment
 - (e) Interest in farming

2. How do you guys know each other?

3. And how did you come to own this piece of land?

4. Discuss the quality of these public services in your residential:
 - (a) Police station
 - (b) Schools

(c) Clinics/hospital

(d) Municipal services – water, toilets, trash removal etc.

5. What is your water source? What is the quality of this water?
6. What is your energy source? (electricity, gas, paraffin etc)
7. Can you describe the nature of the land redistribution contract (that is, the terms and conditions)?
8. When did you officially receive the land?
9. What is your opinion on the quality of this land?
10. How have you divided the land?
11. What do you farm on the land?
12. What are your different roles on the land?
13. How often do you meet to discuss the farm projects etc?
14. Are you using the land for commercial purposes or for subsistence or both?
15. If for commercial use;
 - (a) Who is your target market? (vendors, spaza shops, super markets etc)
 - (b) How do you get your products to the market? (explain)
 - (c) Do you keep up with farming trends?

(d) What type of farming equipment do you have? (how did you obtain them? Are they up to date?

(e) How many people do you employ?

(f) What are your short term and long-term plans to growing the business?

(g) Who manages your accounts? (book keeper?)

(h) Is this farm profitable? (discuss)

(i) Has the business grown since you started? (explain)

(j) Do you have any competition? (if so, explain) (k) Are you part of any farmers associations?

16. How many people (families) does this land supporting?

17. How much income do you generate per annum, and how does this contribute to the farm?

18. Have you received any form of assistance from the government (discuss)?

19. Is the government monitoring you, or was it on a one-time basis?

20. Has anyone from the government given you any information regarding excessing loans, information about the programme?

21. Is this assistance adequate or not? (explain)

22. Do you think the government could do more? How?

23. Have you received any alternative assistance, outside the government? (explain)

24. What are the main challenges that you are experiencing as a group on this project?

25. How did these affect your farming experience?

26. What contribution does this land make to your families' livelihoods?

27. What are your short term and long-term goals for this land?

28. What is your opinion about the land reform programme as a whole?

29. What do you think can be done to improve it?

30. Would you want to sell the land? (have you received any offers?)

31. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

THE END

APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW SCHEDULE – EXTENSION OFFICER INTERVIEW



RHODES UNIVERSITY
Where leaders learn

**LAND REDISTRIBUTION AND POST-SETTLEMENT SUPPORT
GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

1. Briefly introduce yourself
(a) Your occupation (b)
Job description
2. Can you describe the nature of the land redistribution contract (that is, the terms and conditions)?
3. Has the government fulfilled its part of the agreement? If so, how has the government done it? If not, how can this be improved?
4. Do you think that the land redistribution beneficiaries have fulfilled their part of the agreement?

5. Has there been any post-settlement support/ assistance given to the land redistribution beneficiaries? If so, describe this assistance.
6. Is there been an extension officer/ any other government official(s) assigned to the farm? If so, how often do these official(s) visit the farm(s)?
7. What short-term and long-term plans does the provincial department have for the land redistribution beneficiaries?
8. Does the Department of Agriculture feel that the post-settlement support/ assistance offered to the beneficiaries is adequate? If not, how can this be improved? (Explain).
9. Do you think that the government could do more? How?
10. Has the provincial department experienced any budget cuts? If so, how has this affected the land redistribution projects in the province?
11. How is the relationship between the department and the land redistribution beneficiaries?
12. Have there been any land redistribution projects which were paused because of certain challenges between the land redistribution beneficiaries and government? If so, explain these challenges.
13. What are some of the main challenges that the beneficiaries experience?
14. Is there any other information that you would like to add

THE END

APPENDIX 4: CONSENT FORM



Department of Sociology
Prince Alfred Street, Grahamstown, 6139, South Africa
PO Box 94, Grahamstown, 6140, South Africa
t: +27 (0) 46 603 8361
f: +27 (0) 46 603 7549

www.ru.ac.za

15 October 2019

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This letter serves to confirm that Ms Simela Msuthu, student number: 614M3281 is a student in our Department. As part of her Sociology Masters coursework thesis degree, Ms Msuthu is required to conduct interviews for her research. The research process is a vital component of our teaching programme and we would appreciate any assistance that you could give to enable her to meet her commitments in this regard. Please note that the data collected will be used for research purposes only.

Many thanks.

Yours sincerely



Prof Gilton Klerck
Head of Department

DEPT. OF SOCIOLOGY
RHODES UNIVERSITY
P.O. BOX 94
6140 GRAHAMSTOWN
SOUTH AFRICA