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ABSTRACT

Land reform is a vital political issue that has been fiercely debated in recent years, especially in South Africa. With the historical background of South Africa consisting of colonialism and political resistance that resulted in racial discrimination, apartheid was forced onto the black citizens by the white government. To correct the injustices of the apartheid regime, the new democratic government had to find a way to redistribute land that was previously owned by citizens previously disposed of their land. The South African government uses land reform to address the social, political and economic issues that this newly democratic country face; however, it has not been implemented very well to date. The aim of this study was to determine the perceptions on the progress and implementation of land reform in the Matzikama Municipality of South Africa. With different stakeholders’ perceptions to be taken into consideration, this study focused on three aspects: (1) the perceptions of commercial farmers in the Matzikama Municipality; (2) the progress of Equity Share Scheme (ESS) projects in the Matzikama Municipality; and (3) the perceptions of the key role players on land reform. The study focused on the commercial farmer members of the Vredendal farmers’ association and members of the ESS projects in close proximity to Vredendal.

The research objectives of this study were sixfold, namely (1) to examine the literature on land reform to establish an understanding of what land reform is about, what overall objectives it has, what types and approaches exist and how it has been implemented internationally; (2) to investigate policies, legislation and the land reform programme of South Africa and how it has been implemented nationally; (3) to identify the perceptions of the commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area on land reform; (4) to determine how successful or unsuccessful land reform projects have been in the Matzikama municipal area by investigating farms that have incorporated it; (5) to identify the perceptions that key role players have on land reform and to use these perceptions to assess the current state of the land reform programme in the study area; and (6) to identify the problems that the land reform programme is experiencing and to make recommendations on how to improve the current state of land reform. The necessary data was collected through a questionnaire survey among commercial farmers and conducting interviews with beneficiaries of ESS projects and key role-players. The data was then analysed by making use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and Microsoft Excel.

The findings indicate that the commercial farmers have a very negative perception of land reform, the main reason being that they felt the government was targeting white commercial farmers, and some respondents indicated that they felt insecure about land security. As for ESS projects in the Matzikama Municipality, the projects have not being very successful, although the Alfalfa land reform project is still trying to uplift its shareholders. From the data collected from the interviews conducted with the key role players, five problems were identified relating to the current implementation of the land reform.
programme in the study area in general: (1) the incoherence of the current policy-making approach and the massive gaps between national and local stakeholders in the current decision-making approach; (2) the slow acquisition process for agricultural land due to cumbersome bureaucracy; (3) the lack of partnership and integration between government departments, the private sector and beneficiaries; (4) the lack of government support, which has contributed to the poor success rate of land reform projects; and (5) the beneficiaries’ inexperience and lack of skills concerning farming. To address the problems identified with the current implementation of the land reform programme in South Africa, it is recommended that the government reassesses the approach it has been using to try to redistribute agricultural land. This can be done by ensuring that officials dealing with land reform have the necessary skills and experience to implement the strategies. The government should also consider a grassroots approach when identifying land for redistribution by making use of local communities. Funding from the government is also crucial and should be allocated appropriately. Lastly, the government should invest in programmes that focus on educating emerging farmers on managing a commercial farm successfully.

**Key words and phrases:** land reform, apartheid, restitution, redistribution, tenure reform, Equity Sharing Scheme (ESS) projects, agricultural land, National Development Plan (NDP), previously disadvantaged, Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD), land acquisition, commercial farmers, emerging farmers, beneficiaries and shareholders.
OPSOMMING

Grondhervorming is 'n belangrike politieke kwessie waaraan daar die afgelope paar jaar heftig gedebatteer word, veral in Suid-Afrika. Met die geskiedkundige agtergrond van Suid-Afrika, bestaande uit kolonialisme en politieke weerstand wat gelei het tot rasse diskriminasie, is apartheid deur die wit regering afgedwing op swart burgers. Om die ongeregtighede van apartheid reg te stel, moes die nuwe demokratiese regering 'n manier vind om grond te herverdeel aan die voorheen benadeelde burgers wat voor apartheid die grond besit het. Die Suid-Afrikaanse regering gebruik grondhervorming om die sosiale, politieke en ekonomiese kwessies wat hierdie nuwe demokratiese land in die gesig staar, aan te spreek, maar dit word nie so goed geïmplementeer as wat die voorheen benadeelde burgers verwag het nie. Die doel van hierdie studie was om die persepsies oor die vordering met en implementering van die grondhervormingsprogram in die Matzikama Munisipaliteit van Suid-Afrika te bepaal. Met verskillende belanghebbendes se persepsies wat in ag geneem moet word, het hierdie studie gefokus op drie standpunte: (1) die persepsies van komsersiële boere in die Matzikama Munisipaliteit; (2) die vordering van Gedeelde-eienaarskapskema (ESS – Equity Share Scheme) projekte in die Matzikama Munisipaliteit, en (3) die sleutel rolspelers se persepsie oor grondhervorming. Die studie het gefokus op die komsersiële boere wat lid was van die Vredendal Boerevereniging en lede van die AWS projekte in die nabyheid van Vredendal.

Daar was ses doelwitte vir hierdie studie, naamlik (1) om die literatuur oor grondhervorming te ondersoek om 'n begrip te bekom van wat grondhervorming is, watter algemene doelstellings dit het, watter tipe grondhervorming en benaderings bestaan, en om vas te stel hoe grondhervorming op 'n internasionale vlak geïmplementeer word; (2) om ondersoek in te stel oor die beleide, wetgewing en grondhervormingsprogram van Suid-Afrika en hoe dit op die nasionale vlak geïmplementeer word; (3) om die persepsies van die komsersiële boere in die Matzikama Munisipale gebied oor grondhervorming te identifiseer; (4) om te bepaal hoe suksesvol of onsuksesvol grondhervormingsprojekte in die Matzikama Munisipale area is deur ondersoek in te stel op plase wat AWS projekte begin het, (5) die persepsies wat belangrike rolspelers oor grondhervorming het, te identifiseer en hierdie persepsies te gebruik om die huidige toestand van die grondhervormingsprogram in Suid-Afrika te bepaal, en (6) die probleme wat die grondhervormingsprogram ondervind te identifiseer en aanbevelings te maak oor hoe om die huidige stand van grondhervorming in Suid-Afrika te verbeter. Deur die verspreiding van vraelyste onder die komsersiële boere en deur onderhoude met begunstigdes van AWS projekte en sleutel rolspelers te voer, is die noodsaaklike data ingesamel, waarna dit ontleed is deur gebruik te maak van die Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) en Microsoft Excel.

Daar is bevind dat die komsersiële boere ’n baie negatiewe persepsie oor grondhervorming het. Die hoof rede hiervoor is dat hulle voel die regering teiken wit komsersiële boere en sommige respondente
het aangedui dat hulle onseker voel oor grondsekeriteit. Die AWS-projekte was nog nie regtig suksesvol in die Matzikama Munisipaliteit nie, maar die Alfalfa grondhervormingsprojek bestaan nog en probeer om die aandeelhouers op te hef. Uit die data wat deur die onderhoude met die sleutel rolspelers versamel is, is vyf probleme met die huidige implementering van die grondhervormingsprogram van Suid-Afrika geïdentificeer: (1) die onsamehangendheid van die huidige benadering tot beleidskepping en die massiewe gapings tussen die nasionale en plaaslike belanghebbendes wat die huidige besluitnemingsbenadering aanbetref, (2) die stadige verkrygingsproses van landbougrond weens omlagtinge burokrasie; (3) die gebrek aan vennootskappe en integrasie tussen regeringsdepartemente, die private sektor en die begunstigdes van grondhervorming; (4) die gebrek aan ondersteun van die regering, wat bydra tot die swak slaagsyfer van grondhervormingsprojekte, en (5) die gebrek aan begunstigdes met ervaring en vaardighede met betrekking tot die landbou. Om die probleme met die huidige implementering van die grondhervormingsprogram in Suid-Afrika aan te spreek, word dit aanbeveel dat die regering die benadering wat hulle gebruik om doe herverdeling van landbougrond te finaliseer, herevalueer. Dit kan gedoen word deur te verseker dat amptenare wat met grondhervorming werk die noodsaaklike vaardighede en ondervinding het om die nodige strategieë te implementeer. Die regering moet ook oorweeg om met behulp van die plaaslike gemeenskap grond te indentifiseer wat beskikbaar is vir herverdeling. Befondsing van die regering is ook van kardinale belang en moet toepaslik toegeken word. Laastens moet die regering belê in programme wat fokus op die opvoeding van opkomende boere wat hulle kan in staat stel om ’n suksesvolle kommersiële boere te word.

Sleutelwoorde en -frases: grondhervorming, apartheid, restitusie, herverdeling, besitreghervorming, Gedeelde-eienaarskapskema (ESS) projekte, landbougrond, Nasionale Ontwikkelingsplan (NOP), voorheen benadeelde, Herverdeling van Grond vir Landbouontwikkeling (LRAD), grondverkryging, kommersiële boere, opkomende boere, begunstigdes en aandeelhouers.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the following individuals and research institutions for their assistance whilst conducting my research.

- My supervisor, Prof Ronnie Donaldson, for his contribution and continuous support and guidance during the study.
- My parents, for giving me the opportunity to further my postgraduate studies and supporting me throughout the good and bad times. Words cannot express how grateful I am for all the sacrifices that you have made on my behalf.
- My sister, for checking up on me and forcing me to go work on my thesis when I was not eager to do so.
- The rest of my family, especially my grandmother, for motivating me to finish my thesis and being there when I needed additional support.
- My friends, for being there when I needed to take a break and have helped me stay sane through these difficult years.
- Mr Pierre van Heerden, Vredendal farmers’ association chairman, for providing me with the Vredendal farmers’ association member list used to contact farmers in the region.
- Mr Alro van der Spuy, commercial farmer and shareholder/mentor of the Alfalfa land reform project, for his assistance and support during the investigation of the Alfalfa land reform project.
- Mr Sipho Sityata, Cape Winelands District Officer of the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR), who was willing to see me on short notice and also provided the business plan of the Eikevlei land reform project.
- All the respondents, commercial farmers of the Vredendal farmers’ association and beneficiaries of the two case studies who participated in this study and took the time to fill in the questionnaire and/or have an informal interview to discover the perceptions they have of land reform.
- Ms Annelize Crosby (Legal and Policy Advisor of Agri SA), Ms Juanita Pienaar (Professor of Private Law at Stellenbosch University) and Prof Mohammad Karaan (National Planning Commissioner and Dean of the Faculty of AgriSciences at Stellenbosch University), who were willing to answer questions about land reform in South Africa.
- All the staff and fellow students in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Stellenbosch University, for their valued feedback and support.
- My language editor, Ms Marisa Honey, for correcting all my language errors in my thesis.
- Colin Prins, who helped with the design of the snap survey questionnaire and assisted me during the first fieldwork opportunity.
- My heavenly Father for protection and granting me with the strength and ability to finish my thesis.
## CONTENTS

DECLARATION ..................................................................................................................................... ii

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................................... iii

OPSOMMING ....................................................................................................................................... v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .................................................................................................................. vii

CONTENTS ......................................................................................................................................... viii

TABLES ............................................................................................................................................... xii

FIGURES ............................................................................................................................................. xiii

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS ............................................................................................ xiv

CHAPTER 1: SETTING THE SCENE .................................................................................................. 1

1.1 INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................................ 1

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM .............................................................................................................. 2

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES .......................................................................................................... 3

1.4 STUDY AREA ............................................................................................................................. 4

1.5 METHODOLOGY ....................................................................................................................... 8

1.5.1 Literature review .................................................................................................................... 8

1.5.2 Data design and collection ..................................................................................................... 8

1.5.3 Data processing and analysis ............................................................................................... 10

1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN ................................................................................................................ 10

1.7 THESIS STRUCTURE ............................................................................................................... 11

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .............................................................................................. 12

2.1 DEFINING LAND AND AGRARIAN REFORM ..................................................................... 12

2.2 OBJECTIVES OF LAND REFORM .......................................................................................... 14

2.2.1 Political and social objectives .............................................................................................. 14

2.2.2 Economic objectives ............................................................................................................ 15

2.3 TYPES OF LAND REFORM ..................................................................................................... 16

2.3.1 Distributive land reform ....................................................................................................... 16

2.3.2 Tenure reform ...................................................................................................................... 16

2.3.3 Restitution ............................................................................................................................ 16

2.3.4 Land consolidation ............................................................................................................... 17

2.4 APPROACHES TO LAND REFORM ................................................................................. 17

2.4.1 State-led land reform .......................................................................................................... 17

2.4.2 Community-led land reform ............................................................................................... 18

2.4.3 Market-led land reform ....................................................................................................... 19

2.5 STAKEHOLDERS OF LAND REFORM ............................................................................ 20

2.6 INTERNATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORM .............................................. 21
2.6.1 Africa .......................................................... 21
2.6.2 Asia ............................................................ 24
2.6.3 South America ............................................... 27
2.7 CONCLUSION .................................................. 28

CHAPTER 3: LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA .................................................. 31
3.1 INTRODUCTION ................................................ 31
3.2 LAND REFORM POLICIES ................................... 31
    3.2.1 Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) ......................... 31
    3.2.2 The 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy ......................... 32
    3.2.3 The 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform .............................................. 32
    3.2.4 National Development Plan - 2030 ......................................................... 33
3.3 LEGISLATION CONCERNING LAND REFORM ............................................. 36
3.4 LAND REFORM PROGRAMME ........................................ 38
    3.4.1 Land restitution ...................................................... 38
    3.4.2 Land redistribution .................................................. 43
    3.4.3 Tenure reform ......................................................... 48
3.5 ALTERNATIVE REFORM APPROACH: SHARED OWNERSHIP ...................... 51
3.6 CATEGORISATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES .... 52
3.7 THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK ......................................................... 53
3.8 NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORM ...................................... 54
    3.8.1 Successful case studies ....................................................... 55
    3.8.2 Failed case studies ......................................................... 58
3.3 CONCLUSION .......................................................... 60

CHAPTER 4: PERCEPTIONS OF KEY ROLE PLAYERS ON LAND REFORM .......... 62
4.1 INTRODUCTION ...................................................... 62
4.2 POLICY ASPECTS .................................................. 63
    4.2.1 Policy formulation approach ....................................................... 63
    4.2.2 Land accessibility ......................................................... 63
    4.2.3 Women equity ............................................................. 64
    4.2.4 Tenure security ........................................................... 64
    4.2.5 Land acquisition ......................................................... 65
    4.2.6 Sustainability ............................................................. 66
4.3 MANAGERIAL ASPECTS .............................................. 66
    4.3.1 Institutional and organisational arrangement ...................................... 67
    4.3.2 Managerial efficiency and capacity ............................................... 67
4.4 OPERATIONAL ASPECTS .............................................. 68
7.2.4 Lack of government support .......................................................... 121
7.2.5 Beneficiaries’ inexperience and lack of skills concerning farming .................................................. 121
7.3 REVISITING THE OBJECTIVES .......................................................... 121
7.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY .......................................................... 123
7.5 FUTURE RESEARCH ........................................................................... 125
REFERENCES .......................................................................................... 126
PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS ................................................................. 133
APPENDICES .......................................................................................... 135
APPENDIX A: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTION LIST FOR DRDLR OFFICIAL .... 135
APPENDIX B: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTION LIST FOR OTHER KEY ROLE PLAYERS .......................................................... 139
APPENDIX C: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SHAREHOLDERS/BENEFICIARIES OF LAND REFORM PROJECTS ........................................ 144
APPENDIX D: SNAP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COMMERCIAL FARMERS .... 145
TABLES

Table 1.1: Wards of the Matzikama Municipality.................................................................4
Table 1.2: Racial population composition of the Matzikama Municipality..............................6
Table 2.1: Seven facts leading to redistributive reforms in Taiwan, South Korea and Japan........25
Table 3.1: South African legislation regarding land reform....................................................37
Table 3.2: Number of outstanding restitution claims in South Africa....................................41
Table 3.3: Hectares of land transferred by the DRD LR..........................................................42
Table 3.4: Number of land claims settled by the DRD LR from 1995 until 31 January 2012........42
Table 3.5: Total of grants expended by the DRD LR...............................................................43
Table 3.6: Comparison of SLAG and LRAD projects.............................................................45
Table 3.7: Four categories of land reform beneficiaries in South Africa..................................53
Table 3.8: Stakeholders in the land reform process of South Africa.......................................54
Table 3.9: Implementation of the land reform programme in Namaqualand............................55
Table 4.1: Key role players’ perceptions of land reform.........................................................80
Table 5.1: Processes influencing the respondents’ land ownership security............................90
Table 5.2: Implications of land reform policies for respondents’ agricultural productivity........91
Table 5.3: Usage of services provided by service providers to enhance agricultural success.......97
FIGURES

Figure 1.1: Matzikama municipal area.................................................................5
Figure 1.2: Sector view of the Matzikama local economy.......................................6
Figure 1.3: Crop production in the Matzikama Municipality....................................6
Figure 1.4: Total population of towns in the Matzikama Municipality....................7
Figure 1.5: Study area: farms belonging to members of the Vredendal farmers’ association...........7
Figure 1.6: Research design..................................................................................10
Figure 3.1: NPC guidelines to implement land reform..........................................36
Figure 3.2: LRAD grant scale...............................................................................45
Figure 3.3: Implementation cycle of redistribution..................................................46
Figure 3.4: Conceptual framework for FWES implementation...............................52
Figure 5.1: Age of respondents...........................................................................83
Figure 5.2: Respondents’ level of education.........................................................84
Figure 5.3: Respondents’ primary source of income.............................................85
Figure 5.4: Respondents’ secondary source of income.........................................85
Figure 5.5: Respondents’ annual income..............................................................86
Figure 5.6: Percentage of farms in family name....................................................86
Figure 5.7: Percentage of farms in respondents’ name.........................................87
Figure 5.8: Respondents’ methods of acquiring their farm....................................87
Figure 5.9: Land-use change on farms.................................................................88
Figure 5.10: Respondents’ perception of land ownership security..........................89
Figure 5.11: Number of respondents participating in an ESS project.....................93
Figure 5.12: Number of respondents considering starting an ESS project..............93
Figure 5.13: Respondents’ perception of the success rate of ESS projects............94
Figure 5.14: Number of respondents mentoring/training emerging farmers...........95
Figure 6.1a: State-owned land in the Matzikama Municipality.............................103
Figure 6.1b: State-owned land in the Matzikama Municipality (Vredendal area)........104
Figure 6.2: Land reform projects in the Matzikama Municipality..........................105
Figure 6.3: Locations of ESS project case studies.................................................105
Figure 6.4: Alfalfa Boerdery Trust shareholder relationship.................................106
Figure 6.5: The structure of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust..........................................107
Figure 6.6: KEP Boerdery Trust shareholder relationship.....................................111
**ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agri SA</td>
<td>Agri South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>African National Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASGISA</td>
<td>Accelerated Shared Growth Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDE</td>
<td>Centre for Development and Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLaRA</td>
<td>Communal Land Rights Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPA</td>
<td>Communal Property Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRDP</td>
<td>Comprehensive Rural Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>Department of Land Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoA</td>
<td>Department of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRDLR</td>
<td>Department of Rural Development and Land Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS</td>
<td>Equity Share Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESTA</td>
<td>Extension of Security of Tenure Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTLP</td>
<td>Fast Track Land Reform Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWES</td>
<td>farm worker equity share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEP</td>
<td>Kapel-Eikevlei-Pomptuin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRAD</td>
<td>Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDC</td>
<td>Movement for Democratic Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARYSEC</td>
<td>National Rural Youth Service Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDP</td>
<td>National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>nongovernmental organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPC</td>
<td>National Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAS</td>
<td>Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDP</td>
<td>Reconstruction and Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAG</td>
<td>Settlement Land Acquisition Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Surplus People Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSS</td>
<td>Statistical Package for the Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STBB</td>
<td>Smith Tabata Buchanan Boyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLCs</td>
<td>Transitional Local Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANCRAA</td>
<td>Transformation of Certain Rural Areas Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBWS</td>
<td>“willing buyer, willing seller”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZANU PF</td>
<td>Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front</td>
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CHAPTER 1: SETTING THE SCENE

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study by defining the processes that were implemented in order to be able to do the research. A brief introduction is given, followed by the research problem, aim, objectives, study and methodology. The methodology explains how the steps that were followed helped to conduct the research. These steps include the literature review, data design and collection, and data processing and analysis. A brief overview of the study area (Matzikama municipal area) is provided, followed by the research design, which summarises the complete research process, and the thesis structure, which clarifies what each chapter is about.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Land reform is a vital political issue that has been fiercely debated in recent years in South Africa. Against the historical background of colonialism, racial discrimination and political resistance in South Africa (Centre for Development and Enterprise [CDE] 2005), it is not surprising to see headlines mentioning land reform. The politics of land in South Africa has become important to the black majority, putting pressure on the government to deliver and implement proper programmes and initiatives to right the wrongs of the past. Enforced segregation of the population of South Africa under apartheid created separate groups based on racial ethnicity, with each group representing a different political and social position within the system (Waldo 1991).

The destructive legislation that prevailed in South Africa during the 20th century, like the Natives Land Act of 1913, the 1936 Natives Trust and Land Act, and the Group Areas Act of 1950, contributed to destroying independent black farming communities, thus putting more land at the disposal of white commercial farmers (CDE 2005). It is widely believed that white people in South Africa own some 87% of the country’s land, while the black majority own 13% (CDE 2005). These acts laid the foundation for the homeland policy, which was a key policy under the apartheid regime and forced black people to leave the areas they used to live in and move into overcrowded areas allocated to them according to ethnicity (CDE 2005).

A consequence of these apartheid policies is that land reform is now such a sensitive and potentially explosive issue, even though South Africa has changed immensely in comparison to how it was in 1913 (CDE 2005). Land reform can be challenging and complicating for any government, considering all the factors that play a role in why and how this process will be dealt with. According to the CDE (2005:5), “the popular debate on land reform in South Africa is influenced far more by beliefs about this country’s history than by plans for its future wellbeing”.
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1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM

With all the different forces that contributed to the extreme racial imbalance in landholding, particularly the apartheid regime, millions of non-white citizens were forced into overcrowded ‘homelands’ (CDE 2005). The remaining independent black farming communities in the ‘white areas’ were destroyed as a result of moving non-white citizens into ‘homelands’ (CDE 2005). Local communities in the ‘homelands’ were unable to obtain an agricultural subsistence base and received no help from the state, while white commercial farmers were offered every kind of state subsidy and assistance available (CDE 2005).

“At the end of apartheid, approximately 82 million hectares of commercial farmland (86% of total agricultural land, or 68% of the total surface area) was in the hands of the white minority, and concentrated in the hands of approximately 60,000 owners” (Levin & Weiner 1991:92; Lahiff 2007a:2). This was an alarming statistic that the new South African government had to address through the new constitution and by providing policies that focus directly on changing the injustices of the past.

Section 25 of the Bill of Rights declares that “the state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis” (South Africa 1996). One of the essential legislative measures that the state has implemented is the programme of land reform. According to the CDE, the South African government is faced with this relentless burden of implementing an ambitious, restitution-orientated and unrealistic concept of land reform (CDE 2005). Since its implementation, land reform has been criticised for failing to reach its targets or deliver the objectives that the state has set out to accomplish. These objectives include historical redress (return of land to those who were unfairly dispossessed), redistribution of wealth and opportunities, restoration of the extreme racial imbalance in landholding, and economic growth (Lahiff 2007a; 2008).

Official government policy since 1994 has combined all previously mentioned objectives, although there has been a distinctive shift in emphasis over the years, from meeting the basic needs of the very poor to promoting black commercial farmers (Lahiff 2007a). The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) of 1994 provided a clear statement on why there is a need for land reform (Lahiff 2007c:15):

A national land reform programme is the central and driving force of a programme of rural development. Such a programme aims to address effectively the injustices of forced removals and the historical denial of access to land. It aims to ensure security of tenure for rural dwellers. And in implementing the national land reform programme, and through the provision of support services, the democratic government will build the economy by generating large-scale employment, increasing rural incomes and eliminating overcrowding.
Another ambitious aim of the RDP was that (Lahiff 2007a:15):

*The programme must aim to redistribute 30 per cent of agricultural land within the first five years of the programme.*

This target of 30% was evidently an irrational target to meet within the first five years of the programme, and the period was postponed to 2014. The inability to set reasonable and realistic aims that can be accomplished puts immense pressure on the government. Land reform in South Africa has relied on a ‘demand-led’ approach based on self-selection by beneficiaries, thus creating difficulties to meet the demand and ignoring needs that are not communicated in an adequate way (Hall 2009a). The land reform programme has produced a small, stagnant population of beneficiaries (approximately 150 000) who are neither landless nor, in many circumstances, unsuccessful small-scale farmers (Hall 2009a). These beneficiaries contribute to the overall problem that exists when revising the land reform programme.

There are two main problems that are linked directly to the land reform programme and are essential to this study. Firstly, the lack of sufficient and skilled management of newly acquired farms by previously disadvantaged and/or discriminated against citizens. According to Gugile Nkwinti, the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform, at least nine out of every ten land reform projects fail to make a commercial success (SAPA 2010). The failure rate is as a result of inadequate management of farms by black farmers, who lack the necessary skills to make a commercial success of farms that previously flourished economically. Failing agricultural ventures directly affect the food security and economic stability that those farms used to contribute to, and this can create tremendous problems in the near future. Secondly, the land reform programme has no clear database that indicates all the projects that are currently taking place, or where more projects can commence. The lack of keeping track of current projects makes the inquiring about or applying for land reform projects extremely difficult and creates confusion between different levels of government involved in the programme of land reform.

**1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The aim of this study was to determine perceptions on the progress and implementation of land reform in the Matzikama Municipality in South Africa. The objectives of this study were to:

1. Examine the literature on land reform to establish an understanding of what land reform is, what overall objectives it has, what types and approaches exists, and how it has been implemented internationally.
2. Investigate policies, legislation and the land reform programme of South Africa and how these have been implemented nationally.
3. Identify the perceptions that key role players have of land reform and to use these perceptions to assess the current state of the land reform programme in South Africa;

4. Identify the perceptions of commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area on land reform;

5. Determine how successful or unsuccessful land reform projects have been in the Matzikama municipal area by investigating farms that have incorporated it and identify the perceptions of beneficiaries that have participated or are currently part of such a project; and

6. Identify the problems that the land reform programme is experiencing and make recommendations on how to improve the current condition of land reform in the study area.

1.4 STUDY AREA

Matzikama Municipality, from ‘matzi’, meaning ‘he gives’, and ‘kamma’, meaning ‘water’, is situated in Southern Namaqualand and has been declared a category B municipality in terms of Provincial Notice No. 481/2000 of September 2000 (Matzikama Municipality 2010). In 2011 the Matzikama Municipality’s geographical area increased from approximately 8 000 km² to 14 000 km² (Matzikama Municipality 2013). The Municipality is currently divided into eight wards (see Table 1.1). “As of the last local government elections in May 2011 the previous district managed area to the north [see ward 8 indicated in purple in Figure 1.1] of the Matzikama has been incorporated as per notice in the Provincial Gazette Extraordinary 6825” (Matzikama Municipality 2013:8).

Table 1.1: Wards of the Matzikama Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Koekenaap, Lutzville/rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Doring Bay, Strandfontein, Ebenhaeser/ Papendorp, Lutzville Wes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Vredendal North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vredendal North and South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vredendal South/rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Klawer/Trawal/rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Vanrhynsdorp/rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nuwerus, Bitterfontein, Kliprand, Stofkraal, Molsvlei, Rietpoort and Put-se-kloof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Matzikama Municipality 2013:15-18
Matzikama Municipality is located in an arid environment, with the Olifants River as its life-giving arterial (Matzikama Municipality 2010). The river provides the necessary water to maintain the flourish agricultural sector, built mainly on viniculture, thus the population is concentrated along the river (Matzikama Municipality 2010). According to the revised Integrated Development Plan of the Matzikama Municipality (Matzikama Municipality 2013), the municipality has a total population of 67000 residents and the population composition is as follows (see Table 1.2):
Table 1.2: Racial population composition of the Matzikama Municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>50185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Asian</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Matzikama Municipality 2013:45-46

The agricultural sector is the main economic driver in the Matzikama Municipality (see Figure 1.2), with the dominant crop being vineyards (Matzikama Municipality 2013). According to the Matzikama Municipality (2013), almost 68% of the agricultural economy relies on grape farming, which consists of grapes for wine, table grapes and raisins (see Figure 1.3).

Source: Matzikama Municipality 2013:66

Figure 1.2: Sector view of the Matzikama local economy

Source: Matzikama Municipality 2013:67

Figure 1.3: Crop production in the Matzikama Municipality
The Matzikama Municipality covers a vast area, thus a focus study area had to be chosen. As seen in Figure 1.4, the majority of the Matzikama Municipality’s population resides in Vredendal or on immediate farms around Vredendal. The Vredendal farmers’ association is the biggest farmers’ association in the Matzikama Municipality in terms of farmer numbers, and their area of jurisdiction can be seen in Figure 1.5.

**Source: Matzikama Municipality 2013:48**

Figure 1.4: Total population of towns in the Matzikama Municipality

Figure 1.5: Study area: farms belonging to members of the Vredendal farmers’ association
1.5 METHODOLOGY

The methodology describes in which ways this study was conducted. Firstly, an extensive literature review was done to get a better understanding of land reform. Secondly, interviews were conducted and questionnaires were designed to be able to collect the relevant information needed to accomplish the objectives that were set out for this descriptive study. Finally, the data was processed and analysed with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

1.5.1 Literature review

A comprehensive literature review was conducted on land reform – starting with a broad overview of what land reform is and how it is implemented internationally, and then narrowing it down to focus on how it is implemented in South Africa. The literature focuses on how land reform has evolved throughout the centuries, how it is implemented and what it can lead to. By doing an extensive review of the literature regarding land reform a good background was provided for further research that was conducted. The following subjects were discussed in the literature review:

- Defining land and agrarian reform
- Objectives of land reform
- Types of land reform
- Approaches to land reform
- Stakeholders of land reform

1.5.2 Data design and collection

To be able to accomplish the overall aim and objectives that were set out for this study, interviews were conducted with key role players and shareholders/beneficiaries of the ESS projects, while a questionnaire survey was undertaken among commercial farmers to investigate their perception of land reform.

1.5.2.1 Interviews

Qualitative data was collected by conducting interviews with key role players, a commercial farmer of a land reform project in the area and shareholders/beneficiaries of land reform projects. When the key role players were interviewed a structured interview method was chosen, meaning that the researcher asked each respondent the same series of questions. This was done to compare the different or similar views the different key role players have and what suggestions they have on how to improve the current state of land reform in South Africa. The following persons were interviewed as key role players: an official from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR), a member of an agricultural organisation, and academics. For the questions asked in the structured interview with the
DRDLR official, see Appendix A. See Appendix B for the questions asked in the structured interview with a member of an agricultural organisation and academics. The interviews done with the shareholders/beneficiaries of land reform projects were semi-structured to enable the interviewees to speak freely. Seven shareholders of the Alfalfa land reform project and three beneficiaries of the Eikevlei land reform project was interviewed. The interviews held with the shareholders was arranged with them, while the beneficiaries interviewed was done in an informal manner by going to their houses and see if anyone was willing to participate. For the questions asked and topics discussed with the shareholders/beneficiaries of land reform projects, see Appendix C.

1.5.2.2 Questionnaire survey of commercial farmers

An Afrikaans questionnaire was designed in collaboration with a master’s student from the University of Utrecht, Colin Prins. The questionnaire (see Appendix D) consists of four sections of open- (qualitative data) and closed-ended (quantitative data) questions. Section A covered the general information regarding the participant, Section B covered the ownership of the participant’s farm and if land reform has had an affect on their ownership what so ever, Section C focused on land reform policies and how the participant perceives them, and Section D focused on how the participant thought the state should support the participants.

Data collection was done by making use of self-reporting. Self-reporting data came from the questionnaires that were distributed while doing interviews with the commercial farmers belonging to the Vredendal farmers’ association, and by sending questionnaires through the mail to the commercial farmers who belonged to the Vredendal farmers’ association. The Vredendal farmers’ association was used as a focus group, because it was the largest farmers’association in the Matzikama Municipality and it was the only farmers’ association willing make their members’details available for the research done in the area.

By using the membership list of the Vredendal farmers’ association (which consists of 100 members – 83 of those members being commercial farmers), commercial farmers were contacted to arrange meetings so that they could complete the questionnaire and, in some cases, also conduct an interview. Most of the farmers that participated wanted the researcher to complete the questionnaire while discussing the questions, thus making it a time consuming process. The study area was visited twice, during which 15 farmers participated in the questionnaire survey. The questionnaires that were mailed to the members of the Vredendal farmers’ association included a cover letter explaining what the research entailed and a self-addressed envelope to enable the members to mail the questionnaire back. Of the 83 questionnaires that were sent out, only eight were returned, thus the return rate was just under 10%. In total, 23 commercial farmers participated in the questionnaire survey that was used in this study, thus meaning that out of the 83 members that are commercial farmers approximately 28% participated.
1.5.3 Data processing and analysis

The results of the survey questionnaire were analysed with SPSS 19, a computer program used for statistical analysis. By making use of data calculations, such as frequency counts, the results were analysed and represented in figures and tables that were created in Microsoft Excel. The analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire survey served as the foundation for identifying the perceptions of the commercial farmers on land reform. The qualitative data obtained through the interviews with key role players and the shareholders/beneficiaries of land reform projects was analysed by sorting and sifting through the thoughts and perceptions of the interviewees and searching for patterns and connections, thus assembling the data in a significant and understandable manner.

1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN

Figure 1.6 illustrates the research design used in this study.
1.7 THESIS STRUCTURE

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the study by defining the processes that were implemented to be able to do the research, including defining the research problem, the aims and objectives, the study area and the methodology of the study.

Chapter 2 provides a broad overview of the international literature on land reform, focusing on defining land reform and how it has progressed throughout centuries of its implementation. International case studies were examined to illustrate how countries abroad have implemented land reform and what impact land reform has had on a social, economic and/or political level.

Chapter 3 focuses on land reform in South Africa, specifically the land reform programme. It also examines what legislation is in place to be used by the government to implement land reform legitimately. Successful and unsuccessful case studies were also examined to show how land reform has been implemented thus far.

Chapter 4 identifies and analyses the perceptions of key role players. The interviews were held with an official of the DRDLR, a representative from an agricultural organisation, a law professor and a commissioner of the NPC. These key role players provided great insight into the progression of land reform in South Africa and also made suggestions on how to improve the current implementation of the land reform programme.

Chapter 5 focuses on the results and the findings of the data gathered from a snap survey with the commercial farmer members of the Vredendal farmers’ association. The analysis of the data was done on the demographic profile of the farmers, the farmers’ ownership status, their perceptions on land reform policies and what support they need from the government.

Chapter 6 examines the successes and failures of ESS projects in the Matzikama municipal area by reviewing an existing ESS project and a failed ESS project. Each project’s business plan was examined to discover why the specific ESS project was still functional or had failed. The perceptions of the current shareholders in the functional ESS project and the beneficiaries of the failed ESS project were also considered to analyse why the project had succeeded or failed.

Finally, Chapter 7 concludes the study by providing a summary of the analysis and a synthesis of the study. The problems identified with the land reform programme and recommendations on how to improve it are discussed, and limitations and suggestions for future research were identified and discussed. The discussion will now continue by defining land reform, the objectives of land reform, what types of reform exist and what stakeholders are involved in land reform. This chapter also includes international case studies that provided insight on how land reform has been implemented abroad.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the literature concerning land reform. The discussion starts with an overview of what land reform is and how it has evolved over centuries. After discussing how land reform came into existence, international case studies will be discussed to show how countries abroad have implemented land reform and what impact it has had on development of the agricultural sector.

2.1 DEFINING LAND AND AGRARIAN REFORM

To define land reform is not an easy task due to all the different factors that contribute to land reform. These factors include the differences in the history of land acquisition, land types, farming techniques, general social and economic conditions and political aims (Adams 1995). Land reform typically refers to changes in how land ownership is distributed, recorded and administrated (Forsyth 2005). A common view of land reform entails the redistribution of property rights over land from usually large landowners to peasants and/or landless rural labourers (Forsyth 2005). However, the term land reform is more complex and has adopted many different definitions and interpretations over the centuries of implementing this policy, mainly because authors tend to include and exclude certain issues in their conceptualisation and/or place emphasis on different aspects of the land reform process (Forsyth 2005). Some of these interpretations have defined land reform narrowly, by referring to it as a means to provide land to the landless, while others have defined it broadly, by referring to it as a comprehensive programme for the transformation of the whole agricultural economy (Tai 1974).

Lipton (2009) defines land reform as laws that are envisioned to cut poverty by raising the poor’s share of land rights. This definition links to Tai’s interpretation of a narrow definition. He argues that “a broad definition encourages people to interpret land reform differently and to talk past each other”, and makes it easier to exploit the positive emotional charge behind land reform (Lipton 2009:327). Warriner (1969) and Adams (1995:1) also provide a narrow definition of land reform, with Adams defining it as “the redistribution of property or rights in land for the benefit of the landless, tenants and farm labourers”. The narrow definition is preferred because it reduces land reform to its simplest elements (Warriner 1969).

Jacoby (1971) says that land and agrarian reform are terms frequently used to represent any integrated programme that aims to restructure the institutional framework of agriculture with the intention of facilitating social and economic progress within communities. For Ghimire (2001), land reform is a significant change in agrarian structure that can result in increased access to land by the rural poor, as well as secure tenure for the people who actually work on the land. It also includes access to the needed assistance that new owners of the land will need to promote agricultural production (Ghimire 2001).
Fraser (2008:309) mentions that “land reform entails policies, programmes, or actions that alter the distribution of land and the ways in which it is owned or occupied”. Different entities can be influential when it comes to reformation in different countries. Reformation can be instigated by a government, by groups that are interested in reformation, or even by a revolution. If a government decides to implement reformation it is dealt with in a top-down way, while interest groups and revolutionists will have a bottom-up approach to reformation (Fraser 2008).

De Janvry (1981:384) stated that “reform is an institutional innovation promoted by the ruling order in an attempt to overcome economic or political contradictions without changing the dominant social relations”. Reform that changes the main social relations falls short of being called a revolution and goes further than simply disregarding economic difficulties or repressing the demands of politicians (De Janvry 1981).

One of the aims of land reform is to help transform the agrarian structure (which is characterised by a system of social relations and land tenure) and it consequently can change the methods of production in agriculture, the class structure specified by the state and the pattern of land tenure (De Janvry 1981). Thus, land reform can be seen as “an attempt by the government, through public policies, at either inducing a change among states of the agrarian structure or at preventing such a change” (De Janvry 1981:385).

According to Adams (1995:1), the concepts “land reform and agrarian reform are often used interchangeably”. Agrarian reform, embracing advances in both land tenure and the organisation of agriculture, was a concept used to counter communist land reform during the Cold War (Adams 1995). Smith (1972) defines agrarian reform as the appropriation of large portions of land, dividing it into smaller portions and redistributing the land rights of these portions of land to the previously disadvantaged who worked on the land as occupants or labourers.

Agrarian reform is a policy that urges government not only to focus on redistribution, but also to support other rural development measures, such as the improvement of farm credit, the establishment of organisations that will help with farm-input supply and marketing, and the provision of additional services to facilitate the productive use of the reallocated land (Adams 1995). While this sounds promising conceptually, these wider recommendations can discourage government from doing anything until it has found some way to do everything needed to successfully accomplish agrarian reform (Adams 1995).

Taking all these definitions into consideration, it is certain that, even though every country has different factors influencing land reform, the end result is the same – to provide land to the landless. Without land, people cannot develop and create a chance to uplift themselves from their poor livelihoods. In theory, therefore, land can be used as a stepping stone to alleviate poverty. How it plays out in practice
is another story. By giving emerging farmers a chance to change their circumstances by making use of the land provided to them by the state, they can (if they are taught the necessary skills) provide for their families and even contribute to the economy. However, this approach appears to be plagued by mismanagement in the implementation of land reform policies worldwide, yet there are success stories as well.

2.2 OBJECTIVES OF LAND REFORM

Land reform has been a key issue in the economic, social and political development of many countries. Those persons or groups that have control over land and other natural resources are generally also those who have the economic, social and political power (Forsyth 2005). Reform can become a key problem-solving mechanism implemented by governments around the world that are under a great deal of internal and external pressure to change their economic, social or political position. Land reform can be applied to accomplish objectives that can include improving political stability, winning over international support, putting pressure on the opposition or strengthening the reformers’ own position. These objectives can be categorised as political, social and economic.

2.2.1 Political and social objectives

The abolishment of the feudal system that prevailed in Europe during the Middle Ages can be accepted as one of the very first instances of land reform, which entailed the dethroning of the landlord class and shifting its powers to those who started the reformation (Geschwender 2008; Österberg & Van der Molen 1999). By dethroning the landlords it also contributed to the objective of liberating the peasants who were being suppressed and were dependent on these landlords, making it possible for the peasants to become independent citizens (Borras, Kay & Akram-Lodhi 2007).

The struggle for independence and decolonisation, especially after the Second World War, also contributed to land reform in third world countries (Forsyth 2005; Borras Jr, Kay & Akram-Lodhi 2007). Lehmann (1978) and Borras, Kay and Akram-Lodhi (2007) argue that capitalist governments believe that individual private ownership of farms will make a greater contribution to democracy and the economy, and thus base their reformation on providing land to individuals.

In contrast to what capitalist governments believe, communist governments believe that there is “a need to create an alliance of all classes against feudal landlords and imperialism” (Lehmann 1978:339). Communists consider private ownership as a method to exploit citizens who are not able to get access to land. This links to what is argued by Ravallion and Van de Walle (2008a) that the poor rely mainly on farming for their livelihoods, therefore opening up the agricultural markets can be seen as a risky way to incorporate reform.
Land reform has also been used as a tool to resolve political crises or even to avoid a revolution, thus increasing the probability that the ruling party remain in power by pleasing the public (Deininger 1999; Swinnen 1999). In this way, governments aim to win the support of citizens by applying redistributive measures to lessen tension in rural areas and to lay the foundation for capitalism (Lehmann 1979).

According to Ravallion (1989) there is a positive connection between household income and having access to land. Policy makers often try to manipulate this connection to alleviate poverty by using the landowners as an indicator of income (Ravallion 1989). Land reform is a well-known method for policy makers to accomplish social objectives, which include improving the social conditions and position of citizens by redistributing wealth and alleviating poverty. It is argued by Ravallion and Van de Walle (2008a), however, that using this method could also re-establish a class of rural poor farmers if emerging farmers are not supported.

Redistributing land to the landless is only the beginning of helping the poor to improve their social conditions. Without the necessary skills training and support by the government, creating opportunities for the youth of a nation will be pointless. It therefore is crucial that social objectives be accomplished by creating opportunities for the landless to excel and providing them with the necessary services to excel, such as education and health services.

2.2.2 Economic objectives

According to Johnston and Mellor (1961), one of the characteristics of economic development is a significant increase in the demand for agricultural produce, hence failing to do so can seriously hinder economic growth. Rigg (2006) argues that the majority of scholars and development practitioners believe that poverty is found mainly in the rural areas of countries. These rural areas are usually predominately agriculture based, making it a critical resource that is assumed to help alleviate global poverty (Rigg 2006).

It therefore is essential for governments that have implemented land reform policies to ensure that the people getting access to agricultural land are being productive. Traditional small-scale farming has not been focusing on producing labour-intensive produce, thus it is not contributing to the economy and can be seen as land being wasted.

According to Borras Jr, Kay and Akram-Lodhi (2007:5), “many agrarian settings are marked by significant degrees of unemployment and under-employment of labour and relative scarcity of land”. Therefore, it is economically more practical to increase land productivity than rather wasting time trying to increase labour productivity (Borras Jr, Kay & Akram-Lodhi 2007). The overall economic aim of land reform is to coordinate the agricultural sector with the rest of the economy by ensuring the growth in this sector’s contribution to the economy (Johnston & Mellor 1961).
2.3 TYPES OF LAND REFORM

The categorisation of the types of land reform is based on the relationship between the community and the land and/or the rights that are linked to the land. The most universally implemented types of land reform are distributive land reform, tenurial reform, restitution and land consolidation.

2.3.1 Distributive land reform

Distributive land reform is characterised by the redistribution of property rights from one sector to another (Forsyth 2005; Bhatta 2010). According to Forsyth (2005), this type of land reform typically takes place within a capitalist system. Distributive land reform is implemented by privatising state land or by taking land from large landowners and giving it to people who are landless or have a small plot of land (UN/ECE 1996; Bhatta 2010). The recipients of this land tend to be residents who were already working on the farm or had a small share in the farm (Forsyth 2005). Even though distributive land reform has lost some of its earlier significance, it still remains an important component of the approach of developing countries to land reform (Sikor & Müller 2009). The best case example of distributive land reform is the recent land reform process that was implemented in Zimbabwe.

The form of and how redistribution is financed can play a major role in a country’s development. According to Borras and McKinley (2006), redistribution can be implemented in three different ways:

- The confiscation of the land of large landholders;
- Progressive taxation of land; and
- Providing public subsidies to finance land transfers (can be overly expensive).

2.3.2 Tenure reform

Tenure reform is based on land tenure, “that is the terms and conditions on which land is held, used and transacted” (Adams, Sibanda & Turner 1999:2). The main objective of any tenure reform is to improve and ensure the security of people’s land rights, thus specialised state agencies have been established to focus on the registration of individual land claims and land titling (Sikor & Müller 2009). More recently, these agencies have tried to formalise regular claims made by groups and/or to acknowledge the authority that the leaders of those groups have over the land claimed (Sikor & Müller 2009).

2.3.3 Restitution

Land restitution is a restoration or compensation process implemented by the state to return land to its previous owners (Du Plessis 2003). The land usually was removed forcibly by previous governing parties, for example by South Africa’s apartheid regime, which forced millions of black South African citizens to move from their land to townships or homelands allocated to them by the government (Du
Plessis 2003; Bhatta 2010). Restitution generally takes place in two forms: monetary compensation or returning the original land (or if not available, to find alternative land).

2.3.4 Land consolidation

Land consolidation is a “comprehensive reallocation procedure of a rural area consisting of fragmented agricultural or forest holdings or their parts” (Vitikainen 2004:25). The demand for consolidating land has increased because unfavourable land division has led to a decline in using land more effectively (Vitikainen 2004; Bhatta 2010). Every country has a different reason for considering land consolidation, be it because of historical trends, cultural differences or even previous legislation that prevented farmers from buying larger farmland.

2.4 APPROACHES TO LAND REFORM

There are various approaches to land reform that countries, especially developing countries, can implement and/or combine to enhance socio-economic development and help alleviate poverty. There are three main approaches, namely state-led, community-led and market-led land reform.

2.4.1 State-led land reform

In state-led land reform, the national government is responsible for initiating and implementing land reform programmes by using a top-down approach. This approach is expected to help alleviate rural poverty, increase the agricultural productivity and reinforce the new nation state (Sikor & Müller 2009:1308).

State-led land reform was a crucial tool used by national governments around the world from the 1950s to 1980s during social movements or after de-colonisation and independence (Bhatta 2010). State-led land reform has taken various forms, including successful one-time state interventions to create classless peasant ownership, and expropriation to create collectivised agriculture (Borras & McKinley 2006).

For economic redistribution to occur successfully in rural areas the national government will be required to actively support its implementation, especially with regard to advancing the interests of the landless and the land deprived (Borras & McKinley 2006:1). National governments usually overlook the demand for land until they recognise genuine opportunity for progress, thus there is a need for the national government to be well organised and to provide decisive backing for beneficiaries (Borras & McKinley 2006:1).

Bouquet (2009) found some limitations with the approach of state-led land reform (Bhatta 2010:11):

- The state could overlook or misunderstand local systems of property rights, thus resulting in the exclusion of some stakeholders (including secondary rights holders and women);
A problem of corruption could arise, thus obstructing the opportunity for equal opportunities;
Limited resources of the national government.

According to Sikor and Müller (2009), the initiatives of the state regularly do not have support from the relevant local actors, bureaucratic modalities cannot accommodate the varying meanings of land, there are plural notions of property and the political-economic contexts are too diverse. Therefore these factors also limit the efficiency of state-led land reform.

The state-led approach has also been criticised for distorting the market and being ineffective (Borras & McKinley 2006:1). If state-led land reform is successful it could disrupt normal and unequal market relations, but once the transfer of the land is complete, vibrant market relations could regenerate themselves on the basis of a more impartial distribution of wealth (Borras & McKinley 2006:1).

2.4.2 Community-led land reform

Since the state-led approach to land reform has some limitations, it is suggested by Sikor and Müller (2009) that alternatives should be considered. One prospective alternative is based on the community that has gained recognition for being significant in the processes of land reform, referred to as community-led land reform (Sikor & Müller 2009).

According to Sikor and Müller (2009) and Bhatta (2010), this approach implements ‘bottom-up’ political initiatives that are facilitated by the state and are supposed to be more reactive to the political demands and more responsive to local interests, institutions and practices. Some issues that are integrated in this approach are (Sikor & Müller 2009; Bhatta 2010:12):

- The connections with the broader dynamics of authority;
- The responsiveness to local livelihoods;
- The environmental repercussions; and
- The interactions with social inequalities.

Many land reform programmes have considered a community-led approach to land reform, although it has been implemented differently in different countries. Sikor and Müller (2009) mention examples in the Philippines, where indigenous groups have gained constitutional rights to their ancestral land, and in Latin America, where indigenous groups recently received collective titles to customary lands through different programmes that promote customary land titling.

According to Bouquet (2009:1391), “to question the relevance and/or capacity of the state to intervene in land matters in some contexts is not to say that exclusively community-managed property right systems are panaceas”. Powerful outsiders can become intrusive and community members might then struggle to protect themselves (Bouquet 2009). Thus it is the role of the state to support the community
to prevent this intrusion, to enhance the capacity of the community and to provide the necessary legal assistance to ensure tenure security (Bouquet 2009).

2.4.3 Market-led land reform

The market-led land reform approach has built a reputation worldwide since the early 1990s as an alternative to the state-led land reform approach that was implemented widely over the course of the 20th century, primarily due to forceful lobbying by international financial institutions (Forsyth 2005; Lahiff, Borras & Kay 2007). This neoliberal policy framework, most actively promoted by the World Bank, is based on the ‘willing buyer, willing seller’ (WBWS) principle, referring to landowners who voluntarily sell their land to smallholders or to landless farm workers who have a desire to buy the land (Forsyth 2005; Lahiff, Borras & Kay 2007). The smallholders or landless people receive subsidies or their projects are facilitated by favourable loan programmes from the government. Among the first countries to have implemented this approach are Brazil, Colombia and South Africa (Forsyth 2005; Sikor & Müller 2009).

Deininger (1999) envisioned that this approach would be beneficial because it is negotiated land reform (more accepted by stakeholders) and is less costly (more beneficial for the scarce government resources in land reform). Even though this approach can be beneficial, it might not be suitable where the distribution of land is exceptionally unequal and inefficient (Deininger 2003). According to Lahiff, Borras and Kay (2007), resistance to the market-led land reform approach has come from various movements of the landless. Among the factors that this resistance is based on are the high degree of discretion it grants existing landowners, the targeting of a narrow range of more commercially oriented beneficiaries, and a generally slow pace of land transfer (Lahiff, Borras & Kay 2007).

Borras and McKinley (2006:2) mention that the market-led approach “has under-estimated the power of large landlords and capitalist farmers and overestimated the power of the landless and land deprived”. Economic power usually overpowers the equity objectives of land reform programmes, giving large landowners the power to influence local government officials to bias the selection of buyers of land and the assessment of land values (Borras & McKinley 2006).

Due to the problems mentioned above, market-led land reform initiatives have turned into under-funded, localised programmes that address poverty, but never will be able to eliminate poverty (Borras & McKinley 2006). When large landholders decide to sell their land, it is usually a small plot or land that has low agricultural quality, for which they demand high prices (Borras & McKinley 2006).
2.5 STAKEHOLDERS OF LAND REFORM

There are different stakeholders of land reform that have specific roles and responsibilities that are affected by the policies, decisions and actions of land reform (Bhatta 2010). These stakeholders of land reform are the state, the community, the actors of the land market and the beneficiaries of the land.

The state is responsible for implementing land reform programmes and/or initiatives that are appropriate nationally and locally, although the government has to steer clear of the isolation of its responsibilities and mobilise other stakeholders to assist in the implementation of land reform programmes (Bhatta 2010). The state does not only have the responsibility to create policies to address the requirements of landless people, but also has to initiate the capacity building of the community.

The community has different ways to support and contribute to the land reform process (Bhatta 2010):

- Represent the beneficiaries during the land reform process;
- Encourage the formulation of pro-beneficiary policies by lobbying;
- Raise awareness and mobilise society;
- Identify land adequate for land reform;
- Provide assistance during the land acquisition process;
- Facilitate the selection of adequate beneficiaries;
- Conduct training programmes and support post-reform activities;
- Mediate conflict on a local level;
- Monitor land reform activities and outcomes; and
- Help negotiate more affordable market price for the landless and maintain transparency in the market.

The transparency of the actors of the land market is crucial to encourage more beneficiaries, thus giving the land market the potential to improve access to land that the beneficiaries did not have previously due to state funding and resources. Beneficiaries are the key stakeholder in the implementation of land reform. If the beneficiaries do not participate actively in the programmes and motivate others to be more active in the land reform process, it will be a waste of the state’s resources and time. These programmes are implemented to create opportunities and to improve the livelihoods of beneficiaries, so logically, if there is a lack in participation, there will be a lack of successful results.
2.6 INTERNATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORM

Land reform has been implemented by various countries around the world. Each country has its own issues that it has to address, thus each country will have a different approach to land reform in the applicable regions. Implementing land reform successfully in third world countries is extremely difficult and has been one of the greatest practical challenges in agricultural development (Groenewald 2003).

According to Groenewald (2003), the agricultural sectors of third world countries have numerous problems, for instance uneven access to land resources, extreme rural poverty, unproductive use of land and resources, and inequality on a social, economic and political level. These problems, related to the occupation, ownership and use of land, have frequently been at the root of revolutions (Groenewald 2003). Examples from Africa, Asia and South America will be discussed in further detail to provide an overview of why and how land reform has been implemented.

2.6.1 Africa

Africa has always struggled to overcome its colonial heritage, as well as the extended period of internal colonialism in countries like South Africa (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Two features are clearly visible when one focuses on the colonial heritage in Africa.

One of these features, which is present in some regions (especially in European settlement areas), is colonial infiltration, which led to a great amount of land ownership concentration and forcefully removed the African population to less agriculturally significant, more arid land and to land that was situated further away from the markets where trade commences (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Among the examples mentioned by Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) of countries where this has happened is Kenya, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa.

Another feature revealed by Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) is that, even in areas where European settlement was thin, the European concepts of private property rights were gradually introduced, consequently resulting in the displacement of the African tenure system that was based on communal ownership rights. Even after independence, indigenous land institutions continued to be displaced by Western institutions, even though there has been increasing recognition of the suitability of communal systems in the African context (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

Getting rid of communal property rights by replacing them with private property rights did not necessarily provide the improvements in efficiency expected, although it has contributed to increasing inequality in the distribution of productive wealth (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). A brief overview
of how the incorrect implementation of land reform has destroyed a country will be given by looking at Zimbabwe as an example.

2.6.1.1 Zimbabwe

At independence in 1980, “Zimbabwe inherited a highly skewed pattern of land distribution” (Chitsike 2003:2). This resulted in a small minority of white large-scale commercial farmers owning and farming most of the better agricultural land, leaving the majority of the population, mainly black Zimbabweans, to farm in the areas with lower rainfall and poorer soil (Chitsike 2003; Sibanda 2010; Cliffe et al. 2011).

As a result of a variety of pieces of legislation introduced during the colonial era, this dual structure of land ownership, which created the issue of access to land, led to the war of liberation in Zimbabwe (Chitsike 2003). According to Chitsike (2003), negotiations had to be entered into between the liberation armies and the then newly elected Conservative Government in Britain, led by Thatcher, until the Lancaster House Agreement was finally reached.

Zimbabwe’s agricultural sector started to change and slowly reflected the country’s transformed history through an increase in rural-urban migration by black people who previously were not allowed to enter urban areas (Sibanda 2010), thus the “agrarian economy remained articulated around the small farm sector” (Moyo et al. 2000:182). Unfortunately, the land expectations of millions of black people, who were crammed on small pieces of land, were dampened by the Lancaster House Agreement (Sachikonye 2004:69). The Agreement only provided for the resolution of the land issue through the WBWS method of land acquisition (Sachikonye 2004:69).

The Zimbabwe government had to reassess its approach to land reform and, in 1990, parliament passed the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment Act, which limited the degree of protection afforded by the Constitution against the acquisition of land for resettlement purposes, and a new Land Acquisition Act was passed in 1992 (Chitsike 2003). Chitsike (2003:8) mentions that the Land Acquisition Act and the constitution of Zimbabwe together provide for the following:

- Payment for land acquired to be in local currency only;
- Government could now compulsorily acquire land that was being utilised fully;
- Government has to pay fair compensation when acquiring designated land, depending on the guidelines set by the Minister;
- Compensation to be assessed by a “compensation committee”;
- Where there is a dispute about the amount of compensation, the parties can appeal to the Administrative Court for arbitration.

Under the 1992 Land Acquisition Act, a process of land designation was developed that enabled government technical specialists, farmers’ interests groups and policy makers to identify land for
acquisition (Chitsike 2003). Chitsike (2003) explains that designated farms are gazetted to provide notice to landowners, who are given 30 days to write in objection if they so wish, and the designated farms then are processed for evaluation and compensation.

In 2000, the government appointed a commission to assess the Constitution and the Land Acquisition Act to try to increase the amount of land being acquired for resettlement, thus this commission had to look into drafting a new Constitution (Chitsike 2003). The draft constitution consisted of new procedures relating to land acquisition for resettlement and also placed the responsibility for providing compensation for the acquired farms on the former colonial power, in other words the government would no longer have to pay compensation to farmers for their farm, except for infrastructural improvements (Chitsike 2003).

A referendum was held in 2000 to allow the people of Zimbabwe to either accept or reject this new draft of the constitution. The majority of Zimbabwean citizens chose not to accept the draft, entirely due to political reasons. With the election of parliament that same year, the ruling party were under even more pressure to improve their approach to answering the land question in Zimbabwe. The Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU PF) found itself sandwiched between increasing economic issues and aggressive requests from war veterans and other dispossessed people for land redistribution (Sibanda 2010).

In 2003, when Zimbabwe had already been independent for 20 years, “there was not much to show in terms of access to land for the majority of Zimbabweans residing in the communal areas” (Chitsike 2003:9). With the inability to provide what their supporters wanted, ZANU PF was facing stiff competition in the voting polls from the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), which had the backing of the Commercial Farmer’s Union (CFU), wealthy white people and also thousands of urban residents (Sibanda 2010; Cliffe et al. 2011).

With the rejection of the draft constitution, the war veterans of Zimbabwe decided to take matters into their own hands by invading white-owned farms in an impulsive protests supported by the government (Chitsike 2003). Giving permission for farm invasions and for the use of violence in acquiring land was most likely seen by ZANU-PF as a way to mobilise rural support and, in the process, punish its political rivals, including the white farmers, their workers and other supporters of the MDC (Alexander 2006; Cliffe et al. 2011).

The Zimbabwean Government’s condoning of the farm invasions largely contributed to the introduction of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP). FTLRP was formally introduced in 2002 and made way for a new Land Acquisition Act in 2002 that legalised compulsory purchase without compensation for the value of the land (Cliffe et al. 2011). Moyo and Yeros (2005) argue that, by implementing FTLRP, Zimbabwe was providing land to landless black people. According to Cliffe et
al. (2011), the total target of farm land that the FTLRP wanted to acquire was more than 10 million hectares (Utete CMB 2003), almost double what had been the target in the previous land reform programme (Government of Zimbabwe [GoZ] 1998).

With the political struggles that are currently taking place in Zimbabwe it is difficult to see the country’s agricultural sector improving. Zimbabwe had a flourishing agricultural sector until ZANU PF implemented the FTLRP, which has forced commercial farmers out of the country by violently taking their farms and redistributing it to whom they think deserves the land. Without training emerging farmers and no financial support from the government to these farmers, there is a possibility that the farm’s produce capacity could decrease.

2.6.2 Asia

According to Griffin Khan and Ickowitz (2002), five specific Asian countries have successfully renovated their agrarian structures to establish a system of individual peasant farming with highly democratic access to land, namely Japan, Taiwan, South Korea, China and Vietnam. Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) argue that the redistribution of land in these countries possibly was the most comprehensive ever implemented, making their experience supreme. The conditions in all five countries before implementing land reform were alike. Land was extremely scarce, the agricultural sector was enormous, the occurrence of tenancy was high and land ownership was distributed unequally. However, these five countries followed two distinctive paths that eventually led to the creation of a classless peasant farming system (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002:303) claim that “Japan, Taiwan and South Korea followed a policy of land to the tiller and distributed land ownership rights among households in a highly egalitarian manner”, while “China and Vietnam also followed radically redistributive policies after expropriating the landlords, but they quickly replaced peasant farming by collective farming”.

Collective farming was not overturned in China and Vietnam for several decades, but in the end both conformed to a system of individual peasant farming. A brief overview will be given of the two distinctive paths that these five Asian countries took.

2.6.2.1 Taiwan, South Korea and Japan

According to Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) there are a number of elements that contributed to the success of the redistributive reforms implemented in Taiwan, South Korea and Japan. The following (see Table 2.1) are seven facts that contributed to the implementation of this type of Asian land reform in the three countries (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002:307-309).
Table 2.1: Seven facts leading to redistributive reforms in Taiwan, South Korea and Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACT</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Land scarcity</td>
<td>It is argued that if land is scarce there is nothing to redistribute; however, in Taiwan, South Korea and Japan the scarcity was an important justification for redistribution, because land scarcity inevitably is linked to high rents and a high factor share of land in total rural income. The inequality of land ownership creates great inequality and a high rate of rural poverty, thus the greater the scarcity, the stronger the need for the equitable distribution of land. By adopting a low ceiling of land ownership, the maximum amount of land allowed was about 2.5 times the average amount of land available per household in these three countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Two historical accidents: War and the end of colonialism</td>
<td>In Taiwan and South Korea redistribution was made easier when the state received more cultivated land due to the Japanese colonial regime collapsing at the end of the Second World War. The state owned as much as 20% of the cultivated land in the country, thus a significant amount of land was available for distribution before having to expropriate land from local private landowners. In addition, the problem of funding compensation for expropriated land was eased by the fact that the state acquired industrial enterprises that had been abandoned by the departing Japanese, thus enabling the state to provide shares in these enterprises as payment for the expropriated land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Redistribution not based on market principles</td>
<td>Even with the cushion provided by the two windfall gains from historical accidents, there was a substantial element of confiscation of landowners’ property and a substantial element of subsidy to tenant beneficiaries. In South Korea, landowners received between 1.5 and 1.8 times the value of annual output and, in Taiwan, landowners received 2.5 times the value of the annual output of their land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strong and determined governments</td>
<td>In all three cases, the government was not dependent on landowners for support. In Taiwan, the Guomindang government had few ties to the island and the land reforms being implemented on mainland China by the communists made it important for the Nationalist Chinese to create support among the Taiwanese peasantry, thereby reducing the threat of agrarian rebellion. In South Korea, the US military government directed the reforms and was able to do this in part because it had no links to the landed aristocracy. In addition, the threat from North Korea gave added incentive to the reforms when a civilian government came to power in South Korea in 1948. The land reform in occupied Japan was also designed and implemented under the authority of the US military government, thus special circumstances prevailed, as they always do in such cases, e.g. in the transition economies today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tenure reform introduced before land redistribution</td>
<td>In Taiwan, the tenure reforms apparently were successful; they led to a fall in land rents and in land values, which subsequently made it easier to purchase land at low prices. In South Korea, the tenure reforms were not successful; indeed, they led to perverse outcomes that harmed tenants. One explanation for these differences is that, at the time, South Korea did not have strong grassroots rural organisations, although it later developed them, whereas Taiwan created strong rural organisations at the beginning of the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Active participation by intended beneficiaries</td>
<td>When the time came for the government to purchase and re-sell land at below market prices, there were strong local organisations to implement and monitor the reforms and to reduce corruption and bribery. Taiwan had an extensive network of rural institutions; South Korea created an equally extensive network of tripartite land committees, with representatives from the tenants, owners and government; and Japan had its network of locally elected land commissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Different pre-reform institutional arrangements to South Asia</td>
<td>The incidence of agricultural wage labour was low, absentee or non-cultivating ownership was high, and operational holdings appeared to have been distributed evenly. This was certainly true in the case of South Korea. Land redistribution in essence represented a transfer of land titles from the predominantly non-cultivating landlords to the actual tenant cultivators, thus redistribution did not displace those who actually tilled the soil. Farming continued to be carried out by the same people and there was no disruption in production. On the contrary, the improved structure of incentives led to a rapid rise in production. Source: Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz 2002:307-309.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.2.2 China and Vietnam

As mentioned previously, a different path to redistributive land reform was followed by China and Vietnam (Khan 1998; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). In these countries the landlords were removed from power after a revolutionary riot, which resulted in the redistribution of land among peasant households. According to Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002), an egalitarian peasant farming system was created, although this system was soon eliminated to make way for a system of collectivised agriculture. After struggling for decades to create an effective system of collective agriculture, it was
decided once more to distribute the land among individual households, thus reinstating a system of egalitarian peasant farming (Chen & Davis 1998; Marsh and MacAulay 2001; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

The financial cost of transferring land in China and Vietnam was just about nothing after land reform was implemented after a successful revolution, because of the confiscation of land and the reduction in the size of holdings of landlords (Moise 1976; Chen & Davis 1998; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). However, those who came to power after the revolution saw the landowning class as representatives of an old-fashioned feudal order and hence as their political foes (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Vietnam’s land reform was a result of decolonisation, while China’s first land reform effort formed part of a period when the Chinese government rejuvenated the country after being influenced by foreign countries for years and being occupied by the Japanese army during the Second World War (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

Considering the difference between the path China and Vietnam took and the path Taiwan, South Korea and Japan took, the big difference is that China and Vietnam chose to explore the possibilities that collective agriculture could provide (Chen & Davis 1998; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002; Ravallion & Van der Walle 2008b). This, however, was a waste of time and resources, because in the end both countries chose to reinstate a small peasant farming system. Thus a major detour was taken by China and Vietnam. Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) and Ravallion and Van der Walle (2008b) explain that if both countries continued with and reinforced their small peasant farming systems, they might have avoided the long periods of slow growth, the consequent persistence of massive rural poverty, famine and the cultural revolution.

However China and Vietnam would never be able to successfully implement a peasant farming system or a collective farming system, because of the overall framework of central planning they have in place. The following factors are incompatible with efficient agriculture of any type, especially egalitarian small peasant farming systems (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002:315):

- The irrational set of relative prices;
- The arbitrary procurement policies; and
- The bureaucratic control over inputs and agricultural services.

When taking the previously mentioned factors into consideration, along with the choice of central planning, the subsequent choice of collective agriculture may not have been totally illogical (Chen & Davis 1998; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002; Ravallion & Van der Walle 2008b). Small farm systems will more likely flourish in a decentralised economy, where market forces are given the necessary room to function properly (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).
2.6.3 South America

According to Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002), South America’s inequality of land distribution has long been the most unequal in the world. Large landowners in South America, also known as latifundistas, had great influence around 1960, as they owned nearly 80% of the land, even though they constituted only 5% of all landowners (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Small landowners in South America, also known as minifundistas, owned only about 5% of the land, although they were in the majority, at 80% of all landowners (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). The other 15% of the land was owned by a small group of family farms that made up 15% of landowners in South America (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002) mention that, with one third of the agricultural labour force being landless, it forced the landless and most of the minifundistas to work on the latifundistas land as permanent or seasonal farm workers, tied labourers under service contracts, or sharecroppers. The extremity of this inequality contributed to rural unrest, periodic agitation for agrarian reform and occasional social upheaval (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Mexico (1917), Cuba (1959) and Nicaragua (1979) implemented sweeping land reforms, which were a product of war combined with the threat of a profound social-political revolution, as in the case of land reform in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan (Barraclough 1999; Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002).

More modest land reforms took place in countries like Guatemala and Chile, where redistributive measures were reversed or partially rescinded, although the small farmers who had something to gain from these modest reforms were left to their own devices (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002:296). The most significant land reform that was implemented in South America, namely in Mexico, will now be discussed briefly.

2.6.3.1 Mexico

According to Barraclough (1999:10), “the first major twentieth century land reform occurred in Mexico”. The implementation of land reform by the Mexican government “remains one of the most ambitious experiments of its kind” (Heath 1992:695) in South America, both in terms of the vast area it had to cover and the time it took to acquire land for redistribution.

The Mexican revolution began in 1910, only to end officially in 1917 with the approval of a new constitution that initiated land reform (Barraclough 1999). Since then, approximately half of the national territory and two-thirds of Mexico’s agricultural land have been acquired for the reform sector (Barraclough 1999; Heath 1992). However the new political system only stabilised in the late 1930s when the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) reclaimed control of Mexico, including the state and key sectors of civil society at all levels (Barraclough 1999).
The Cárdenas government was faced with the great depression of the 1930s that caused unemployment and an extreme decline in the daily income of people in Mexico (Barraclough 1999). The intensity of land reform in Mexico reached its peak during the Cárdenas administration (1934 to 1940) as the populist coalition mobilised the rural poor as well as the urban workers and important middle-class sectors in support of a wide range of social reforms (Barraclough 1999; Heath 1992). According to Barraclough (1999), about two fifths of Mexico’s agricultural land (approximately 18 million hectares) was seized during the reign of the Cárdenas government.

By 1940, land reform in Mexico had expropriated nearly half the country’s farmlands and had benefited over half of its rural poor (Barraclough 1999; Heath 1992). According to Heath (1992), the land that was acquired for redistribution was redistributed among tenants, workers and the rural poor in *ejidos* (communally owned farms under a system supported by the state). Heath (1992) believes that the distributing land to the rural poor helped to improve the productivity of the agricultural sector by redistributing land that was previously underutilised to farmers who wanted to farm.

By the late 1950s, Mexico was able to become self-reliant in the provision of basic foods because the crop output increased faster than the growth of the population (Heath 1992). However, by the 1960s, the extent to which land agrarian reform could contribute to agricultural growth, which was a land-extensive strategy, was limited, since little prime farmland was left to redistribute (Heath 1992). Furthermore, Heath (1992) mentions that public sector investments, credit and support programmes shifted their focus to large, irrigated farms, thus shrinking the scope for agricultural intensification in the *ejidos*.

After 1970, the government increased spending on rural agriculture in the rain-fed regions to respond to the sudden decline in agricultural growth and the deterioration of the sectoral trade balance (Heath 1992:695-696). Even with the increased investment by the government, agricultural growth in Mexico did not improve as the government hoped it would. When the oil boom took place in the late 1970s, food prices took a dip compared to other prices, and the government developed and implemented the ambitious programme of the Sistema Alimentario Mexicano (1980 to 1982), which intended to use oil profits to promote peasant farming and staple food production (Heath 1992:696). This initiative by the government, however, proved to be unsustainable (Heath 1992). In 1985, Mexico suddenly shifted to economic liberalisation, thus hindering the revival of agriculture and, by 1990, government officials started making public statements that land reform might have been the main reason why the agricultural sector had struggled to grow over the previous 25 years (Heath 1992).

**2.7 CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, literature on land reform was reviewed, starting with a broad overview of what land reform is. When defining land reform, every country has its own factors that have to be taken into
consideration to define it as a whole. Factors mentioned earlier include the differences in the history of land acquisition, land types, farming techniques, general social and economic conditions and political aims (Adams 1995). The overview of definitions provided by numerous scholars in this chapter reveals that, despite the fact that each country has its own problems that contribute to reasons for implementing land reform, each country’s aim is to provide land to the landless, to empower the poor and to ensure that the wrongs of the past are fixed. The literature review focused on how land reform has been implemented internationally. Through internal and external forces putting pressure on the resolution or prevention of social, political or economic crises, the objectives of land reform were formed and used as a problem-solving mechanism. Three categories of land reform objectives were identified:

- Political objectives – Usually developed in countries that struggled for independence and decolonisation, thus resulting in an objective to create democracy or to prevent a revolution in the process.
- Social objectives – Stressing the importance of improving social conditions and the status of the poor by concentrating on methods to alleviate poverty and redistribute income in their favour.
- Economic objectives – To increase the economic development of the country.

The types of land reform generally implemented are distributive land reform (the redistribution of property rights from one sector to another), tenure reform (ensuring the security of people’s land rights), restitution (a restoration or compensation process implemented to return land to its previous owners) and land consolidation (comprehensive reallocation procedure of a rural area). To implement any of these types of land reform, a country has to decide what approach will work best to apply land reform successfully. There are three approaches, namely state-led (national government using a top-down approach), community-led (‘bottom-up’ political initiatives that are facilitated by the state) and market-led (WBWS) land reform. These approaches affect the stakeholders of land reform, who are the state, community, the actors in the land market and the beneficiaries of the land. The stakeholders of land reform play crucial roles in the process of land reform.

The discussion on international experiences of land reform focused on third world countries (most of which have experienced some form of colonisation), where the agricultural sector, in most cases, struggled with problems like limited access to land resources and the inability to use it properly, extreme rural poverty and inequality on all levels in the country (Groenewald 2003). With problems like these it is no wonder that citizens will become rebellious and want to start an uprising against the government.

Land reform has frequently been used to try to stop revolutions and wars from happening, but if not implemented correctly it can ruin a country. Take Zimbabwe for example. Before ZANU PF implemented the FTLRP, the country’s agricultural sector was doing well in comparison to that of other third world countries. However, the majority of the people, especially the war veterans, were unhappy
because they did not have access to land and thus took matters into their own hands by targeting white-owned farms and taking them without the consent of the owner.

In Asia, however, land reform helped the country to redistribute its land more equally, even though land was scarce. The Asian countries that were discussed in this chapter transformed their agricultural land from being distributed unequally and with most of the land being owned by landlords, who exploited the poor, to the creation of an egalitarian peasant farming system that empowered the exploited by providing them with land.

In South America, land inequality has always been a major issue. The inequality of the distribution of land in South America was so intense that 80% of the land was owned by only 5% of landowners (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz 2002). Mexico, where the most significant land reform was implemented in South America, was used as an example of how land reform was implemented in South America. Even with all the effort that the Mexican government put into implementing land reform properly, they still could not revive the agricultural sector. Heath (1992) mentions that when Mexico suddenly shifted to economic liberalisation in 1985 it hindered the revival of agriculture and, by 1990, government officials started considering land reform as the reason why the agricultural sector has been struggling to grow over the 25 years it had been implemented.

The discussion will next shift to land reform in South Africa and a focus on the policies, legislation and programmes that are in place to attempt to implement land reform successfully.
CHAPTER 3: LAND REFORM IN SOUTH AFRICA

Chapter 3 provides an overview of how the land reform programme was shaped, what legislation is in place to support the implementation of land reform, and how it functions in South Africa.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Previous colonial and apartheid policies, specifically the Natives Land Act of 1913, the 1936 Natives Trust and Land Act, and the Group Areas Act of 1950, dispossessed millions of black South African citizens of their land and forced them to move into designated areas such as impoverished reserves, homelands and townships (Aliber & Mokoena 2003; CDE 2005). It has been estimated by the Surplus People Project (SPP) (1983:13) that 3.5 million people were removed from their land.

In 1993 the African National Congress (ANC) drafted its election manifesto and programme that prioritised land reform. When the ANC won the election in 1994, hope arose among black citizens that they would finally be able to claim the land that was previously owned by them. South Africa’s post-apartheid government then implemented extensive and ambitious land reform policies, intended to redress the legacy of centuries of dispossession (Cousins 1997).

The Department of Land Affairs (DLA) was assigned to formulate these policies and the overall land reform programme. There are various acts concerning land reform that have had a major impact on the policies and programmes that are being implemented. Policies include the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy, and the 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform. The land reform programme has three main components, namely land restitution, land redistribution and tenure reform. There are certain visible non-state stakeholders in the land reform process, namely the Legal Resource Centre, the National Land Committee, the Transvaal Agricultural Union, the Land Bank, Agri SA and the Landless People’s Movement. There are four broad models of land use that can be identified, namely individual access to land, group access to land, joint ventures with external parties and contractual arrangements with external parties.

3.2 LAND REFORM POLICIES

3.2.1 Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP)

According to section 2.2.3 of the RDP (African National Congress [ANC] 1994:15), the “central objective of our RDP is to improve the quality of life of all South Africans, and in particular the most poor and marginalised sections of our communities”. This objective should be realised through a process of empowerment that gives the poor control over their lives and increases their ability to mobilise sufficient development resources, including from the democratic government where necessary.
“The RDP reflects a commitment to grassroots, bottom-up development which is owned and driven by communities and their representative organisations” (ANC 1994:15). To improve the quality of life of all South Africans, the government should provide the country with basic needs, one of which the RDP lists as land reform. The RDP provides a clear statement on why there is a need for land reform in section 2.4.2 (ANC 1994:20):

A national land reform programme is the central and driving force of a programme of rural development. Such a programme aims to address effectively the injustices of forced removals and the historical denial of access to land. It aims to ensure security of tenure for rural dwellers. And in implementing the national land reform programme, and through the provision of support services, the democratic government will build the economy by generating large-scale employment, increasing rural incomes and eliminating over-crowding.

An ambitious aim was then set out in section 2.4.14 (ANC 1994:22):

The programme must aim to redistribute 30 per cent of agricultural land within the first five years of the programme.

This target of 30% was evidently an irrational target to meet within the first five years of the programme and, as soon as the government realised this, it extended the period for reaching this target to 2014. The inability to set reasonable and realistic aims that can be accomplished puts immense pressure on the government.

3.2.2 The 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy

According to the former Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Ms AT Didiza, “the White Paper on South African Land Policy was the outcome of an extensive process of public consultation” (Didiza 2006). The land policy focuses on redressing the injustices of apartheid, fostering national reconciliation and stability, underpinning economic growth, improving household welfare and alleviating poverty (DLA 1997; Didiza 2006).

Therefore, the main objectives of the land policy are to distribute land ownership more equitably, secure tenure and use land reform as a tool to alleviate land dispossession and poverty (DLA 1997).

3.2.3 The 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform

According to the DRDLR (2011:4), the main reasons why the government must continue to invest in the transformation of land relations (systems and patterns of land control and ownership) in South Africa is the necessity to encourage national identity, shared citizenship and autonomy-fostering service delivery. The DRDLR (2011:4) argues that the current economic structure of South Africa, which has
been influenced by apartheid, has and continues to produce major factors that challenge the creation of conditions that are advantageous for promoting unity in society and developing those historically dispossessed of their land. The new vision that the DRDLR has for improving and enhancing land reform in South Africa focuses on the following four ideas (DRDLR 2011:4):

1. Create a new design for a single, rational four-tier system of land tenure to ensure that every South African, particularly rural blacks, has access to secure land rights in order to satisfy their basic needs for housing and productive livelihoods.

2. Generate clearly defined property rights that will be sustained by a reasonable, impartial and accountable administration system within an effective judiciary system.

3. Introduce forms of secure long-term land tenure for resident non-citizens involved in appropriate investments that increase food sovereignty, enhance livelihood security and improve agro-industrial development.

4. Implement effective land use planning and monitoring systems that encourage optimal land utilisation, effectively administrate rural and urban lands and apply sustainable rural production systems.

By implementing these ideas and using a set of progressive proposals, the DRDLR wants to improve the trajectory of land reform in an attempt to improve on past and current land reform perspectives and to evade or reduce land redistribution and restitution, which lead to unsustainable livelihoods, employment and incomes (DRDLR 2011).

By doing so, the DRDLR wants to minimise the disruption of agricultural production and try to improve the food security of the country, although the DRDLR never mentions how they are going to achieve this vision. This policy still has to be edited and more thought must go into how land reform can practically be improved.

As a result, important role players, like Agri South Africa (Agri SA), have criticised the DRDLR for not considering what resources are needed to accomplish the vision they have proposed (Agri SA 2011). With the rate at which South Africa’s population grows and the rate at which unemployment increases, it will be a real challenge to accomplish goals like improve food security and create sustainable livelihoods, employment and incomes (Agri SA 2011).

3.2.4 National Development Plan - 2030

According to the National Planning Commission (NPC) (2012:1), "[t]he National Development Plan (NDP) is a plan for the country to eliminate poverty and reduce inequality by 2030 through uniting South Africans, unleashing the energies of its citizens, growing an inclusive economy, building
capabilities, enhancing the capability of the state and leaders working together to solve complex problems”.

The NPC has 26 commissioners, with Mr Trevor A. Manual as the chairperson and Cyril Ramaphosa as the deputy chairperson, who were responsible for creating the NDP, have the responsibility to continue mobilising support, conducting research, giving advice on how to implement the plan in society and reporting on the progress being made in achieving the objectives set out for the NDP (NPC 2012). The following are needed for this plan to be implemented successfully (NPC 2012):

- Citizens should be active in the development process;
- A state that is open to development and able to right the wrongs of historical injustices; and
- Strong leadership in society that works together to solve the country’s problems.

The NDP has to contribute to enhancing the abilities of South Africans to improve their socio-economic conditions and develop the skills South Africa as a country needs to increase their social and economic growth, especially focusing on uplifting the poor.

One of the NDP’s main focuses is to create an integrated and inclusive rural economy (NPC 2012). The NPC (2012:217) mentions that “rural communities require greater social, economic and political opportunities to overcome poverty”. In order to overcome poverty, the NPC suggests that the following key points must be taken into consideration (NPC 2012:217):

- Agricultural development should introduce a land reform and job creation/livelihood strategy that ensures that rural communities have jobs;
- Quality access to basic services, health care, education and food security should be ensured;
- Plans for rural towns should be tailor made according to the varying opportunities in each area.
- Intergovernmental relations should be addressed to improve rural governance.

With the lack of post-reform support from the government, which includes the necessary infrastructure, resources and technical support, it is extremely difficult for beneficiaries to truly settle and use the land acquired to its full potential. For any person to truly invest in business they need the assurance that it could be successful, and the same goes for farming. “To realise opportunities, security of tenure is required” (NPC 2012:221). For farmers to be assured of a steady income they require infrastructure and market institutions that are functioning well.

The beneficiaries of land reform projects in commercial farming areas are expected to provide their own funding to buy land, forcing the beneficiaries to live in debt and putting pressure on the farm’s ability to become profitable. On the other hand, if beneficiaries are supplied with financial support in the form of grants, the government has to provide that funding through the fiscus (NPC 2012). The Land Bank has been identified as a potential partner to resolve the difficulty of entering the commercial
farming sector by providing the funding if the South African government is not able to provide the necessary post-reform support (NPC 2012). According to the NPC (2012:222), “the bank has used explicit and, later, implicit subsidies from government to provide mortgage loans for up to 40 years”.

The NPC (2012) believes that the agricultural sector has the potential to grow exponentially and become a dynamic, employment-creating sector if land reform is implemented correctly. The NPC proposed a model that could lead to land reform being more practical and realistic, based on the following principles that they identified (NPC 2012):

- Increase transfer speed of farms to black beneficiaries without distorting land markets and/or trade confidence in the agribusiness sector.
- Increase the chances of post-reform success by providing beneficiaries with the necessary skills through leadership training, mentoring and enhanced training in agricultural sciences.
- Establish institutions that will monitor the condition of land markets by providing protection from speculation, opportunism and corruption.
- Ensure that the targets for land transfer are coherent with fiscal and economic realities to ensure successful land transfers.
- Create opportunities for white commercial farmers and corporate bodies to contribute to increasing the success rate of land reform through mentorships, chain integration, preferential procurement and meaningful skills transfer.

According to the NPC (2012), every South African district municipality with a commercial farming community should assemble a committee that can be called the District Lands Committee, which should consist of all farm owners in the district and also include important stakeholders from the private sector (commercial banks), the state (DRDRLR) and state agencies (Land Bank). The responsibility of this committee will be to identify 20% of all commercial agricultural land in their district and give the landowners the choice to assist in transferring their land to black beneficiaries (NPC 2012). For this to become a reality, the NPC (2012) suggests the guidelines described in Figure 3.1.

If these guidelines are implemented appropriately it could increase the success rate of land reform, thus increasing job creation and improving agricultural production that, overall, will contribute to the growth of an inclusive rural economy (NPC 2012). Creating a committee that will deal with land reform on a local level will be more practical, because the committee members will know from their own experience of staying in the district how to approach farmers who might be able to participate in this proposed model for land reform.
3.3 LEGISLATION CONCERNING LAND REFORM

The legislation concerning land reform is exceptionally complex and various acts have been implemented by the DRDRLR. The following table (see Table 3.1) is a summary of all legislation concerning land reform and what they entail (DRDRLR 2009:13-14).

Figure 3.1: NPC guidelines to implement land reform

Source: NPC 2012:227
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEGISLATION</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act 22 of 1994)</td>
<td>Enables the restitution of land or the award of equitable redress to persons or communities dispossessed of land as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Act, 2003 (Act 48 of 2003)</td>
<td>Empowers the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform to purchase, acquire in any other manner or expropriate land or rights in land for the purpose of restitution awards or for any related land reform purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill, 2013</td>
<td>Proposes certain amendments to the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act 22 of 1994) to extend the date of lodging a claim for restitution to 18 June 2018; to further regulate the appointment, tenure of office, remuneration and the terms and conditions of service of judges of the Land Claims Court and to further amend certain provisions which are aimed at promoting the effective implementation of the Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Distribution and Transfer of Certain State Land Act, 1993 (Act 119 of 1993)</td>
<td>Enables the distribution and transfer of State land to persons or descendants of persons who were removed from such land and had prior to 27 April 1994 submitted applications to the then Advisory Commission on Land Allocation and the said Commission had confirmed their possible entitlement to such land. It empowers the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform to designate such land to be dealt with in terms of the Act and also appoint a Land Distribution Commissioner to investigate and make awards to such persons who are found to have legitimate claims to such land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act, 1996 (Act 31 of 1996)</td>
<td>Provides temporary protection of certain rights and interests in land which are not otherwise adequately protected by law, until comprehensive new legislation is in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Extension of Security of Tenure Act (ESTA), 1997 (Act 62 of 1997)</td>
<td>Provides for security of tenure to people living on land belonging to another person and regulates the conditions under which the eviction of such people may take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act, 1996 (Act 3 of 1996)</td>
<td>Provides for security of tenure to labour tenants and their associates and for the acquisition of land by labour tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Communal Property Associations Act, 1996 (Act 28 of 1996)</td>
<td>Provides for the establishment of legal entities enabling communities to acquire, hold and manage land on an agreed basis in terms of a constitution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Act, 1994, as amended by the (national) KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Amendment Act, 1997 (Act 9 of 1997)</td>
<td>It provides for the establishment of the Ingonyama Trust with Ingonyama of Isizwe sakwaZulu as the sole trustee, the establishment of the board (KwaZulu-Natal Ingonyama Trust Board), which administers the affairs of the trust and its land and for the vesting of all the land that originally fell within the legislative jurisdiction of the former KwaZulu Legislative Assembly and land that may have been acquired for purposes of transfer to the then KwaZulu Government; and for the transfer of that land to the affected communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LAND PLANNING AND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act and Act Numbers</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Deeds Registries Act, 1937 (Act 47 of 1937)</td>
<td>Is responsible for the administration of the land registration system and the registration of rights in land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Development Facilitation Act, 1995 (Act 67 of 1995)</td>
<td>Takes extraordinary measures to facilitate and speed up the implementation of reconstruction and development programmes and projects in relation to land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Spatial Data Infrastructure Act, 2003 (Act 54 of 2003)</td>
<td>Provides the technical, institutional and policy framework for the capture, maintenance, distribution and use of publicly held spatial information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Land Titles Adjustment Act, 1993 (Act 111 of 1993)</td>
<td>Regulates the allocation of private land in respect of which one or more persons claim ownership, but do not have registered title deeds. It empowers the Minister to designate such land to be dealt with in terms of the Act and to appoint a Titles Adjustment Commissioner to investigate and make findings on such claims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Abolition of Certain Title Conditions Act, 1999 (Act 43 of 1999)</td>
<td>Enables the cancellation of title conditions requiring the consent of the holders of obsolete offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black Authorities Act, 1951 (Act 68 of 1951)</td>
<td>Regulated the administration of certain categories of land and is to be finally repealed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kimberley Leasehold Conversion to Freehold Act, 1961 (Act 40 of 1961)</td>
<td>Enables the conversion of certain land in the Northern Cape to freehold title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Land Administration Act, 1995 (Act 2 of 1995)</td>
<td>Empowers the Minister to delegate any power conferred by or under a law regarding land matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The State Land Disposal Act, 1961 (Act 48 of 1961)</td>
<td>Empowers the Minister to dispose of State land for which s/he is responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Physical Planning Act, 1967 (Act 88 of 1967) and the Physical Planning Act, 1991 (Act 125 of 1991)</td>
<td>Regulated certain aspects of spatial planning and land development, and it is anticipated that they will be repealed as they no longer meet the needs of the developmental state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** DRDLR 2009:13-14.

### 3.4 LAND REFORM PROGRAMME

In 1994, members and advisers of the ANC saw the state as the primary cause of the problems of the past concerning land, and therefore the new state had to play the main role in resolving these problems in the new democratic order (CDE 2005:18). Using the state’s resources to restore land to its rightful owners has been the main approach of the government land reform programme (CDE 2005). This programme has three main components, namely (1) land restitution, (2) land redistribution and (3) tenure reform (CDE 2005; DLA 1997).

#### 3.4.1 Land restitution

The government’s Restitution Programme is based on the provision in section 25(7) of the Constitution (South Africa 1996):
A person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property or to equitable redress.

Thus the aim of the restitution programme is to restore the rights to land or compensation to individuals or communities who lost their property after 19 June 1913 as a result of racially discriminatory laws or practices (CDE 2005). According to the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy, this aim will be accomplished in such a way that it will provide support to the process of reconciliation and development, and also with regard to the consideration of justice for individuals, communities and the country as a whole (DLA 1997).

The restitution programme is based on the provisions of the Constitution and the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994 (South Africa 1994), and in terms of these provisions restitution can take many forms, namely (DLA 1997; Didiza 2006):

- Restoration of the land from which claimants were dispossessed;
- Provision of alternative land;
- Payment of compensation;
- Alternative relief comprising a combination of the above; or
- Priority access to government housing and land development programmes.

All restitution claims are finalised by the Commission of the Restitution of Land Rights, commonly referred to as the ‘Land Claims Commission’ (CDE 2005; Didiza 2006). The Commission facilitates the investigation and verification of the claims, as well as the referral of a claim to the Land Claims Court for ratification or adjudication (Didiza 2006). The qualifications to become a claimant were the following (DRDLR n.d. a):

- Must be a person dispossessed of a right in land after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices.
- It is a deceased estate disposed of by a right in land after 19 June 1913 as a result of past racially discriminatory laws and practices.
- Must be a direct descendant of a person referred to in paragraph (a) who died before lodging a claim and has no descendant.
- The community or part of community dispossessed of a right in land after 19 June 1913 as a result of past discriminatory laws and practices.
- The claim for such restitution is lodged not later than 31 December 1998.

An 18-year timeframe was set out for restitution in the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy, which initially gave claimants three years to lodge claims; however, the final deadline was later
extended to 31 December 1998 (DLA 1997; Hall 2009b). Five years were proposed for the settlement of claims, and an additional ten years for the implementation of all settlement agreements and court orders (DLA 1997; Hall 2009b).

The deadline proposed for the settlement of claims given to the Land Claims Commission was initially 2005, although the deadline was extended to December 2008 to accommodate additional claims and administration concerning the settlements (BuaNews 2011). Even with this extension, the deadline was missed once again and it was extended to 2011, with the Commission asking the Cabinet for an additional R18 billion to settle the outstanding claims (BuaNews 2011).

According to the Land Claims Commission, 79 696 land claims were lodged by the cut-off date for the lodgement of claims, with a total of 76 506 restitution claims that have been settled (Maphoto 2012). The claims that have been settled include some that are partially settled (phased claims and phased payments), and those that have been finalised (Maphoto 2012). With regard to the South African restitution system, any given claim has to go through six broad phases to be processed properly (Du Plessis 2003:6):

1. **Lodgement and registration** – including claim received, acknowledged and registered.
2. **Screening and categorisation** – including background research, screening, feasibility check, and batching.
3. **Determination of qualification** – including consideration, decision, claimant response, possible referral to court for declaratory order, decision on priority, publication in Government Gazette, and the notification of interested parties.
4. **Preparations for negotiations** – including calculation of monetary value of claim, development of remedy options, informed choice by claimant, identification of interested parties, outstanding research and the development of negotiating positions.
5. **Negotiations** – including meetings of parties’ negotiations and mediation process, resulting in EITHER an agreement between the parties, a deed of settlement and Ministerial approval, OR resulting in no agreement and then a referral to court.
6. **Implementation** – including transfer of asset (land transfer, payment of compensation, other), settlement and development planning and post-award support.

Implementing restitution in South Africa was always going to be a challenging task, since this process is trying to right the wrongs of the past (Du Plessis 2003). Challenges faced by the implementation of restitution include onerous information requirements, duplication and confusion of institutional roles, the nature of how claims are settled, legal constraints (for example the process of acquiring land on a willing-seller basis from current owners slows down land restoration cases and increases the cost of the process), and group and communal claims, which are more complex claims to settle (Du Plessis 2003).
The acting Chief Land Claims Commissioner in 2012 presented a progress report on land restitution claims to the portfolio committee on rural development and land reform on 7 February 2012 (Maphoto 2012). According to Maphoto, the Commission decided to start a process in March 2011 to validate the accuracy of information concerning the number of claims lodged and outstanding, while the DRDLR started a process in December 2011 to validate the accuracy of information concerning the commitments made to restitution claimants (Maphoto 2012).

At the progress report session, Maphoto (2012) revealed the number of restitution claims that were still outstanding, restitution claims that had been settled from 1995 until 31 January 2012, the number of hectares transferred from 1995 until 31 January 2012, and how many grants had been expended from 1995 until 31 January 2012.

Considering the number of outstanding restitution claims – 8 770 in total (see Table 3.2), there are still challenges that affect the settlement of claims. According to Maphoto (2012), these challenges include conflict amongst beneficiaries, claims made on unsurveyed or invaded state land, claims made on occupied communal land, claims made on state land that is being leased on a long-term basis, and claims made on state-owned entities, where the municipalities demand compensation valued at market value for the land.

Table 3.2: Number of outstanding restitution claims in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Not researched</th>
<th>Validation</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Gazetted</th>
<th>Verification</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Negotiation</th>
<th>Section 42 D*</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>1 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng &amp; North West</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu – Natal</td>
<td>1 359</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1 117</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>2 927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 346</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1 409</td>
<td>1 247</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>1 226</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>8 770</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Section 42 D of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, Act 22 of 1994, which gives the Minister the power to award claimants land and/or compensation in the case of certain agreements (South Africa 1994).


As seen in Table 3.3, the DRDLR had acquired 2.8 million hectares from private landowners for restitution beneficiaries by 2012 (Maphoto 2012). “Of the 2.8 million hectares, a total of 979 921
hectares has been transferred into the name of claimant communities and the State” (Maphoto 2012:9). According to Maphoto (2012), approximately 140 262 hectares had been transferred to the name of the South African government due to disputes in communities and other challenges.

Table 3.3: Hectares of land transferred by the DRDLR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Total number of ha approved for acquisition</th>
<th>Total number of ha transferred to beneficiaries</th>
<th>Total number of households that benefited</th>
<th>Total number of beneficiaries that benefited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>129 075</td>
<td>95 766</td>
<td>60 370</td>
<td>217 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>51 185</td>
<td>6 333</td>
<td>6 598</td>
<td>43 765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>16 378</td>
<td>8 416</td>
<td>14 030</td>
<td>65 715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>679 092</td>
<td>103 931</td>
<td>78 756</td>
<td>465 667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>556 315</td>
<td>232 231</td>
<td>45 643</td>
<td>234 628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>428 563</td>
<td>113 267</td>
<td>51 197</td>
<td>233 723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>559 634</td>
<td>129 091</td>
<td>19 983</td>
<td>105 987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>378 588</td>
<td>287 765</td>
<td>37 148</td>
<td>171 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>3 838</td>
<td>3 119</td>
<td>25 356</td>
<td>123 857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 802 668</strong></td>
<td><strong>979 921</strong></td>
<td><strong>339 081</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 662 099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Maphoto 2012:8.*

One of the research problems mentioned in the first chapter was that there is no clear database of all the land reform projects and where more can commence. In the progress report presented by Maphoto (2012), he mentions that the DRDLR does not have a comprehensive database with all the details of transferred farms and title deed information, but the DRDLR is in the process of developing a system. The fact that the DRDLR still does not have a system in place to update the necessary database is cause for concern.

According to Maphoto (2012), 76 506 claims have been settled (see Table 3.4), although this number includes claims that have been settled only partially. This makes it difficult to know the exact number of claims that have been settled and how far the partially settled claims are from being settled.

Table 3.4: Number of land claims settled by the DRDLR from 1995 until 31 January 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Claims settled</th>
<th>Number of households</th>
<th>Female-headed households</th>
<th>Number of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Number of hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>16 380</td>
<td>60 370</td>
<td>28 353</td>
<td>217 340</td>
<td>129 075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>2 672</td>
<td>6 598</td>
<td>2 245</td>
<td>43 765</td>
<td>51 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>13 202</td>
<td>14 030</td>
<td>5 432</td>
<td>65 715</td>
<td>16 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>15 081</td>
<td>78 756</td>
<td>24 698</td>
<td>465 667</td>
<td>679 092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>3 384</td>
<td>45 643</td>
<td>17 443</td>
<td>234 628</td>
<td>556 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>2 790</td>
<td>51 197</td>
<td>15 874</td>
<td>233 723</td>
<td>428 563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>3 708</td>
<td>19 983</td>
<td>8 240</td>
<td>105 987</td>
<td>559 634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>3 718</td>
<td>37 148</td>
<td>17 487</td>
<td>171 417</td>
<td>378 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>15 571</td>
<td>25 356</td>
<td>10 685</td>
<td>123 857</td>
<td>3 838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76 506</strong></td>
<td><strong>339 081</strong></td>
<td><strong>130 457</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 662 099</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 802 668</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes claims that are partially settled (phased claims and phased payments) and those that have been finalised.

*Source: Maphoto 2012:7.*
Taking the statistics provided by Maphoto (2012) into consideration, it is clear that the DRDLR is not utilising its budget for grants sufficiently. More than R4 billion (see Table 3.5) has been approved to be used for grants to help beneficiaries finance their farming endeavours, but only close on R9 million has been giving to beneficiaries (Maphoto 2012). As seen in Table 3.5, just more than R3 billion has been committed to projects or beneficiaries, yet the DRDLR struggles to provide these funds to the designated projects or beneficiaries.

Despite the fact that 8 770 claims are still unresolved, the DRDLR (2013) has drafted the 2013 Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill, which has extended the deadline for lodging a claim for restitution to 31 December 2018. The 2013 Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Bill (DRDLR 2013) also makes provision for advertising claims nationally, provincially and in the local district the claim is made in. It also wants to ensure that any fraudulent claims be dealt with as serious offences.

One amendment that could ensure that restitution is more successful is the amendment of section 33 of Act 22 of 1994, which states that, if restoration of a right in land is claimed, the following must be considered (DRDLR 2013:8):

- The feasibility and cost of such restoration; and
- The ability of the claimant to use the land productively.

### 3.4.2 Land redistribution

The second component of the land reform programme in South Africa is focused on the redistribution of agricultural land by transferring ownership of farms from white citizens to black citizens (CDE 2005). It aims to redistribute land among the landless poor, labour tenants, farm workers and emerging farmers for residential and productive uses, thus providing them with the opportunity to improve their
Livelihoods and quality of life (Cliffe 2007). Land for redistribution is identified and acquired by using the WBWS principle, and also how land prices are determined within current South African market-based land reform (Hall 2009a).

According to Lahiff (2007b:6), the “legal basis for redistribution is the Provision 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, but this is no more than an enabling act that empowers the Minister of Land Affairs to provide funds for land purchase”.

Land redistribution has undergone many changes since it was first implemented. According to Kahn (2007), the sub-programme that was implemented was to provide a specific amount to be able to purchase land, known as the Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG). SLAG assists historically disadvantaged people to acquire ownership title to land by initially providing a grant of R15 000, and this amount was increased to R16 000 per household in 1998 (Didiza 2006; Hall 2004). This sub-programme was designed to be flexible, allowing for different types of projects (group settlements, group and individual production, etc.), and with the intention that household could combine their grants and buy land (Didiza 2006; Kahn 2007). The combining of grants did eventually happen, although it resulted in 500 families living on a small portion of land with insufficient individual household land to enable them to even sustain themselves through farming (Kahn 2007; Lyne & Darroch 2003).

Problems that were experienced in the SLAG programme are the following (Didiza 2006:22):

- Drawn-out project cycles;
- Excessive bureaucracy and dependence on outside consultants to formulate project plans without participation by the beneficiaries;
- Over-centralisation of the decision-making process;
- Low levels of complementary support services;
- Lack of partnership and integration between the Departments of Land Affairs and Agriculture;
- Lack of integration with other relevant government departments, non-governmental service providers, non-governmental organisations (NGO) and the private sector;
- SLAG was based on a market-assisted approach, while the land market itself was not restructured; and
- Burdensome sub-division restrictions remained in place, thus forcing beneficiaries to pool their small grants together to be able to purchase the only land available.

As a result of these problems, SLAG was characterised by a slow delivery rate, a considerable number of poorly reviewed and supported projects, a virtually exclusive emphasis on communal property associations, and an insufficient impact on beneficiaries’ incomes and agricultural production (Didiza
Since SLAG performed poorly, a new programme was developed in 1999 by a joint National Task Team, including both the Departments of Land Affairs and Agriculture (Didiza 2006). The new sub-programme, known as the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme, was developed “to contribute more significantly to agricultural development and to extend the target group beyond the poor to include emerging black farmers” (Didiza 2006:23) and was implemented in 2000/2001. This enabled people who did not fit the indigent requirement to also receive the grant provided by LRAD (Kahn 2007). Building on the experiences gained through the SLAG sub-programme, a number of adjustments were made and incorporated into the LRAD sub-programme, as seen in Table 3.6 (Didiza 2006).

Table 3.6: Comparison of SLAG and LRAD projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLAG projects</th>
<th>LRAD projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A grant amount of only R16 000 per household</td>
<td>Grants of R20 000 to R100 000 per individual adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own contribution was not required</td>
<td>Own contribution is required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLAG is linked to the housing subsidy register</td>
<td>LRAD grant is de-linked from the housing subsidy register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants allocated to households</td>
<td>Grants allocated to individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning grants, 9% of R16 000</td>
<td>Planning grant 15% of the total LRAD grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No graduation in grant size</td>
<td>Graduated grant sizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation over-centralised</td>
<td>Implementation decentralised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered all land reform projects</td>
<td>Specific to productive land use agricultural projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Affairs sole implementing agency</td>
<td>Land Bank also appointed as implementing agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Didiza (2006:23), “applicants would be able to gain access to LRAD grants on an individual basis, ensuring that there was no bias against women and the youth”. LRAD grants would be distributed on a sliding scale (Figure 3.2) from R20 000 to R100 000, depending on the contribution (kind, labour and/or money) of the applicant; thus, the more money the applicant can raise, the larger the grant would be (Didiza 2006; Kahn 2007).

The grants provided by the LRAD programme were to be used in a flexible manner to cover land acquisition, land improvements, investments in infrastructure, capital assets and short-term agricultural inputs. The grant was to be used flexibly to cover land acquisition, land

Figure 3.2: LRAD grant scale

improvements, infrastructure investments, capital assets and short-term agricultural inputs (Didiza 2006; Hall 2004). To increase its reach, the programme would have to accommodate a wide range of projects, from food safety-net projects, equity-sharing schemes (ESS) and agriculture in the communal areas, to commercial production for markets (Didiza 2006). According to Lahiff (2007b:7), “under LRAD, grants are provided by provincial land reform offices and, under an agency agreement with the DLA, have also been distributed through the offices of the state-owned Land Bank”. The approach of the LRAD programmes to land acquisition is market-based, while SLAG was focused on a demand-led approach (Lahiff 2007b).

According to the description of the LRAD policy, the phases of a land redistribution project define the responsibilities of applicants in “procedures for implementation” (Hall 2009a:64). Land redistribution projects may differ, although the cycle illustrated in Figure 3.3 can be seen as the dominant official guideline to how redistribution should be implemented (Hall 2009a). The majority of the redistribution projects have involved groups of applicants combining their grants to be able to buy previously white-owned farms for commercial agricultural purposes (Lahiff 2007b). According to Lahiff (2007b), the reason why these group projects have been the popular method of acquiring land is due to the small size of the grant that is available compared to the size and cost of the typical agricultural holding. Many rural communities prefer redistribution, because it extends their existing system of communal land holding (Lahiff 2007b). It thus is clear that most rural communities favour collective ownership.

With the development of LRAD, the government encouraged smaller groups to apply for LRAD,
being able to engage more effectively, they are enabled to design projects and obtain parcels of land that match their needs.

Even though the idea of LRAD is to provide a smaller group of people with more grant money, it is ineffective in making the groups smaller, because land is an expensive commodity. If, for example, a farm costs R2 000 000 and the group that is interested in this farm gets the minimum grant of R20 000 from the government, a 100 people will have to be in this group to obtain enough capital to buy the farm.

The group would then only have bought the farm and will have no additional capital to invest to be able to generate an income from it. Some commercial farmers can barely survive from farming on one farm, so how does the state expect a group of 100 people to make a living on one farm? That is why these grant schemes have failed and why the state has re-evaluated its strategy of implementing land redistribution.

During the National Land Summit of 2005, Minister Didiza (2006) identified that, in order to re-evaluate its strategy towards land redistribution, the state has to implement a proactive land acquisition strategy that will focus on the state providing land to targeted groups in the land market. The implementation of the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS) was believed to “contribute to the higher path of growth, employment and equity by 2014” (DLA 2006:4). This new strategy was approved in July 2003 (DLA 2006).

With two possible approaches that PLAS dealt with, specifically a needs-based and supply-led approach, it therefore was decided that these approaches would be reorganised into one approach: State-driven Proactive Land Acquisition (DLA 2006:4). “This means that the state will proactively target land and match this with the demand or need for land” (DLA 2006:4). When implementing this strategy, the state has to take the objectives of the Accelerated Shared Growth Initiative (ASGISA) into consideration.

The core of ASGISA is that shared growth is a national effort that is not created and implemented by government alone (Mlambo-Ngcuka 2007). ASGISA objectives include increasing the growth in gross domestic product growth and, through this growth, to eliminate poverty and reduce inequalities (Mlambo-Ngcuka 2007). According to Mlambo-Ngcuka (2007:1), “ASGISA’s success depends on how widely its implementation is discussed, prepared and monitored”. The advantages that are associated with PLAS are the following (DLA 2006:4-5):

- To speed up the land distribution process;
- To ensure that the DLA can acquire land in the nodal areas, identified agricultural corridors and other areas of high agricultural potential to meet the objectives of ASGISA;
• To improve the identification and selection of beneficiaries and the planning of land on which people would be settled; and
• To ensure maximum productive use of the land acquired.

The approach that PLAS has adopted is “primarily pro-poor and is based on purchasing advantageous land” (DLA 2007:5). When the government purchases land it takes into consideration the location of the property, if the owner is willing to sell the land, if the land is suitable for the type of farming that the government would like to encourage regarding redistribution, and/or if the land that is being sold is a good bargain (DLA 2007).

On paper, PLAS looks as if it has potential, although it has its limitations. PLAS answers the question of how to get land for redistribution, but leaves unsolved core questions of which land should be purchased and who it is being purchased for (Hall 2009a). This can cause vulnerabilities in the approach, such as the following (Hall 2009a:83):

• Land is being purchased without taking into consideration the needs of the potential beneficiaries;
• The state’s lack in providing proper land-use planning, beneficiary identification, development planning and settlement in time, thus causing problems with the caretakership of the land purchased; and
• Landowners, state officials and/or local elites take advantage of the weaknesses in the process mentioned above by abusing it.

According to Hall (2009a), proactive acquisition can become a component of a broader strategy for acquisition, but giving government officials the authority to spend funds to acquire land can certainly not be a substitute for policy. Consequently an essential link is missing in PLAS, namely a methodology that would engage in ways to include rural beneficiaries to participate in identifying their land needs (Hall 2009a).

3.4.3 Tenure reform

The overarching goal of tenure reform was set out in the RDP in 1994 as being to improve the security of tenure of dwellers on rural, peri-urban farmland and also on communal land (ANC 1994; CDE 2005). As an obligation under the constitution, tenure reform has the ability to secure tenure that is legally insecure as a result of past racial discriminatory laws or practices, or provide the equivalent compensation instead of tenure (South Africa 1996; CDE 2005).

The DLA extended security of tenure in various ways, even though “the tenure reform programme has been the slowest and most difficult aspect of [the] South African land and agrarian reform programme to date” (Didiza 2006:42). However, since 1994, numerous laws have been promulgated to amend the
tenure insecurity of people, be it a community or group of people, in the following areas (Didiza 2006:42):

- Former homeland and ex-South African Development Trust areas;
- Former coloured areas; and
- White commercial farming areas, including the peri-urban areas where farm workers and farm occupiers are generally found.

The government has passed four laws that focus on implementing tenure reform, which are The Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act, 1996 (Act 31 of 1996), The Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act, 1996 (Act 3 of 1996), The Extension of Security of Tenure Act, 1997 (Act 62 of 1997) and The Communal Land Rights Act, 2004 (Act 11 of 2004) (see Table 3.1 for the functions of these acts).

In trying to address the previous problems faced by these acts face in relation to implementing tenure reform, the Green Paper on Land Reform suggested a single land tenure framework that integrates the current multiple forms of land ownership (communal, state, public and private) into a single, four-tier tenure system (DRDLR 2011:6):

1. State and public land: Leasehold;
2. Privately owned land: Freehold, with limited extent;
3. Land owned by foreigners: Freehold, but precarious tenure, with obligations and conditions to comply with; and
4. Communal land: Communal tenure, with institutionalised use rights.

This single, four-tier tenure system proposes enabling South Africans to continue exercising their freehold rights over land. The four-tier tenure system also provides that, in deserving cases, regulatory limitations can be placed on the freehold titles held by South Africans in respect of ensuring the protection of prime and unique agricultural land, sustainable utilisation of land, subdivision of rural/agricultural land, etc. (DRDLR 2012).

These regulatory limitations of the four-tier tenure system can also be placed on “controlled transactions such as transactions valued at a prescribed threshold, non-resident ‘absent-landlord’ properties, and land quantity restrictions” (DRDLR 2012:12). Regulatory limitations can furthermore be placed on the titles held by foreigners in respect of the following (DRDLR 2012:12):

- Strict compliance with obligations and conditions;
- Partnership by foreigners with South Africans in respect of specified land-based investments in the country;
- Sensitive and national security land such as communal, coastal, heritage, rural, agricultural, environmentally-sensitive, security-sensitive, and border lands; and,
• Controlled transactions such as transactions valued at a prescribed threshold, non-resident ‘absent-landlord’ properties, and land quantity restrictions subject to special consent and approval regimes.

The four-tier tenure system proposes that, “for purposes of equitable redistribution, land quantity restrictions/land ceilings, pre-emption rights and rights of first refusal are imposed on freehold titles of both South Africans and foreigners” (DRDLR 2012:12). Considering the complexity and the recent nullification of the Communal Land Rights Act (CLaRA) by the Constitutional Court, this will be treated in a separate policy articulation (DRDLR 2011:6).

It is said that “the most significant move towards reform has been the enactment of the Communal Land Rights Act 11 of 2004 (CLaRA), which provides for the transfer of private title to communal land to ‘traditional communities’ under the control and governance of ‘traditional councils’ comprising tribal authorities and some elected members” (Hall 2009a:10). CLaRA is aimed at the following (CDE 2005:25):

• Recognising and formalising the African communal land tenure system;
• Providing security of tenure to those ‘within this tenure system’;
• Providing for the administration of communal land; and
• Providing for compensating people who hold old, unsecure land rights in communal areas, which the state is unable to legally secure.

The major challenge when considering implementing these acts has been resolving issues that arise when considering tenure reform in a community. The decision that a community has to make about getting compensation or continue with farming on communal agricultural land can cause great division in the community involved (Didiza 2006). The challenges that tenure reform faces are clearly the capacity and resources of the DRDLR internally and externally, including the following (Didiza 2006:50):

• External structures such as law enforcement agencies are still absent;
• Great resistance from certain quarters of the farming community is still being experienced;
• Legal representation remains inadequate;
• Processing the huge number of land claims lodged in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga is daunting;
• Creation of an environment in which land rights are respected; and
• Need for material, institutional and technical support for labour tenants.

Tenure reform aims “to secure the land rights of farm workers, labour tenants and residents in ‘communal areas’ under ‘traditional’ systems” (O’Laughlin et al. 2013). However, new legislation and policies put in place to address this have struggled to achieve this objective (Claassens & Cousins 2008).
This struggle contributes to the conflict between the legal authorities and farmers due to the uncertainty it creates of when land rights will be transferred to the rightful owner(s).

### 3.5 ALTERNATIVE REFORM APPROACH: SHARED OWNERSHIP

Joint ventures are an alternative reform approach that is fundamentally a strategic alliance between two or more groups to start an economic activity to gain a mutual advantage from it (Lahiff 2007a). According to Mayson (2004) there are five types of joint venture that can be implemented to increase reform, namely contact farming, Equity Share Scheme (ESS) projects, municipal commonage schemes, sharecropping and company-supported schemes.

ESS is the more popular choice for a joint venture in South Africa as it is defined in the agricultural sector as a contract in which farm workers or any other previously disadvantaged individuals can purchase shares in a commercial farm or an agricultural processing company (Mayson 2004). In high-value agricultural sectors, particularly the wine industry, ESS is usually considered due to its capital-intensive tendencies and high land prices. The structure that an ESS takes on when considering the South African land reform programme will consist of the farm owners (willing seller) and the farm workers (willing buyers), who receive financial support from the DRDLR.

Another form of state-assisted redistribution that is worth mentioning, even though it will not necessarily expand black land ownership instantly, is farm worker equity share (FWES) schemes (CDE 2005:23). In the early 1990s, FWES schemes were initiated in the Western Cape as a way of redistributing farming assets to black beneficiaries while continuing the capability of commercial farming operations (CDE 2005).

This initiative was initiated by the private sector to increase the redistribution of equity from the commercial farm owner to the farm workers by making them shareholders, thus taking a more empowering approach to that of the conventional land reform programme. This means that the previously privately owned farms will be remodelled into companies, where the commercial farmer still owns the farm, although the farm workers are shareholders and get dividends. According to Knight and Lyne (2004), the following objectives should be accomplished to have a successful FWES:

- Redistribute wealth and future benefit streams;
- Empower farm workers through skills training and include farm workers in the policy-making process;
- Retain or attract quality management;
- Attract the private sector to invest in the FWES by providing financial support;
- Improve worker productivity and labour relations; and
• Provide, in the long term, for the transfer of both ownership and control of commercial farms to the farm workers who were previously disadvantaged.

If a FWES is successful it should be like a corporation in which shareholders are able to vote and get benefits from their investment. To ensure that the workers’ interests are being looked after, a trust can be created and shares can be bought from workers who leave the scheme and then redistribute the proceeds to the worker (KingHo Or 2011). By implementing this system (see Figure 3.4), it will be ensured that only new and current employees can obtain shares in the scheme, thus making sure that the scheme remains exclusive to the farm workers. Even though transferable shares are the ideal that these schemes strive for, a temporary moratorium on the sale of shares should help preserve the solvency of the trust by preventing sudden reductions in equity capital and managerial expertise (KingHo Or 2011:24-25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy and programme interventions</th>
<th>Conceptual framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and macro-policy framework</td>
<td>Sound institutional arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital investment</td>
<td>Conductive macro-policy environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour management relations</td>
<td>Improved management capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and investment policy</td>
<td>Sound institutional arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input market policy</td>
<td>Incentivised workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise choice and market environment</td>
<td>Quality management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand for capital improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand for complementary inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good enterprise performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Lyne & Roth 2004:3.

Figure 3.4: Conceptual framework for FWES implementation

3.6 CATEGORISATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN LAND REFORM BENEFICIARIES

The DRDLR (2009:10) mentions that “poverty and inequity are some of the features that stand out in the South African social development landscape”. To address these features, the DRDLR has to identify the different types of beneficiaries in relation to land reform. These beneficiaries have different interests and are at different levels of development, thus the DRDLR has identified four categories that beneficiaries can be categorised into (see Table 3.7).
Table 3.7: Four categories of land reform beneficiaries in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 1: Landless households</td>
<td>Those who have no space even for gardening, equals over two million rural households. Land allocated will be determined by agri-climatic conditions and will target a certain number of such beneficiary households (inclusive of non-exclusive grazing) with which to engage in subsistence production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 2: Commercial</td>
<td>Ready subsistence producers, those who wish and are capable of having a more commercial focus, but need land and support, mostly on a part-time basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 3: Expanding commercial smallholders</td>
<td>Those who have already been farming commercially on a small scale and with an aptitude to expand, but are constrained by land and other resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY 4: Well-established black commercial farmers</td>
<td>Those who have been farming on a reasonable scale, but are disadvantaged by location and other circumstances, who possess real potential to become large-scale commercial farmers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DRDLR 2009:12.

In the implementation of land reform it is necessary to ensure that we are responsive to the specific needs of the different categories and that the post-settlement support programmes will help these categories to be meaningful role players in economic development.

3.7 THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

It is said that “the emotive, political, economic and social aspects of land have meant that there are numerous stakeholders vying for attention” (Kahn 2007:6). Thus stakeholders who have the largest livelihood stake in the process should be seen as the primary stakeholders (Kahn 2007). According to Kahn (2007), the majority of people who have the most at stake in the process remain voiceless because of poor resources. To empower the people who remain voiceless, particular civil society organisations, for example the National Land Committee, have created a forum to enable the dispossessed and disadvantaged to express their grievances. Even though there frequently are concerns about whose voice is finally represented, it is necessary to integrate the opinions of these civil society organisations into any strategic planning concerning land, as their members are often the people most directly affected by policy decisions (Kahn 2007). With reference to Kahn (2007), the more visible stakeholders in the South African land reform process are shown in Table 3.8.
Table 3.8: Stakeholders in the land reform process of South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>CONTRIBUTION TO THE LAND REFORM PROCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The Legal Resources Centre (LRC)</em></td>
<td>The LRC often represents poor communities during their restitution claims. The LRC has also been one of the leading groups in the fight to stop forced removals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *The National Land Committee*                    | Three objectives (Camay & Gordon 2000:6):  
  - Investigating and influencing the formulation of a just land reform policy in SA;  
  - Establishing and extending land rights and related development resources to communities excluded and dispossessed as a result of apartheid policies; and  
  - Assisting in building community organisations within and across communities so that land rights can be enforced and defended.                                                                 |
| *The Transvaal Agricultural Union (TAU)*         | The TAU was kindly subsidised by the South African government during the apartheid era. During the 1980s and 1990s the union was a hotbed for the recruitment of right-wing activists. In Mpumalanga, a new union was established known as the Mpumalanga Agricultural Union. However, members of the TAU have refused to join the new organisation because it admits black members and has done everything in its power to stop any type of land reform in Mpumalanga. |
| *The Land Bank*                                  | The Bank provides various services for farm development to predominately black farmers. A substantial percentage of the Bank’s clientele would not normally receive funding from ordinary commercial banks. The Bank has not discarded its white clientele and, although this has drawn criticism, the Bank argues that its needs to maintain these relationships in order to remain commercially viable. |
| *Agri SA*                                        | The union was initially resistant to land reform, but recently it has been working, in a limited capacity, with the process. It has illustrated a willingness to cooperate in those aspects of reform, such as the LRAD programme, which fall into the commercially friendly category. The organisation is, however, still strongly opposed to secure tenure on commercial farms because the organisation focuses on the interests of the private sector. |

*Source: Kahn 2007:6-8.*

### 3.8 NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION OF LAND REFORM

According to Hall (2009a:1), “land reform in South Africa is a political project that has foundered”. The process of land reform has been described by numerous people for years as being ‘in crisis’, ‘at a crossroads’, ‘at an impasse’ or ‘simply stuck’, and it still seems likely to be true (Hall 2009a). The pressure that the government is facing to find new solutions to old problems has resulted in nine out of
every ten land reform projects failing to make a commercial success (Hall 2009a; SAPA 2010). However, at least some projects are being managed correctly and have become a commercial success. In the following section, successful and failed cases will be discussed briefly.

3.8.1 Successful case studies

Since successful land reform projects are so scarce in South Africa, it is remarkable that some projects have actually lasted and contribute to the agricultural sector. Two case studies will be looked at, namely land reform in Namaqualand and the Anrene Egg Production project.

3.8.1.1 Namaqualand

The land reform programme of South Africa has three components, namely restitution, redistribution and tenure reform. In Table 3.9 it is illustrated how each component was implemented in Namaqualand.

Table 3.9: Implementation of the land reform programme in Namaqualand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of the Land Reform Programme</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land restitution</td>
<td>The <em>Richtersveld community claim</em> was upheld by the Supreme Court of Appeal (March 2003) and the South African Constitutional Court (October 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land tenure reform</td>
<td>The <em>Transformation of Certain Rural Areas Act 94 of 1998 (TRANCRAA)</em> provides tenure reform in twenty-three former ‘coloured rural areas’, six of which are in Namaqualand. The decision on transfer of ownership from state to municipal authorities or Communal Property Associations (CPAs) is pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land redistribution</td>
<td>The <em>Municipal Commonage Programme (1995)</em> is the main method of land redistribution in Namaqualand. Prior to the establishment of local municipalities in 2000, commonage land was vested in transitional local councils. Since then, municipalities have managed these new communal areas according to Department of Agriculture (DoA) guidelines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Benjaminsen et al. 2006:527.

According to May (2008:38), “most of the land transferred in the first year of the land reform process (1996 to 1997) was in the Namaqualand area in the Northern Cape”. This land was largely transferred as commonage land because the land claims made by many people that fell outside the regulations of restitution (May 2008:38). Restitution in South Africa involves returning land, or providing other compensation, to people who were dispossessed of property after 1913 as a result of apartheid, although it has been argued that the right to restitution did not apply in Namaqualand because land alienation took place before 1913 (South Africa 1996; Benjaminsen et al. 2006).

Some communities within the Northern Cape, however, have successfully receive entitlement to restitution of land. Benjaminsen et al. (2006) mention that recent rulings by the Supreme Court of
Appeal (March 2003) and the Constitutional Court of South Africa (October 2003) have ruled in favour of the Richtersveld community, giving them the entitlement to restitution of the land they claim to be theirs.

The Surplus People Project (SPP), which is an NGO working on land reform in rural development in the Western and Northern Cape provinces (May 2008), helped the Richtersveld community with their restitution claim, which was settled in 2007, although the community was not fully satisfied with what they got in the end (May 2008:38).

TRANCRAA aims to transfer land owned by the state to residents or responsible local institutions (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). According to Wisborg and Rohde (2003; 2005), the prescribed transitional phase of TRANCRAA was applied in the six rural areas of Namaqualand between January 2001 and January 2003, after waiting for the demarcation and organisation of new municipalities.

The SPP, while working with locally selected Transformation Committees, helped by carrying out many tasks during meetings in collaboration with the DLA and the municipalities involved (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). For the transformation process to work, it requires participatory management planning that includes grazing contracts that have to be signed by the new farmers (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). According to Benjaminsen et al. (2006:527), “from November 2002 to January 2003, five of the six rural areas held referenda over land ownership”. The alternatives that the people could have voted for were CPA, municipal ownership or other options suggested by the residents, which included subdivision and individual title (Benjaminsen et al. 2006).

While the majority of the areas (four out of the five areas) voted for CPAs, one voted for municipal control and the sixth area, due to conflicts within the community, never finished the consultation process (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). The Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, however, is responsible for making the final executive decision about the transfer of land (Benjaminsen et al. 2006).

Redistribution in Namaqualand has been managed by a Municipal Commonage Programme that was developed in 1995 to work in collaboration with residents, the SPP, the LRC and the DLA (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). Benjaminsen et al. (2006) state that the De Klerk government made funds available, which were drawn from passed land reform legislation, to purchase privately owned land from farmers and mining companies at market price.

In 2002, according to Anderson and Pienaar (2003), 23% of all land redistributed (1.35 million hectares) in South Africa since 1994 was in Namaqualand. The redistribution process has also increased the availability of land to communities situated in previously ‘coloured rural areas’ in Namaqualand by nearly 21%, thus adding approximately 245 550 hectares (Benjaminsen et al. 2006).
According to Benjaminsen et al. (2006), the Transitional Local Councils (TLCs) received the deeds of redistribution farms to be used exclusively for the benefit of residents in the communal areas managed by them, and for the deeds to be transferred to residents, TLCs had to establish a Commonage Committee to help manage the farms. For resident farmers in communal areas to gain access to the new farms, they have to apply to the Commonage Committees and indicate the number of animals to be moved to the farm (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). However, in many cases, the infrastructure on these new farms is inadequate, it is unclear what management responsibilities the applicants have, and their relocation to the new farm separates them from civilisation except people with access to motorised transportation (Rohde, Benjaminsen & Hoffman 2002).

Commonage Committees granted permits to enable the committees to control the number of animals that grazed in a certain area within the redistributed farms and to implement suggested levels of stock identified by the DLA based on the concept of carrying capacity (Benjaminsen et al. 2006). These regulations, however, were not enforced in the ‘old commonage’, neither were they applied on many of the ‘redistributed farms’ and, from January 2001, the redistributed farms were transferred to municipalities (Benjaminsen et al. 2006).

Namaqualand’s land reform has been quite a dynamic process that allowed teamwork between many actors, but also created conflict in the process. To date, the greatest achievement that Namaqualand accomplished was to expand the amount of land available to farmers in previously rural areas, although the harsh environment, poor infrastructure and insecurity of tenure affect this achievement negatively.

3.8.1.2 Anrene Egg Production project

A good example of a successful land reform project mentioned by the DRDLR (n.d. b) is the Anrene Egg Production project, which is situated in Magaliesburg and functions as a registered company. This egg production of this land reform initiatives is at such an optimum level that it can be regarded as a commercial farm, even though the beneficiaries still classify themselves as emerging black farmers (DRDLR n.d. b).

The DRDLR (n.d. b) bought this farm by using PLAS from the previous owner, who put his farm on the market for the sake of land reform, for R4.5 million, which included all assets on the farm. The beneficiaries are currently leasing the farm from the DRDLR for three years, after which they can purchase the farm directly from the Department (DRDLR n.d. b). Out of the total price of the farm given by the DRDLR, the beneficiaries pay 6% as rental fee for three years as part of the loan agreement with DRDLR (DRDLR n.d. b).

According to the production manager on the farm, John Mogale, the standard production of the farm is between 18 000 and 20 000 eggs (DRDLR n.d. b). Mogale mentions that their production level is higher than their profit margins because of the global rise in feed prices that have put a dent in small to medium-
size enterprises (DRDLR n.d. b). The DRDLR (n.d. b) also mentioned that the project not only focuses on poultry and egg production, but also in breeding livestock to optimise the use of the farmland.

According to the DRDLR (n.d. b), the project has developed reliable markets in the area, such as B&Bs and lodges, and even supplies street hawkers and the local communities. Despite generating many employment opportunities in the area, the beneficiaries are still concerned about the wellbeing of the communities (DRDLR n.d. b). The project donates eggs to a school in their region and even has given eggs to communities that face extreme hunger, thus helping the disadvantaged by giving back to the community what they have received through the project (DRDLR n.d. b).

Another initiative mentioned by the DRDLR (n.d. b) is that the project has employed a number of students from the Tshwane University of Technology (TUT), who do an apprenticeship in Animal Production on the farm. However, after graduating and finishing their apprenticeship they are demotivated by the fact that it is an unpaid apprenticeship.

Even though this project faces some challenges that the DRDLR (n.d. b) has identified, such as building their own feed mill, getting capital for their internship intakes and improving their profit margins to top their production level, the Anrene Egg Production project has become a great example of how black emerging farmers can reach commercial farming status. The challenges may create problems for the project, but these problems cannot threaten the sustainability of the project, at least not in the near future (DRDLR n.d. b).

3.8.2 Failed case studies

As mentioned by the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform, no less than nine out of every ten land reform projects fail to make a commercial success (SAPA 2010). This is a result of many factors, such as the inadequate management of farms by emerging farmers, the lack of necessary skills required to farm, and insufficient capital to invest in the farm after it is acquired. Two case studies will be looked at, namely the Marobala Chicken Trust and the Mmatshehla Trust project in Limpopo Province.

3.8.2.1 Marobala Chicken Trust

The Marobala Chicken Trust is a redistribution project financed by the SLAG programme of the DLA. Early SLAG-based redistribution projects typically consisted of a large group of beneficiaries, and in the case of this specific project there was a grand total of 88 beneficiary households (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). Aliber and Maluleke (2010) identified that most beneficiaries were part of the Marobala community and came from the village of Marobala, which falls under Dikgale (35 kilometres east of Polokwane and 26 kilometres west of Morebeng).
The former owner decided to sell his farm to be used for land reform and, in 1997, he helped organise a beneficiary group (of whom four were workers on his farm) to acquire his farm and the transfer was effected in 1999 (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). According to Aliber and Maluleke (2010:12), “the farm is situated 3 kilometres from Morebeng and comprises 232 hectares” and, according to former farm workers, the previous owner had given the impression that the farm was profitable and that he used the land to its full capacity.

The expectations that the beneficiaries had were that of communally farming the land, accumulate wealth for the first time in their lives and even empowering more people in the process by employing them (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). Even though the project seemed to be functioning reasonably well, the project apparently collapsed due to poor management. Members of the project were paying themselves R1 000 per month, and as the project consisted of 88 members it was clear that the farm would not be able to sustain that amount for long, especially when the previous number of employees on the farm was only nine (Aliber & Maluleke 2010).

There was a brief period of euphoria when the President visited the farm and praised the progress of this project on national television. However, by 2001/2002 the project had deteriorated to such an extent that only about six members remained (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). The production loan that the project had taken out from the Land Bank in the beginning stages of the project has not been paid (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). Interestingly enough, of the six members who remain, four of them are the original four farm workers who were chosen by the previous owner to start this project. This does not suggest, however, that these former farm workers are eager to farm, but may indicate that they have no alternative but to stay on the farm until something happens (Aliber & Maluleke 2010).

According to Aliber and Maluleke (2010), most of the land that is not arable currently is being leased out to a local white farmer who uses it as grazing fields for his livestock, although there still is a small avocado orchard, which is not tended properly but produces some fruit that people in the ‘community’ harvest. Three of the remaining members tried to produce maize and potatoes on a small scale to sell and consume, but they were not able to maintain it for longer than three years (Aliber & Maluleke 2010).

3.8.2.2 Mmatshehla Trust

The Mmatshehla Trust project is another SLAG project in the Morebeng area in Limpopo Province. It occupies 396 hectares of land and was transferred to 60 beneficiaries in 1999 (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). The beneficiaries of this project are all from villages in the surrounding area, and a small number of the beneficiaries were former farm workers who were included when the project was in the development process (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). According to Aliber and Maluleke (2010), the beneficiaries were actively involved in farming crops like maize, pumpkins, beetroot and spinach after acquiring the land.
for this project. Besides the land and the structures located on it, the beneficiaries obtained numerous implements (including vehicles and water pumps), a pigsty and a cattle kraal (Aliber & Maluleke 2010).

The beneficiaries even managed to buy cattle with the ‘balance of the grant’, but, after almost a year and a half had passed, the commitment of the beneficiaries was dwindling (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). According to the beneficiaries they were no longer interested in farming because all the effort they put in was not matched by adequate reward (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). As the unity among the beneficiary group collapsed, a period of chaos followed that resulted in the beneficiaries, and then non-beneficiaries from the area, stripping the assets of the project, excluding the water pumps and other irrigation infrastructure (Aliber & Maluleke 2010). By 2006 the total number of active beneficiaries had shrunk to six, two of whom were former farm workers on the farm (Aliber & Maluleke 2010:14).

3.3 CONCLUSION

This chapter focused on how land reform has been implemented in South Africa. South Africa’s previous colonial and apartheid policies (the Natives Land Act of 1913, the 1936 Natives Trust and Land Act and the Group Areas Act of 1950) dispossessed millions of black South African citizens (Aliber & Mokoena 2003; CDE 2005). The ANC drew up an election manifesto and programme that recognised that land reform was a priority (Aliber & Mokoena 2003; CDE 2005). Various policies and legislation regarding land reform in South Africa were discussed throughout this chapter. The land reform programme of South Africa is divided into three main components. These components are land restitution, which aims to restore the rights to land or compensation to individuals/communities that lost their property after 19 June 1913 as a result of racially discriminatory laws or practices; land redistribution, which aims to redistribute land among the landless poor, labour tenants, farm workers and emerging farmers for residential and productive uses; and tenure reform, which aims to improve the security of tenure of dwellers on rural land, peri-urban farmland and on communal land.

To demonstrate how land reform has been implemented nationally, examples of successful and unsuccessful case studies in South Africa were discussed. After apartheid the ANC government was under immense pressure from the black majority to tend to the land question. The ANC government tried to mend what had been broken by the previous governing party, although the implementation of the land reform project has not always been as successful as the ANC thought it would. An astonishing nine out of ten land reform projects failed to make a commercial success (SAPA 2010).

This chapter also provided examples of successful and failed land reform projects. The examples provided on failed land reform projects clearly illustrated that, if the government does not provide the necessary support and if the beneficiaries have no drive to make a success of farming, the farm will go to waste. The examples of successful projects show that, if the capital is invested properly, the necessary skills are acquired to maintain the farm and, through hard work, the farm can flourish and contribute to
the agricultural sector. This discussion will now continue to the analysis of the perceptions of key role players on land reform. To be able to obtain a broad overview of their opinions, they were asked about the policy aspects, managerial aspects, operational aspects, post-reform support, external factors and impact of land reform in general.
CHAPTER 4: PERCEPTIONS OF KEY ROLE PLAYERS ON LAND REFORM

For the purpose of this research, it was essential to conduct interviews with key role players who have extensive knowledge of and a great deal of experience in land reform in South Africa. Mr Sipho Sityata, the Cape Winelands District Officer of the DRDLR, was chosen for his understanding of how the DRDLR operates and what is expected from the DRDLR by the previously disadvantaged. Prof. Mohammad Karaan, National Planning Commissioner and Dean of the Faculty of AgriSciences at Stellenbosch University, was chosen for his knowledge of the agricultural sector and what the government plans to improve agricultural production and land distribution by using the NDP. Prof. Juanita Pienaar, Professor in Private Law at Stellenbosch University, was a member of the Advisory Committee of the Law Commission (specialised in land legislation from 2008 to 2011) and an acting judge in the Land Claims Court from 2006 to 2007, therefore she was chosen for her legal knowledge of land reform in South Africa. Ms Annelize Crosby is the Legal and Policy Advisor of Agri SA and was chosen for her insight into commercial farmers’ concerns for the success of the agricultural sector in South Africa, as well as the expectations of the commercial farmers from government. Sityata was asked the questions listed in Appendix A and the other key role players listed above was asked the questions listed in Appendix B.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The analysis of the perceptions of key role players on land reform was done by asking the key role players their opinion on different aspects that are associated with land reform. The aspects are the following:

- Policy aspects;
- Managerial aspects;
- Operational aspects;
- Post-reform support;
- External factors; and
- Impact of land reform.

This qualitative data focuses on the overall perception of South Africa’s land reform programme. The structured interview method was chosen to acquire this data, meaning that the researcher asked the same series of questions to each respondent.
4.2 POLICY ASPECTS

The land reform programme is an important tool used by the government to apply the land policy in respect to redistribution and economic growth, thus the land reform programme focuses on rural development and poverty reduction. For the policy aspect of land reform to be analysed, different elements were focused on to get a complete picture of how the land reform programme’s approach to land reform is perceived by the interviewees.

4.2.1 Policy formulation approach

When asked which approach the government uses for policy making (top-down, bottom-up or both), all the interviewees confirmed that the government currently is using a top-down approach. Sityata (2013, Pers com) stated that the government approach was top down, although it also incorporated a consultative approach. This means that when a policy is being written it goes through different stages and, at each stage, different people are consulted, including the community, but the government is still the main creator of the policy (Sityata 2013, Pers com). Crosby (2013, Pers com) revealed that the government was responsible for drafting policies and then consults the public through workshops during which remarks can be made, although the approach to the 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform had been more bottom up in the sense that government created a forum where agricultural organisations, beneficiaries, etc. could express their opinions.

The interviewees had various views when asked which approach they believed should be used. According to Karaan (2013, Pers com), a bottom-up approach to policy formulation is not a better alternative, because the government needs to lead the country and do so in a positive manner to increase national growth. According to Pienaar (2013, Pers com), the government should increase the contribution made on a grassroots level because these are the people who ultimately will benefit from policies being made. Similarly, Crosby (2013, Pers com) believed that the opinions and knowledge of the people whom the policy will have an effect on should be included in the drafting of policies.

4.2.2 Land accessibility

The provision of getting access to land through redistribution has been and still is a time-consuming process. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), the SLAG and LRAD programmes used for providing access to land were too slow, thus the government shifted its focus to PLAS. As discussed in Chapter 3 (section 3.4.2), PLAS gives the government an opportunity to ensure that emerging farmers succeed commercially by leasing farmland for a five-year period. Sityata (2013, Pers com), believes that a five-year period is not long enough for emerging farmers to settle into the commercial farming profession and recommends that the government should consider changing the guidelines of PLAS to a 10-year
leasing period. Without the financial muscle and adequate support through mentoring and training, any emerging farmer would struggle to achieve success commercially (Sityata 2013, Pers com).

When the interviewees were asked how the eligibility of beneficiaries for getting access to land should be assessed they all agreed that the beneficiaries should be capable to farm, but they should not necessarily have been farm workers (Karaan 2013, Pers com). Eligible beneficiaries should have the necessary skills and training that any successful commercial farmer would need to farm efficiently (Crosby 2013, Pers com; Karaan 2013, Pers com).

According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), agricultural land should go through a selection process, which should include criteria like amount of farming experience/training and business skills, as well if the beneficiaries have a passion for farming. According to Pienaar (2013, Pers com), there should be central decision makers who would take the initiative to identify possible opportunities for land reform projects, and this process should be structured and aligned with the community who would benefit from the land reform projects.

### 4.2.3 Women equity

When questions were raised with regard to women having equal access to agricultural land, the interviewees revealed that there was no specific policy or programme that focused specifically on empowering women by giving them access to agricultural land. Sityata (2013, Pers com) mentioned that even though there are no policies aimed at increasing female ownership of agricultural land, women are encouraged to apply for grants and projects if they have the desire to farm.

According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), there is a lot of talk about increasing the number of female farmers, although special provisions are being made for women. The only way that more women can be included in the agricultural sector through redistribution is to include this as a requirement in the selection process (Crosby 2013, Pers com). Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that the policy document should be gender specific and that an effort should be made to recruit and train women who have the desire to farm.

### 4.2.4 Tenure security

When the topic about registered land rights and the level of security of land rights was discussed, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) confirmed that a person can only have tenure security if their land is registered. According to Karaan (2013, Pers com), land rights in South Africa are fairly secure in the sense that it is possible for a person to own land privately. Farmers are concerned about the government’s methods of expropriating land, and that land cannot be appropriated without compensation. The landowner is entitled to get market value for the agricultural land identified for expropriation (Crosby 2013, Pers com; Sityata 2013, Pers com).
With farmers getting frustrated with the Extension of Security of Tenure Act, 1997 (Act 62 of 1997), also known as ESTA, which, according to them, only protects the people who live on their farmland, thus creating conflict between the owner and the ex-employees or other people who do not work on the farm but stay on the farm. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), ESTA was set up to protect both the owner and people living on the land by making sure that the necessary procedures are followed to execute rightful eviction.

As for conflict amongst beneficiaries, Karaan (2013, Pers com) mentioned that collective land ownership will always have its problems, as can be seen in Chapter 5 in relation to the Eikevlei land reform project. Each person’s opinions and objectives are different, thus it is challenging to incorporate all the beneficiaries’ ideas into one programme. Conflict and disputes will always occur amongst beneficiaries if they are not informed about what a land reform project is and how it works.

4.2.5 Land acquisition

With the land acquisition process being tremendously slow in South Africa, it seemed relevant to ask the interviewees their opinion on the current processes used for land acquisition and which methods they believe should be used to improve the redistribution process. From the DRDLR point of view, Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that PLAS is one of the best approaches to redistributing land, but that it should be improved so that the land transfer period is faster. In contrast, Crosby (2013, Pers com) believes that PLAS increases the percentage of land owned by the government instead of it being redistributed to the previously disadvantaged. The government purchases land to distribute it, but with PLAS the beneficiaries never get private ownership of the land (Crosby 2013, Pers com).

According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), Agri SA believed that LRAD has the right components for fair land redistribution, but most projects failed due to poor implementation and inadequate post-reform support. Crosby (2013, Pers com) revealed that it takes the government three to four years to purchase a farm. According to Pienaar (2013, Pers com), the government should initiate a proactive search for land that is already in the market. If the farmer is already willing to sell and the farm has been on the market for a long period, the price might be open for negotiation.

Knowing that the farm is being sold, the farmer will not invest in maintaining the agricultural productivity, thus by the time the government provides the beneficiaries with a farm it has decreased its productive capacity. This makes it difficult for emerging farmers to make a success of their newly acquired farm because they do not have the financial capacity to regenerate the farm’s productive capacity. If more resources are assigned to improve the implementation efficiency of LRAD, land could be transferred more quickly. Available land could be identified faster with the help of local communities (Crosby 2013, Pers com).
Karaan (2013, Pers com), who is a commissioner of the NPC, believes that the government should identify land that is or will be available for transfer, buy this land at 50% of the market value, ensure tenure security, gain black economic empowerment status and create a stepping programme of financing (see section on the NDP in Chapter 3 section). To speed up this process, land acquisition should be district based and executed with the help of the farmers in the district (Karaan 2013, Pers com).

4.2.6 Sustainability

Economic and environmental sustainability are essential for the agricultural sector to flourish, thus the interviewees were asked about the existence of strategies that focus on strengthening economic and environmental sustainability. Pienaar (2013, Pers com) revealed that the government has revised the policy for the Recapitalisation and Development Programme of the DRDLR, which focuses on providing emerging farmers with the social and economic infrastructure and basic resources for success in the agricultural sector on a commercial level (DRDLR 2013). Even though recapitalisation is occurring in projects that are on the verge of failing, this strategy will be very expensive and might not even restore the farm’s productivity capacity.

Karaan (2013, Pers com) mentioned that, for commercial farms to be economically sustainable in the long run, the government has to provide concessionary finance, meaning that the government loans the necessary funds to the emerging farmer at below the normal interest rate. For these emerging farmers then to be able to repay the government they will need market access and the necessary skills to be able to compete commercially.

According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), for land reform projects to be economically and environmentally sustainable this aspect should be included in the planning of the specific project from the start. Each farm has its own carrying capacity, therefore it is critical to ensure that projects are planned around the farm’s carrying capacity (Crosby 2013, Pers com). With the collaboration of the DLA, DRDLR and Department of Environmental Affairs, the economic and environmental sustainability of the land reform projects can be improved (Crosby 2013, pers. com; Sityata 2013, Pers com).

4.3 MANAGERIAL ASPECTS

The management of the land reform programme comprises creating and implementing strategies while making organisational and institutional arrangements and allocating the resources bestowed on the competent authority. The management of the land reform programme has to be assessed regularly to ensure efficiency and proper management in order to improve the management if there are any limitations. To analyse the managerial aspects of the current land reform programme, the interviewees were asked how efficient the DRDLR is and if it have the institutional capacity to execute the land reform programme.
4.3.1 Institutional and organisational arrangement

When discussing whether the DRDLR is centralised or decentralised, the interviewees agreed that the DRDLR is decentralised, although some interviewees emphasised that there is room for improvement. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), each province has its own director that represents the DRDLR and, under these directors, each district has a district officer that oversees the projects in that specific district. The chain of command mentioned by Sityata, however, is not as functional as Karaan would like it to be. Karaan (2013, Pers com) believes that the DRDLR is decentralised to a certain extent, but that this department can be decentralised to district offices, thus making the district officers responsible for the facilitation of land reform in their particular district. The way land reform projects are being overseen by district officers currently is not adequate to improve the success rate of land reform projects in South Africa.

As stated by Crosby (2013, Pers com), the DRDLR is decentralised in theory, although in practice there are gaps between national decision making and grassroots implementation. The implementation of the DRDLR is very poor and therefore often is corruption in local district offices. Communication between the different spheres of the DRDLR (or any organisation in general) is essential for efficiency and to ensure accountability. If the DRDLR does not invest in appointing competent directors and district officers to increase transparency and communication between the national, provincial and local levels, it will be difficult to ensure sufficient delegation.

Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that the DRDLR currently does not delegate sufficiently to handle the daunting task of implementing the land reform programme. Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that the DRDLR should invest more in local government, thus increasing the number and quality of local officers and extending the decentralisation on a local level. For the programme to empower the previously disadvantaged they have to be included in the decision-making process and increase participation on a grassroots level, thus it is logical to expand the local sphere of the DRDLR to enable local government efficiency.

4.3.2 Managerial efficiency and capacity

With the DRDLR struggling to implement the land reform programme, it seemed fitting to ask the interviewees their opinion of the managerial efficiency and capacity of this department. All the interviewees raised concerns about the DRDLR’s efficiency and current capacity to handle the land reform programme. Sityata (2013, Pers com) said that he believed that some regions in South Africa do not have the capacity to implement the land reform programme efficiently. Capable people with the adequate skills to work in the DRDLR should be appointed and the DRDLR employees should undergo continuous training (Sityata 2013, Pers com).
Karaan (2013, Pers com) pointed out that the DRDLR currently was not able to manage the land reform programme adequately, because the DRDLR does not invest in suitable employees to make the correct decisions to increase the efficient implementation of the programme. Many district offices have enough employees, but these employees do not have the agricultural knowledge that is necessary for the implementation of land reform, and thus the government has to rely on consultants (Karaan 2013, Pers com). Consultants have become an expense that the DRDLR could have avoided if it employed people with the essential skills to increase the managerial capacity.

Both Pienaar (2013, Pers com) and Crosby (2013, Pers com) believe that the DRDLR is struggling to accomplish the goals it has set for itself. Crosby (2013, Pers com) emphasised that after 17 years the DRDLR still has not finalised restitution. The DRDLR’s inability to finalise restitution clearly reflects the incapacity that is currently evident in its managerial structure. There clearly is a need for a drastic re-evaluation of the current procedures being applied by management and capable people should be urged to apply for management positions to increase the managerial capacity of the DRDLR, thus increasing efficiency in the process.

4.4 OPERATIONAL ASPECTS

To assess the operational aspects of land reform it is necessary to consider the implementation of the land reform programme’s objectives and strategies by management. Good governance principles are the key to enabling the DRDLR to effectively and efficiently identify the desired outcomes they need. The interviewees were asked about their perceptions of the participation, rule of law, transparency, accountability and overall efficiency of the land reform programme and the previously disadvantaged people involved.

4.4.1 Participation

For any programme or strategy to be successful, the people who started the initiative should not be the only people participating in the implementation process. The beneficiaries play a fundamental role in increasing the success rate of a project by participating in the implementation process and ensuring that their interests are being addressed. When the interviewees were asked about the current level of participation of the beneficiaries involved in land reform projects, all of them indicated that the participation of the beneficiaries was limited. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), the beneficiaries only participate partly in the implementation process of land reform.

Crosby (2013, Pers com) believes that, in theory, all beneficiaries should participate in the implementation process, but CPAs currently are struggling to get along and make collective decisions with regard to the land reform project they are involved with. According to Karaan (2013, Pers com), the beneficiary groups are too big and diverse to include all of them equally in the implementation
process. Big groups create many complications, which include differences in expectations, abilities and willingness, as seen in the Eikevlei land reform project discussed in Chapter 6.

Pienaar (2013, Pers com) mentioned that she believes that not all beneficiaries are being reached or included in the implementation process, because the process is a combined effort by the government and CPAs. Currently the CPAs are representing all beneficiaries and communication between them can be poor, thus decreasing the chance of the beneficiaries’ interests being address by the land reform projects. The communication between the CPAs and beneficiaries has to improve for the government to be informed of all the needs of the beneficiaries.

4.4.2 Rule of law

The legal aspect of the land reform programme is multifaceted, as each sphere involved in the implementation process is considered when enforcing the law. Legal provisions should be dealt with in an impartial manner while protecting the basic human rights of each person involved, thus creating a legal system in which everyone is equal. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), the impartial enforcement of law can be interpreted differently by each party involved.

Sityata (2013, Pers com) stated that ESTA is not biased, because it is designed to protect the landowner and the person living on the land. If the correct procedures are followed by the landowner, people can be evicted from their land legally, but landowners are not satisfied with the current process (Sityata 2013, Pers com). Pienaar (2013, Pers com) revealed that the South African legal system in relation to land reform has taken a conservative approach towards the acquisition of land. According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), the Land Claims Court is impartial and implements legal action in such a manner that all parties are taken into consideration.

With inner conflict amongst the CPAs it is difficult to ensure that all beneficiaries’ legal needs are being taken care of (Sityata 2013, Pers com). With the large number of beneficiaries that CPAs have to represent (Karaan 2013, Pers com), it is not unimaginable that people will feel that some legal actions are being enforced in a biased manner. If the beneficiaries feel that they are not being represented properly by the CPAs it will create chaos and conflict, thus contributing to the difficulty of providing impartial legal provisions.

4.4.3 Transparency

Transparency is vital to develop trust between the DRDLR and the beneficiaries by decreasing the possibility of mismanagement, biasness and corruption, therefore functioning as tool to maintain efficient implementation of the land reform programme. Ensuring transparency requires the DRDLR to grant stakeholders easy access to information regarding the progress of land reform projects and institutional decisions being made on all levels of government. By doing so, thereby ensuring that the
information is provided to the stakeholders in time, necessary criticism can be provided to ensure that the stakeholders adapt to the expected changes. When the interviewees were asked how transparent the DRDLR is in providing beneficiaries information on the land reform programme, the benefits of the programme and their obligations towards the land reform project being implemented, there were mixed responses.

Sityata (2013, Pers com) revealed that the DRDLR facilitates information sessions in which the stakeholders (elected from different communities) engage and get the latest news on the progress of land reform in their community. With a council of stakeholders representing the communities, discussions are simplified because there are fewer people present; however, if transparency is poor between the stakeholders and the community they represent, the overall transparency of the land reform programme can be obscured.

In relation to the above, Karaan (2013, Pers com) believes that the beneficiaries are well informed about the land reform programme itself, although they are not sufficiently informed when it comes to their obligations towards land reform. For a land reform project to succeed, the beneficiaries must be willing to work hard, but in most cases contributions by beneficiaries are unequal, thus contributing to conflict between them.

Contrary to what is mentioned above, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) and Crosby (2013, Pers com) believe that the beneficiaries are not well informed at all. Pienaar (2013, Pers com) mentioned that the level of transparency in South Africa is uneven, meaning that some places are better informed than others, while Crosby (2013, Pers com) revealed that the administration involved in applying for land reform projects is too complex and that the great deal of red tape could be reduced. Misinformation is also common and works against improving transparency, because government might think it is informing the public well enough, but complete clarity is needed.

4.4.4 Accountability

To ensure that the implementing authority (DRDLR) is held accountable for its decisions and methods, stakeholders and beneficiaries should demand to know the standard implementation procedures, the staff of the DRDLR should take responsibility for their duties, and provision should be made for stakeholders and beneficiaries to raise their grievances. The perception that the interviewees have of the level of accountability of the staff of the DRDLR varies, although the overall opinion of the interviewees is that some offices have diligent and knowledgeable personnel.

Karaan (2013, Pers com) believes that the staff of the DRDLR are diligent, but the people in charge of land evaluations and acquisition are corrupt. The process of acquiring land for redistribution takes too long due to a cumbersome bureaucracy, thus making the governing system the real problem (Karaan
2013, Pers com). For the DRDLR to enhance its accountability regarding land evaluations and acquisition they have to create a department that works alongside the DRDLR and then employ individuals who are capable of evaluating land impartially.

Crosby (2013, Pers com) considers the senior staff of the DRDLR to be competent, although the competence of the junior staff shows on examination that they are lacking the essential knowledge and skills required. The DRDLR should facilitate annual training sessions to improve the skills of the employed staff, thus contributing to the overall accountability of the DRDLR. Consistent with what has been said by Crosby, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) revealed that the accountability varies from province to province, for example the staff in Limpopo province do not have the capacity to facilitate land reform properly – the reason being that the current staff component is too small and does not possess the necessary skills to implement the land reform programme.

As for the provision of grievance reporting and hearing, Sityata (2013, Pers com) revealed that the council of stakeholders of the different communities involved in land reform projects are the buffer between the government and beneficiaries. They are responsible for airing the grievances of the communities about the current progress and procedure being implemented in their region. If transparency is lacking between the stakeholders and the community they represent, it directly affects the level of accountability that is needed to implement the land reform programme sufficiently.

4.4.5 Efficiency and effectiveness

To evaluate the efficiency and effectiveness of the land reform programme one has to examine the procedures that are followed to ensure that beneficiaries’ expectations are being met in an uncomplicated and less time-consuming way. Efficiency can also be measured by assessing how cost-effectively the DRDLR utilises its administrative resources, thus it is of the utmost importance to focus on the proper implementation of procedures and allocation of resources to increase the overall strength of executing the land reform programme.

The interviewees had different opinions on the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the DRDLR. Sityata (2013, Pers com) and Karaan (2013, Pers com) believe that the procedures followed by the beneficiaries are not complex at all, but that to implement these procedures is time consuming because of government bureaucracy and the lack of funding for the DRDLR’s budget. If the government would allocate more resources (funding and appointing adequate employees) to the DRDLR to use efficiently the process of redistributing land might speed up and the deadlines could be met.

In contrast to the information in the previous paragraph, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) and Crosby (2013, Pers com) believe that the procedures are complex and multi-levelled, thus decreasing their efficient implementation of land reform. Too much red tape can discourage the previously disadvantaged from
applying for opportunities that could have the potential to uplift them. As for utilising resources efficiently, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) revealed that, if you examine the official documents of the DRDLR it looks as if they are utilising their resources efficiently, although this is not the case in practice considering that they cannot meet the deadlines they set for themselves.

4.5 POST-REFORM SUPPORT

Post-reform support is essential to improve the livelihoods of previously disadvantaged people, thus land reform should not be narrowed down to only providing land. Supportive measures should be implemented to build the capacity of the community on all levels. Capacity building can be done by upgrading the current infrastructure present on the farm, training and any other support that could improve the agricultural productivity of the post-reform farm. The government should invest in research to increase agricultural productivity, as well as to provide the technical services needed to improve the chances of the land reform project being successful and sustainable.

When the interviewees were asked if they knew of any programmes in place that provide beneficiaries with the necessary post-reform training and technical assistance, they indicated that although there were programmes, these were not being implemented properly. Sityata (2013, Pers com) revealed that the DRDLR has established the National Rural Youth Service Corps (NARYSEC) in September 2010 to recruit and develop the rural youth of South Africa who are interested in farming. According to the DRDLR (2010), NARYSEC will “train the youth through Further Education and Training programmes linked to the identified development community projects in rural areas”. The development of the rural youth of South Africa can be done through civic education to provide them with the multidisciplinary skills needed to empower themselves (DRDLR 2010).

This initiative of the DRDLR can increase the amount of support they provide to rural communities aiming to accomplish self-development through the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) (DRDLR 2010). Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that the CRDP has the potential to improve post-reform support in communities currently implementing land reform projects. The CRDP, which was approved by the government in July 2009, aims to respond to poverty and food insecurity by ensuring the effective use and management of South Africa’s natural resources, thus creating self-sufficient rural communities (DRDLR 2009). According to the DRDLR (2009), to be able to create self-sufficient rural communities the CRDP must facilitate social unity and cohesive development through hands-on approaches in which all sectors of society can participate, thus improving the livelihoods of the previously disadvantaged but also correcting past injustices through right-based interventions.

Although NARYSEC and CRDP have the potential to assist the DRDLR to increase the level of post-reform support currently associated with the land reform programme, Karaan (2013, Pers com) believes
that these initiatives are not being implemented and that, once land has been transferred to the beneficiaries, they are left to manage the farm without receiving the support that is apparently out there. Crosby (2013, Pers com) also mentioned that even though these programmes are in place, the beneficiaries need more training and support from the government to increase the chances of accomplishing the overarching goal of the CRDP, which is to create self-sufficient rural communities.

As for the conditions of the basic infrastructure of the redistributed farms, Sityata (2013, Pers com) and Pienaar (2013, Pers com) both believe that the basic infrastructure of post-reform farms varies in the different regions. Karaan (2013, Pers com) credits the time-consuming transfer process with contributing to the decay of the basic infrastructure that farms had before being transferred to the beneficiaries. If the DRDLR could speed up the acquisition process this would contribute directly to sustaining the basic infrastructure that would have been available when the specific farm was acquired.

To sustain the production of farms after transfer the government has to provide the necessary support to maintain or even improve the productivity achieved by the previous owner. This will require the government to provide the beneficiaries with the basic requirements to be able to farm, such as fertilisers and seeds. As was said in the section 4.2.6 under the policy aspects, the Recapitalisation and Development Programme provides the beneficiaries with all the essentials needed for farming successfully. Karaan (2013, Pers com) brought to light that the DoA also provides the beneficiaries with those essentials through the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP). The DoA (2004) states that CASP has to empower the beneficiaries to manage their farms efficiently by focusing on six areas that they have identified as needing support, namely:

- Information and knowledge management;
- Regulatory services, technical assistance and advisory assistance;
- Training and capacity building;
- Marketing and business development;
- On- and off-farm infrastructure and production inputs; and
- Financial assistance.

All these identified areas are in dire need of support, but the government is struggling to accomplish the goals it has set for itself, be it CASP or the Recapitalisation and Development Programme. Crosby (2013, Pers com) believes that the partnership between the DLA, DoA and DRDLR is distorted and that this creates confusion between the different departments on who has to take responsibility for post-reform support.

To improve post-reform success, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) suggests that the implementation process has to be planned thoroughly, meaning that proactive planning must be done for the future. More funds have to be allocated to assist the beneficiaries financially (Pienaar 2013, Pers com; Sityata 2013, Pers...
com). Karaan (2013, Pers com) believes that there should be better integration between the current projects and the markets they have to sell to in the private sector, and that better advisory services are also needed to enhance their chances against accomplished commercial farmers in the region.

4.6 EXTERNAL FACTORS

Like any other system, the processes of the land reform programme can also be influenced by external factors, for instance the beneficiaries’ ability to farm and the expectations that they have of the land reform programme. The land reform programme might be implemented perfectly, but if the beneficiaries are not capable of executing commercial farming to contribute to South Africa’s economy and help strengthen food security, this can put a massive dent in the progress the DRDLR. is trying to make. To examine the external factors influencing the success of the land reform programme, the beneficiaries’ expectations and their capacity have to be taken into consideration.

4.6.1 Beneficiaries’ expectations

With regards to the beneficiaries’ expectations of the land reform programme, most of the interviewees believe that the beneficiaries’ expectations are unrealistic. Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that the beneficiaries’ expectations are achievable if they receive the essential support needed to speed up the implementation of the land reform programme, although the other interviewees disagreed with this statement.

Karaan (2013, Pers com) mentioned that the beneficiaries’ expectations of acquiring a farm were that they would become rich instantly, as they believed all commercial farmers to be rich, but that they lacked the skills and experience to achieve these expectations. The beneficiaries’ expectations should match their abilities, thus it is essential for the government to clarify what exactly is expected of them and to try to align the implementation of the land reform programme with the beneficiaries’ needs.

Pienaar (2013, Pers com) also believes that the beneficiaries’ expectations are unrealistic. One reason why the beneficiaries’ expectations can be seen to be unrealistic are that their expectations are not aligned with what the government expects from them (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). The government expects the beneficiaries to become successful commercial farmers instantly, but with the lack of information provided by the government and the absence of skills required to farm increase the chances of mixed expectations from both parties involved in the implementation of the land reform programme.

Crosby (2013, Pers com) revealed that the beneficiaries were made empty promises by the government that can result in their unrealistic expectations. Overnight success is not accomplishable and was an unrealistic expectation of both the beneficiaries and the government when implementing the land reform programme (Crosby 2013, Pers com). Expecting success without putting in the time and effort needed to succeed in farming, or in anything for that matter, is not the correct mind set to have, considering
that commercial farmers generally grew up farming with their parents and learning the necessary skills from an early age.

4.6.2 Beneficiaries’ capacity

Assessing the capacity of land reform beneficiaries is essential to predict what future the land reform project has and how sustainable it will be in the long run. When the interviewees were asked if the government takes the capacity of the beneficiaries into consideration before the formulation and implementation of strategies used for land reform, Sityata (2013, Pers com) said he believed the DRDLR did take the beneficiaries’ capacity into consideration. Beneficiaries have the capacity to invest in and utilise the acquired land and resources with the help of strategic partners to guide them in the right direction and assist them when need it (Sityata 2013, Pers com).

Identifying the capacity level of beneficiaries across South Africa and considering which developing strategies for land reform should be implemented has always been a problem, although CASP has been trying to address this problem since 2004 (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). Not all beneficiaries in South Africa have the same capacity, thus it is difficult to strategise a programme to implement nationally. Government should consider developing different strategies to be implemented in different situations to address the specific needs of the beneficiaries in that particular circumstance.

According to the other three interviewees, the beneficiaries do not have the capacity to invest in and utilise the acquired land and its resources. The reason for this belief is that the beneficiaries do not know what is expected from them and that, without training to enlighten them, it is not surprising that land reform projects struggle to stay afloat. Beneficiaries should receive adequate training before they receive the land acquired for them through redistribution (Crosby 2013, Pers com). The government expects beneficiaries to know how to farm and run a commercial business instantly. Most successful business owners attained some sort of education or training to provide them with a basic foundation to guide them to run their business effectively.

4.7 IMPACT OF LAND REFORM

Assessing the impact of land reform on previously disadvantaged people who demand land is important in an effort to discover if the current approach to land reform is appropriate and is addressing all the needs of the people involved. Land reform can have a direct and indirect impact on the beneficiaries’ livelihoods, on the productivity of their new acquired farm, and on the sustainability of their new environment. To examine the impact of land reform according to the interviewees, they were asked how they believed land reform has influenced the socio-economic condition and if the beneficiaries are satisfied with the current progress of land reform.
One goal of land reform is to uplift the previously disadvantaged by improving their current level of income, thus it seemed fitting to ask the interviewees if they thought the land reform programme had improved the income level of the beneficiaries. Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that the land reform programme has improved the beneficiaries’ livelihoods with the help of strategic partners, although not every project has diligent strategic partners to help the beneficiaries in times of need. “In some places projects have been successful, thus contributing to improving the livelihoods of the beneficiaries, however these projects usually have mentors that play a very participatory role” (Pienaar 2013, Pers com).

With the unequal results currently being produced by the land reform programme there is no benchmark that the DRDLR can use nationally, because what works in one province might not work in another. Crosby (2013, Pers com) mentioned a study done by Anseeuw and Mathebula, who identified on the basis of results they got from their study in the Mole-mole Municipality (Limpopo Province) that restitution is barely (and in most cases not) improving the livelihoods of the previously disadvantaged in South Africa (Anseeuw & Mathebula 2006). According to Anseeuw and Mathebula (2006), “only one out of five restitution projects could be characterized as sustainable: although it does not benefit much to the beneficiaries, it is maintaining its production”. Maintaining the production of a farm might be beneficial for the food security of South Africa, but the beneficiaries will never be able to improve their livelihoods if they do not ever make a profit.

As for satisfying the beneficiaries, the interviewees raised their concerns that the current land reform programme was hardly satisfactory. Sityata (2013, Pers com) revealed that the beneficiaries were not satisfied with the pace of the land reform programme to redistribute land and right the wrongs of the past. Pienaar (2013, Pers com) said there was a lot of uncertainty amongst the beneficiaries and they were unhappy about the empty promises being made by the government. The beneficiaries have different expectations to those of the government, and this creates confusion between them (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), the beneficiaries frequently complain about the land reform programme.

The land reform programme clearly has some serious issues to address to improve the impact it currently has in South Africa. If the beneficiaries are complaining and unhappy with the way the programme is being implemented, government should consider listening to them and including their suggestions where possible.

4.8 ADDITIONAL PERCEPTIONS

Some general questions were asked of the interviewees to discover how they felt about some key issues identified during the extensive literature review. These issues include the general perspective of the
interviewees on the progress of land reform, the WBWS approach, how commercial farmers feel about the land reform programme and also recommendations on how land reform can be improved.

Sityata’s (2013, Pers com) perspective on the progress of land reform in general is that it is still very slow and that drastic improvement is needed in the processes used to acquire land. He believes that if the prices of land were regulated by one department it could speed up the acquisition process and also ensure that the price of land is reasonable (Sityata 2013, Pers com). As for his thoughts on the WBWS approach, Sityata (2013, Pers com) considers it to be one of the reasons why the acquisition process has been so slow. Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that the WBWS approach affects the asking price of the farm owners in that they try to exploit the government by trying to sell their land for an unreasonable price. Therefore it is essential that the government appoints one entity that is in charge of doing all land audits in South Africa to ensure reasonable prices (Sityata 2013, Pers com).

A problem that some farmers associate with land reform is that agricultural production decreases due to the failure of land reform projects, therefore it seemed appropriate to ask Sityata what he thought could be done about reversing this so-called trend of decreasing agricultural production. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), food security should be intensified by creating value chains in which the markets are not the only entity that is in control of food prices. Sityata (2013, Pers com) suggested that there should be no buffer between the commercial farmers and the commercial market to which they sell their produce. As for the surplus of produce, Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that commercial farmers should distribute any surplus produce to the poor of South Africa.

Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes that ESS projects should not even be considered because they fail the beneficiaries. In the case of the Eikevlei land reform project, for example, it is not surprising that ESS projects can be seen as not being the ideal way to implement land reform, although having 294 beneficiaries on one farm was never a good idea.

Lastly, Sityata was asked what he thought of the relationship between the government and white commercial farmers. Sityata (2013, Pers com) revealed that the government engages the farmers through Agri SA. “The relationship between the government and the white commercial farmers varies. Some farmers are willing to help and work alongside the government to improve the success rate of land reform projects, however there are still farmers who believe the government is against them” (Sityata 2013, Pers com).

Karaan’s (2013, Pers com) perspective on the progress of land reform in general is that it is too slow and that the government has transferred only 10% of the 30% of land they were planning to transfer from white commercial farmers to the previously disadvantaged. As mentioned by Sityata, Karaan (2013, Pers com) also believes that the WBWS approach for acquiring land for redistribution is too slow and expensive. The suggestion made by Karaan (2013, Pers com) for an alternative approach to
acquiring land is the same as made by the NDP, largely because he helped write Chapter 6 of the NDP, which deals with agricultural development and land reform (see Figure 3.1).

Karaan’s (2013, Pers com) perception of what farmers think of land reform and how it has been implemented is that he believes that farmers have a negative attitude towards land reform. Karaan (2013, Pers com) indicated that farmers see land reform as a method by which the government can take land and use it as part of their political agenda, even though some farmers have seen the potential of land reform. Karaan (2013, Pers com) revealed that the relationship between the government and white commercial farmers is not that good. The private sector should be more trusting of government and help it with agricultural research (Karaan 2013, Pers com).

Pienaar (2013, Pers com) mentioned that the redistribution of land through the land reform programme could have progressed even further than it already has. The government has to be realistic about how slow the process of acquiring land has been and address it by improving the implementation process (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). When the land reform programme was first implemented the government did not know what to expect and how to approach the process, which also contributed to the slow redistribution process (Pienaar 2013, Pers com).

As for the WBWS approach, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) agrees with Sityata and Karaan that this approach is too slow and expensive to be the ideal way to acquire land. Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that there is not enough agricultural land available in the open market to be bought by the government for redistribution. An alternative approach that the government might have to consider is expropriating land, although this approach has to be managed appropriately and fairly, without crossing ethical boundaries (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). The government should have the first option to buy available agricultural land to increase the amount of land available for redistribution through PLAS (Pienaar 2013, Pers com).

The recommendations made by Pienaar (2013, Pers com) to improve the current state of land reform in South Africa are the following:

- The government should have more consultation opportunities between them and the beneficiaries, thus improving the transparency of the government;
- There is no sufficient coherence in new policies being created, thus the disjointedness must be addressed by the government;
- The implementation of the land reform programme must be improved to increase the rate at which land is being redistributed in South Africa. This can be done by appointing officials who have the skills and experience to deal with implementing the policies to increase the land transfer rate; and
- The government should be held accountable for its actions and decisions.
Pienaar’s (2013, Pers com) perception of what farmers think of land reform and how it has been implemented is that the farmers are scared and feel threatened that they might lose their land. Farmers are concerned about the state of farming in South Africa, including the food security of the country (Pienaar 2013, Pers com). As for the relationship between the white commercial farmers and government, Pienaar (2013, Pers com) believes that they have a strained relationship that can be improved by open, honest discussions between the two parties.

When Crosby (2013, Pers com) was asked for her perspective on the progress of land reform in general, she said the complexity of the land reform programme has contributed to the slow progress of transferring land from white commercial farmers to the previously disadvantaged. The government should have been more efficient, although the implementation of the land reform programme has been a massive issue (Crosby 2013, Pers com). According to Crosby (2013, Pers com), Agri SA does not believe that the WBWS approach has been unsuccessful, although it has been considered unsuccessful because of poor implementation. Corruption and the slow implementation of the WBWS approach have caused issues between the government and the farmers who are selling their agricultural land (Crosby 2013, Pers com). The recommendations made by Crosby (2013, Pers com) to improve the current state of land reform in South Africa are the following:

- Land reform should be implemented in an orderly fashion, i.e. not as land reform was implemented in Zimbabwe;
- More funds should be allocated towards the land reform programme to increase the capacity of the DRDLR;
- The government should encourage a partnership between the private and public sectors; and
- The DRDLR should focus on implementing a bottom-up approach and establishing local committees to oversee projects in their specific district.

Crosby’s (2013, Pers com) perception of what farmers think of land reform and how it has been implemented is that the farmers are discouraged and feel victimised by the government. They have fears of losing their land through expropriation by the government. Agri SA is very involved in trying to have an influence on the new policies being created, although the new policies are discouraging the farmers (Crosby 2013, Pers com). As for the relationship between the government and the white commercial farmers, Crosby (2013, Pers com) believes that it is not unhealthy. There are many occasions when conversations take place between organised agriculture and the government, but the co-operation between them is terrible.
4.9 CONCLUSION

The results from the interviews done with the identified key role players indicate that the land reform programme has to be revised because the current approach used to transfer land has not been as successful as expected. The following table summarises the overall perceptions of the interviewees of the land reform programme.

Table 4.1: Key role players’ perceptions of land reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy Aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy formulation</td>
<td>Which approach is used for policy making? (top-down, bottom-up or both)</td>
<td>Top down, although it does incorporate a consultative approach that includes the ideas of the shareholders and key role players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land accessibility</td>
<td>How should it be determined which people are eligible to become beneficiaries?</td>
<td>Should have the necessary skills and training that any successful commercial farmer would need to farm efficiently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What programmes are used to gain access to land?</td>
<td>SLAG and LRAD programmes used for providing access to land were too slow, thus the government has shifted its focus to PLAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s equity</td>
<td>How is it ensured that women have equal access to land?</td>
<td>No specific strategy in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the land rights registered?</td>
<td>Can only have tenure security if land is registered, thus all land is registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the level of security of land rights?</td>
<td>Fairly secure in the sense that if a person wants to own land privately it is possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What happens to expropriated land parcels in terms of compensation?</td>
<td>Landowner is entitled to get market value for the agricultural land identified for expropriation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any cases of conflict or disputes?</td>
<td>Collective land ownership will always have its problems. Too many different opinions to consider in the decision-making process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>Which processes are used to acquire land for redistribution?</td>
<td>SLAG, LRAD and PLAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are the human rights of the landowners being ensured during the land acquisition process?</td>
<td>Government has to follow the correct procedures to be able to expropriate land and also provide the landowner with rightful compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Which strategies are in place to ensure economic sustainability?</td>
<td>Revised policy of the Recapitalisation and Development Programme of the DRDLR that focuses on providing emerging farmers with social and economic infrastructure and basic resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are there any strategies to ensure environmental sustainability?</td>
<td>No specific strategy in place to focus on environmental sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional and</td>
<td>Is the DRDLR centralised or decentralised?</td>
<td>Decentralised in theory, although in practice there are gaps between national decision making and grassroots implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrangement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial efficiency and capacity</td>
<td>Is the DRDLR that deals with the implementation of land reform sufficiently delegated?</td>
<td>Not delegated sufficiently enough to handle the implementation of the land reform programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How effective is the DRDLR?</td>
<td>The DRDLR is not able to adequately manage the land reform programme effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the DRDLR have the institutional capacity to deal with the land reform programme?</td>
<td>No, the DRDLR does not have the institutional capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Operational Aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Do all beneficiaries participate in the implementation process?</th>
<th>Beneficiaries only participate partly in the implementation process of land reform.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the interests of the beneficiaries being addressed?</td>
<td>No, hardly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule of law</td>
<td>Are legal provisions being enforced impartially?</td>
<td>Yes, the Land Claims Court is impartial and implements legal action in such a manner that all parties are taken into consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>How well are the beneficiaries informed about the land reform programme, the benefits and their obligations?</td>
<td>The beneficiaries are well informed about the programme itself, but when it comes to their obligations towards land reform they are not sufficiently informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>How responsible are the staff of the DRDLR in implementing the land reform programme?</td>
<td>Varies from province to province. Senior staff more competent than junior staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is there any provision of grievance reporting and hearing?</td>
<td>Yes, beneficiaries can raise their concerns through the council of stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>Are the procedures that beneficiaries have to follow complex?</td>
<td>Not too complex, although too much red tape that can discourage beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How efficiently are resources being utilised?</td>
<td>On paper, yes, but in practice not making the deadlines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are deadlines being met in time?</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Post-reform Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building</th>
<th>Are there any programmes in place to provide beneficiaries with the necessary training and technical assistance?</th>
<th>NARYSEC and CRDP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the condition of the basic infrastructure?</td>
<td>Varies from farm to farm. Depends on the speed of the acquisition process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is any other support provided to the beneficiaries that will improve the productivity of their farms, like fertilisers or seeds?</td>
<td>The DoA provides support through CASP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiaries’ expectations</th>
<th>What are the expectations of the beneficiaries?</th>
<th>To flourish economically by becoming a commercial farmer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are their expectations realistic and achievable?</td>
<td>Without the essential skills and experience these expectations are unachievable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The discussion will now move to how commercial farmers in the Matzikama Municipality perceive land reform, with a focus on members of the Vredendal farmers’ association. A survey was done to collect data on the farmers’ characteristics, the ownership of the farm, their perceptions of land reform policies and what support they need from the government.
CHAPTER 5: PERCEPTION OF COMMERCIAL FARMERS ON LAND REFORM

In Chapter 5 the data gathered from a survey done in the Matzikama municipal area among commercial farmers is analysed. The analysis is divided into four categories that discuss the demographic profile of the farmers, the ownership of the farms, land reform policies and government support.

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The Vredendal farmers’ association was the only farmers’ association (seven associations in total) willing to provide their membership list and therefore was chosen as the group to complete the questionnaire. The Vredendal farmers’ association has some 100 members, 83 of them being commercial farmers. After struggling to get a sufficient number of respondents to participate in the survey, it was decided to move the study’s focus to the use of qualitative data and to use the data from the questionnaires merely as snap review of selected responses. Data collected from the 23 respondents who were willing to complete the questionnaire (see Appendix D) provides some sense of how the farmers perceive land reform in the Matzikama municipal area.

5.2 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF FARMERS

All the respondents who participated in the snap survey were Afrikaans-speaking white males. As only 23 farmers participated in the snap survey it cannot be presumed that only white males own farms in the region, but when the chairman of the farmers’ association was asked if there were any black members of the farmers’ association he revealed that there were none.

The majority of the respondents who participated in the snap survey were aged between 46 and 55 (eight respondents) and 56 and 65 (eight respondents) years old (see Figure 5.1). With 16 respondents being between the ages of 46 and 65 (see Figure 5.1), it is safe to assume that these farmers have a lot of experience in farming and have gone through the different policy changes over the years.

![Figure 5.1: Age of respondents](n = 23)
The farmers’ ages clearly influence how they feel about the land reform programme and the success of the ESS projects. While answering the questionnaire, one of the farmers mentioned that because he is older it makes him more negative and cynical about land reform projects.

Farming can be considered as a family business, since the son(s) of the farmer usually help on their father’s farm. When the father decides to retire from farming, the son is usually expected to take over the farming responsibilities. Through the mentorship of the father, who provides the necessary skills to farm successfully, it is not a prerequisite for the son to further his studies. Nevertheless, the majority of the respondents (13 respondents) had received a tertiary education from a college, such as the Elsenburg Agricultural Training Institute, or a university, such as Stellenbosch University (Figure 5.2). Only one respondent had only finished primary school and nine respondents had only finished high school, thus fewer than half of the respondents had no tertiary education (Figure 5.2).

![Figure 5.2: Respondents’ level of education](http://scholar.sun.ac.za)

One of the respondents mentioned that he had been farming alongside his father from a very young age, which made him the successful farmer that he is today, although he has encouraged his children to get a tertiary education. The farmers realised that getting a tertiary education can improve farming and management skills, thus increasing the chance of the farm being more successful. This links to what Crosby said about most business owners, or in this case farmers, improving their skills set by obtaining a degree or equivalent training.

The majority of the respondents’ (20 respondents) primary income was from viniculture (Figure 5.3). When asked if their land use has changed during the last decade most of the farmers said that they had decreased planting vegetables and focused more on viniculture. The reason for this mentioned by the respondents was that vegetables were not that profitable in comparison to the profit made from
viniculture. One of largest wine distributors in South Africa, Namaqua Wines, is situated in Vredendal on the Olifants River. This can also be a reason why farmers in that region focus on planting vineyards to supply Namaqua Wines with the necessary amount of grapes required for wine. Some farmers mentioned that there was great profit potential in exporting raisins, thus some farmers produce dry grapes as well. Even though the respondents had focused their land use on planting vineyards, 14 still considered vegetable farming as a secondary income (Figure 5.4). Two of the respondents indicated that they had started guesthouses to help sustain their livelihoods (Figure 5.4). The other forms of secondary income that were mentioned by the respondents were being an attorney and owning commercial property.

The majority of the respondents indicated that their annual income was less than R300 000 (eight respondents), while six respondents refused to answer this question (Figure 5.5). With the majority of the respondents making less than R300 000 annually it makes it difficult for them to make a decent living from farming and thus it increases the negativity towards land reform and ESS projects (Figure 5.5).
5.3 OWNERSHIP OF FARMS

With a total of 87% (20 respondents) of farms being owned by the respondents’ family before the respondent took over the farming responsibilities, it is clear that, at least in the Matzikama commercial farming community, farming is passed from generation to generation (Figure 5.6). This makes the potential of land transfers to emerging farmers as part of the land reform process a very sensitive issue. One of the respondents indicated that the farm had been in his family since 1837. Only three of the respondents had bought a farm without it having been in their family (Figure 5.6).

Figure 5.7 shows that the majority of the respondents (17 respondents) indicated that the farm was currently in their own name, while six respondents had registered their farms in a company (two respondents) or put it in a trust (four respondents). This can be an indication that the respondents still feel secure enough financially to keep their farms in their own names. However, registering your farm in a company or putting your farm in a trust can be advantageous financially.
According to Smith Tabata Buchanan Boyes (STBB 2010), the most common reasons for putting your estate in a trust is to protect assets for your children or other beneficiaries and to reduce the amount of estate duty payable by the main beneficiary when he/she dies. Other reasons identified by Smith Tabata Buchanan Boyes (2010) are that if you put your estate in a trust you can protect your assets in the event of bankruptcy and it is easier to administer assets for personal or charitable purposes.

Thus if a farmer puts his estate, or in this case his farm, into a trust, it gives the farmer the ability to manage his assets easier and decrease the chance of losing everything when the farm goes under. If you put your farm in a company you have a greater risk of losing your assets when you become insolvent, because a company is divided up into shares and this complicates the selling process. You can sell the rights to shares, but a trust is seen as one body, making it impossible to say that a specific asset belongs to one person.

Almost half of the respondents (11 respondents) acquired their farms through inheritance from their fathers (Figure 5.8). This supports the assumption made about farms being passed on from generation to generation. However, some respondents still bought their farms by using their own capital or with capital loaned from a commercial bank or the Land Bank (Figure 5.8).

![Figure 5.7: Percentage of farms in respondents’ name](n = 23)

![Figure 5.8: Respondents’ methods of acquiring their farm](n = 23)
When the respondents were asked if any land-use change had occurred on their farms over the last 10 years, less than half of them respondents (11 respondents) indicated that there had been a change (Figure 5.9). This land change corresponds with the remarks made about Figure 5.3, because the majority of the respondents mentioned that their agricultural focus had moved from vegetables to viniculture. The grapes that are produced can be used for wine production, as table grapes or are dried for raisins, thus making it a very diverse fruit. With 12 respondents indicating that they did not undergo any major change, it can be assumed that the respondents were satisfied with how they utilised their farm.

5.4 PERCEPTION OF LAND REFORM POLICIES

In South Africa, land reform is an extremely sensitive topic for white commercial farmers, who own the vast majority of agricultural land in the county. These are the farmers who stand to lose their farms as a result of land reform policies. The respondents were very hesitant at first when it was brought to their attention that this study is about land reform. One respondent asked if this data was being collected for the government, because he was scared that this was a way for government to see which farms could be acquired for land reform projects. This links with the perception that farmers have on land reform being used as a political tool (Karaan 2013, Pers com). After reassuring the respondents that this study was about their perceptions of land reform and how government can improve the implementation of ESS, some respondents started opening up.

The first question asked to the respondents about land reform policies was if these policies affected their ownership of the farm. Most of the respondents mentioned that it had not affected them, although some mentioned that it had made them hesitant to expand the farm. Land rights in South Africa are fairly secure (Karaan 2013, Pers com), but government can use expropriation with rightful compensation as a tool to acquire land. One respondent mentioned that he had decided to put his farm in a trust to ensure that his financial assets would be safe if the farm should go under.
Figure 5.10 illustrates how secure the respondents feel about their ownership of their land on a scale from 1, being very insecure, to 10, being very secure. Most of the respondents (13) who participated in the snap survey felt secure (6 to 7) to very secure (8 to 10) (Figure 5.10), which corresponds with the high percentage (17 respondents) of the farms that are still in the respondent’s own name (Figure 5.7). However, as mentioned above, some of respondents are feeling unsecure about their land security, thus remain hesitant to expand their farms.

The results of the multiple questions about which processes could undermine the ownership security of the respondents’ farms can be seen in Table 5.1. When taking into consideration the current state of South Africa’s wine industry, and that the majority of the respondents’ primary source of income was viniculture (see Figure 5.3), it is not surprising that the majority of respondents felt that the current market circumstances were threatening their ownership security. The respondents also felt they ownership security is being threatened by broader economic perspective, which refers to keeping up with developed countries on how to be optimally productive.

One of the respondents mentioned that the fair Rand value for agricultural land has decreased due to the continuous decrease in the exchange rate. This specific respondent also mentioned that, in 1975, a farmer could buy a new tractor with 30 tons of wine grapes, but now the same tractor will cost about 200 tons of wine grapes, if they are of a noble cultivar. If it takes 200 tons of wine grapes to buy one tractor, it is astonishing that these farmers manage to make a living from farming.

When asked how new policies from provincial and national government could undermine their ownership security, the respondents unanimously agreed. As can be seen in Table 5.1, 16 respondents indicated that provincial government could seriously threaten (eight respondents) or pose some threat (eight respondents) to their ownership security. As for national government’s policies, 22 respondents indicated that these could seriously threaten (14 respondents) or pose some threat (eight respondents) to their ownership security (see Table 5.1). This correlates with what Crosby revealed about farmers being discouraged by the new policies drafted by the government. Government should consider farmers’
opinions on how to deal with land reform, because they are also affected by decisions being made concerning land reform (Crosby 2013, Pers com).

As for land acquisition for nature conservation, the majority of the respondents said that they were neutral (nine respondents) towards it or indicated that it is not applicable (nine respondents), because they have not been approached by anyone concerning nature conservation. When asked about family-related influences that could undermine their ownership security, mainly focusing on whether the farmer has children that would continue farming after he retired, five respondents were neutral in the sense that they did not consider it a threat to their security.

Another five respondents indicated that their children were interested in taking over the family business, although 10 respondents indicated that it was not applicable in the sense that they encouraged their children to study and do something other than farming (even though some of the respondents mentioned that their sons still wanted to farm) (see Table 5.1).

Table 5.1: Processes influencing the respondents’ land ownership security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Influence on undermining security of ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious threats perceived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current market circumstances</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader economic perspectives/outlooks</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policies from the provincial government</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New policies from the national government</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of land for nature conservation</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family related (e.g. no follow-up by children)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the multiple questions about the extent to which land reform policies affect the respondents’ agricultural productivity can be seen in Table 5.2. The fact that three respondents actually participate in ESS projects is reflected in the results in Table 5.2 by the number of respondents indicating that this section was not applicable to them.

As mentioned previously (Figure 5.10), the respondents were hesitant to purchase more land and, as a result, the majority indicated that land reform policies had a neutral influence on the size of their harvest (14 respondents), the diversification of their crops (13 respondents) and their overall turnover (10 respondents). The fact that the majority of the respondents’ primary income came from viniculture
(Figure 5.3) could be the reason why the majority of the respondents indicated that the size of livestock (10 respondents) and quality of livestock (11 respondents) was not applicable to them.

Some respondents indicated that land reform policies had been seriously harmful (two respondents) or harmful (three respondents) to the size of the livestock being kept on their land, although the majority had a neutral response (seven respondents) or said it was not applicable (10 respondents). Concerning market perspectives, some respondents indicated that land reform policies had been seriously harmful (three respondents) or harmful (five respondents), although the majority of the respondents were neutral to this (six respondents) or said that it was not applicable at all (eight respondents).

Table 5.2: Implications of land reform policies for respondents’ agricultural productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural productivity</th>
<th>Implications of land reform policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seriously harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of harvest</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversification of crops</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of livestock</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of livestock</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market perspectives for produce/livestock</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these factors influenced the respondents’ outlook on their ability to make a living from farming. One aspect that was mentioned frequently by the respondents was that they believed the government was hostile-minded when it came to acquiring land for land reform projects, thus making them think twice when considering expanding their agricultural land. The perception that farmers have of the government as being hostile towards white commercial farmers contributes to the strained relationship between commercial farmers and the government. This strained relationship was identified by the key role players in Chapter 4. One respondent mentioned that land reform dampens expansion and renewal, thus no additional land was being bought, and this had an influence on the number of jobs that could have been provided. It also contributes to the belief that land reform hinders the potential of sustainable livelihoods from farming.

Land reform since 1994 has always been part of the South African government’s strategy to accelerate the process of national reconciliation, as mentioned by the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy (DLA 1997). When the respondents were asked about the extent to which they thought land reform policies have had an impact on national reconciliation, 20 respondents felt that land reform had not had any impact on national reconciliation, while the other three respondents did not answer the question. Some of the respondents believed that land reform had increased racism in the farming
community since 1994, and that this hindered the relationship between the respondents and their employees.

Land reform does not have a good image in South Africa, taking into consideration how many policies and programmes have been implemented and how the government has struggled to achieve the set objectives due to it being a slow-moving process, as discussed in Chapter 3. With the respondents’ feelings towards land reform being overwhelmingly negative, it was not surprising that their final comments focused on how land reform had been implemented incorrectly, thus increasing the failure rate. One respondent mentioned that the incorrect execution of land reform could be the reason for the failure of land reform, however he feels that the government likes to blame apartheid and/or white farmers. Other respondents mentioned that emerging farmers could not make a success of farming if they were not willing to contribute to purchasing the land.

According to these respondents, emerging farmers might make a greater effort to make a success of farming if they contributed financially, and it thus was essential that the government identified emerging farmers who were capable of being successful. The expectations created among emerging farmers was of farming being some sort of utopia, while the younger generation might not be interested in farming. As referred to by the key role players in Chapter 4, although the government tries to consider the beneficiaries’ capacity for farming, not all beneficiaries had the same capacity. There is a need for capacity building by providing training and mentorship to the emerging farmers.

The implementation of land reform by the government is very slow. For land reform to be successful, the government has to give farms to people who want to work hard and farm. The emerging farmers must work before they get compensation, thus making ESS projects a perfect stepping stone to improve the success rate of land reform. As mentioned in Chapter 3, ESS is the more popular choice for a joint venture in South Africa, thus it was fitting to see how the respondents felt about starting an ESS project. As seen in Figure 5.11, the majority of the respondents (20 respondents) did not currently participate in ESS projects.

Of those 20 respondents who did not participate in ESS projects, only eight would consider starting an ESS project (see Figure 5.12). Some of the respondents mentioned that they had tried establishing an ESS project before and that it had failed miserably. The reasons given by the respondents were that there was a lack of support from the government, that there was too much red tape that goes with starting an ESS project, and that it was time consuming – time that the respondent could have spent on training emerging farmers. Some of the other respondents indicated that they did not have any interest in starting an ESS project because they were already struggling to make a living from farming on the land that they currently owned.
Most of the land parcels surrounding the Olifants River Valley are small, thus it is difficult to allocate a part of the existing farm to emerging farmers without putting the commercial farmer under pressure financially. One respondent revealed that he had started an ESS project for his farm workers, although without the help of the government. With all the red tape that goes with establishing an ESS project and not getting significant benefits that encourage farmers to start such a project, it is difficult to increase the number of ESS projects.

As mentioned by the key role players (see Chapter 4), the DRDLR does not have the institutional capacity to implement and manage land reform successfully. Some respondents indicated that if they were able to give shares to their farm workers they would, but the majority of the respondents could not afford such a risk without sufficient support from government.

With only three respondents indicating that they had established some sort of ESS project, be it a government-supported initiative or privately financed, views on how ESS projects affected their farms’ production potential are limited. The one respondent who had started an ESS project with the help of
LRAD grants from the government mentioned that, for him to be able to start this project, he had to subsidise his own farm to be able to purchase the land that was chosen, thus putting financial pressure on him.

The other respondents who elaborated on how ESS projects affected their agricultural production mentioned that the farm workers/shareholders were willing to work harder, thus increasing productivity. According to the respondents, being a shareholder in an ESS project had opened the farm workers eyes to the possibility that they could uplift themselves by learning from the commercial farmer and putting an effort into making a success of the ESS project.

When the respondents were asked how they would rate the success of ESS projects out of 10 (1 being very unsuccessful and 10 being very successful), the majority (13 respondents) indicated that they were very unsuccessful (10 respondents) and unsuccessful (three respondents) (see Figure 5.13). Taking into consideration the respondents’ negativity towards land reform in general, it is not surprising that they would regard the success rate of ESS projects to be abysmal. Some respondents were still optimistic about the potential of ESS projects, with 10 respondents indicating that ESS projects can be successful (five respondents) or even very successful (five respondents) (see Figure 5.13).

The key role players interviewed did not come to a consensus about their perception of the success of ESS projects. The DRDLR feels that ESS projects take advantage of the beneficiaries and give white commercial farmer a firm grasp on land ownership (Sityata 2013, Pers com), while Agri SA believes that ESS projects can be used as a stepping stone to transfer land to emerging farmers by first mentoring farm workers (Crosby 2013, Pers com).
With farmers complaining about not getting any benefits from starting an ESS project, the respondents were asked what incentives would encourage them to participate. Eleven of the respondents indicated that they had no comment on incentives because they have no desire to start an ESS project. The examples of incentives mentioned by the other 12 respondents are the following:

- Help acquire and secure land for ESS projects.
- Provide financial advantages like better prices for products, discount on turnover costs, better interest rates at commercial banks and subsidies for fuel, water and electricity.
- Increase accessibility to necessary capital for emerging farmers and decrease the amount of paperwork associated with starting an ESS project.
- With the agricultural land portions next to the Olifants River Valley being small, the respondents felt that the only way ESS projects could be established in this area was by buying additional land and putting it into a trust to include the farm workers by making them trustees/shareholders. One respondent had done so, and this will be discussed in Chapter 6.

When asked if they were currently mentoring or training emerging farmers, 22% of the respondents indicated that they were doing so, while the majority (17 respondents) of the respondents were not currently mentoring or training emerging farmers (see Figure 5.14). One respondent mentioned that he had been involved in mentoring emerging farmers, but that they had sold all the livestock after a year. The reason provided by the respondent for this was that the emerging farmers found farming too difficult and were unhappy about not getting the instant financial benefits they thought would go along with having a farm. This also relates to what was said about the lack of capacity of beneficiaries to succeed in Chapter 4.

\[ \text{Figure 5.14: Number of respondents mentoring/training emerging farmers} \]

(n = 23)
Some of the respondents indicated that they did not necessarily mentor/train emerging farmers, but provided financial support to farm workers whose children showed an interest in excelling academically and taught them how to make financially sound decisions. The respondents that specified that they were currently mentoring/training emerging farmers did so by giving advice and lending farming equipment to emerging farmers who could not afford to buy for themselves.

5.5 GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Since the respondents indicated that they needed support from the government to increase their agricultural productivity and financial success, they were asked what services of the government or other organisations they currently were using. Table 5.3 illustrates the usage percentage of services that could contribute to the respondents’ agricultural success.

The results revealed in Table 5.3 clearly show that the overall majority of respondents were not using these service providers. Considering that agricultural production is a crucial component of the economy, it is worrying that the respondents were not getting enough help from the national and/or provincial DoA. With only nine respondents receiving some type of support from the provincial DoA (six respondents indicated once a year and three respondents indicated monthly), and five respondents receiving help from the national DoA annually (see Table 5.3), it is possible that there might be a communication gap between the respondents and the DoA. The respondents might not know that they can get support from the DoA, or the DoA is not interested or does not have the necessary funds to help the respondents.

With only two respondents (9%) indicating that they make use of the services provided by the National Agricultural Marketing Council (see Table 5.3), it is possible that farmers in this region do not need this support or they do not know what kind of services are provided by the Council. The same goes for the Agricultural Research Council, with only six respondents (see Table 5.3) indicating that they make annual use of its services, and one respondent mentioning that he was certain that the Agricultural Research Council had been terminated. Considering that the Land Bank’s services consist of loaning funds to farmers that have to be repaid in a number of payments annually, only four respondents (see Table 5.3) indicated that they were currently making use of the Land Bank’s services. Some of the respondents mentioned that they had made their last payment or had never used the Bank’s services because they had the funds to pay for additional land themselves.
Table 5.3: Usage of services provided by service providers to enhance agricultural success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service providers</th>
<th>Usage of services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Department of Agriculture</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agricultural Marketing Council</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Research Council</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Bank</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking the results of Figure 5.8 into consideration, 11 respondents indicated that they had inherited the farm from their father, thus it is understandable that the majority of the respondents (19 respondents) have never made use of the Land Bank’s services. Some respondents preferred to loan money from commercial banks for the purchase of agricultural land, as seen in Figure 5.8, with six respondents indicating that they had done so.

For the government or other private organisations to be able to help farmers increase their agricultural productivity, they need to know what the biggest constraints are concerning farming according to the farmers. The respondents were asked to list the biggest obstacles that they had to deal with regarding farming.

The number one obstacle indicated by the respondents was the sin tax on alcohol. With 20 respondents indicating that viniculture was their primary source of income, it is understandable that sin tax can become a financial limitation. One respondent stated that the wine industry was under extreme pressure and that this has a direct effect on the farmers’ financial situation. According to this respondent, farmers were only paid R0.25 per litre of wine produced, while the government received R5 per litre as a result of sin tax. Another respondent revealed that if people paid R80 for a bottle of wine in a restaurant, the commercial farmer earned only about R1 to R1.40 per bottle. Even the waiter’s tip was more than the amount that the farmers got for a bottle of wine.

Another obstacle that relates to the sin tax on alcohol is the prices paid for agricultural produce. The respondents expressed their unhappiness about the current market prices they are receiving for their produce. Farmers were unable to negotiate the price for their produce, thus it put financial pressure on them. One of the older respondents explained that, in 1968, there were about 20 000 to 30 000 small stores to which farmers could sell their produce, but that now there were 2 000 to 3 000 big franchise stores that have become very powerful and can influence the buying price for produce.

This respondent was receiving only R2.20 per kilogram for his produce (vegetables like pumpkins and butternut), while the supermarket to which he sold his produce got R11.99 per kilogram. According to
him, the margin for small supermarkets and stores 26 years ago was about 30%, whereas the current margin was between 100% and 300%. These margins have made food less affordable for people and have discouraged farmers from continuing farming with vegetables, for example. However, the farmers cannot afford to stop selling their produce to these supermarket chains because they cannot afford to lose a customer with a 25% share. Even though prices are increasing, people still buy from the large supermarket chains and sustain their power, thus putting local stores and producers under increasing pressure. This relates to what Sityata said about the government having to creating opportunities for farmers to sell produce locally without the pressure of producing goods for large supermarkets and getting less capital for their produce.

Another obstacle that the respondents felt was hindering their agricultural success was the high production costs. With labour costs increasing, fuel prices climbing and water and electricity being extremely expensive, it is not surprising that farmers are struggling to keep their head above water. The produce prices do not rise along with the prices of electricity, water, etc., thus the expenses of the farmers are more than the income that they get from the produce they sell. One respondent revealed that he paid R13 700 for electricity and R2 700 per hectare for water per month. Another respondent revealed that he paid R27 000 for water per month and, with production costs being so high and the income being generated not sufficient, he had to buy more land to be able to make a living.

Some respondents indicated that, because labour costs have increased, they have considered using less labour-intensive farming methods. Farm workers get paid per day, which means that one farm worker who picks 10 boxes of grapes and another who picks 25 boxes will be paid the same amount at the end of the day. Some farmers do give bonuses to farm workers who pick more than the average expected per worker, although not all farmers have the funds to encourage farm workers to work harder.

Some respondents indicated that farm workers are not as hard working and expect to be paid more for a job that was not done properly. Farm workers are not paid a lot, although most of the permanent staff stay on the farm with free access to water and electricity. The current Extension of Security of Tenure Act (ESTA) makes it difficult for farmers to evict people who do not work for them anymore from houses that they provide for free. One respondent revealed that he had decided not to upgrade any of the houses that freeloaders are staying in because those people were taking housing from the people who actually work for him. Sityata believes, however, that ESTA protects both parties involved in housing on farms and that legal eviction can take place if the guidelines are followed correctly.

The respondents believe that farm workers who receive “All Pay” (social grants from the government) use that money to buy alcohol and sometimes come to work the next day still drunk. According to some respondents, alcohol abuse is very common among the farm workers in the region. This contributes to the decrease in productivity and causes farmers to lose trust in their farm workers.
The last obstacle that the respondents indicated was the lack of interest that the government has in the agricultural sector. One respondent mentioned that he had visited farmers and attended farming conferences abroad, and seen how government officials go out of their way to support and assist farmers when necessary, while the South African government only criticises and threatens farmers, without considering the situation of the farmers. The South African government does not allocate enough of its resources to the agricultural sector. More research should be done to maintain and increase the success of the agricultural sector.

The same respondent believes that South Africa has a pathetic bureaucracy in the sense that farmers have to pay the compensation commissioner for insurance, but farmers are reluctant to claim damages from the commissioner because there usually is no response to their claims. The only communication he receives from the commissioner is an annual assessment accompanied by a threatening letter.

After the respondents had listed all the obstacles they face concerning farming, they were asked what they expected from the government. The respondents indicated that the first thing the government should do is appoint a minister of agriculture who actually cares and knows something about agriculture. The respondents felt that the lack of support was directly linked to the minister’s lack of agricultural knowledge.

With the respondents mentioning that the production costs accompanying farming are unaffordable and decrease their productivity potential, they want subsidies from the government to enable them to expand their agricultural production capacity. Subsidies can help local farmers compete with international farmers whose products are cheaper to import, because some countries abroad (e.g. France and the Netherlands) subsidise their farmers, thus decreasing their expenses. South Africa has the ability to produce all the essential goods needed to feed its population, but it is difficult to do so if farmers are unable to keep their farms due to financial instability.

According to the respondents, the government should also increase agricultural research. Without proper research being done on methods to improve agricultural productivity and sustainability, South Africa will fall behind its competitors abroad. This means that the South African government should appoint reliable and innovative people to serve on the Agricultural Research Council. Taking all that was mentioned by the respondents into consideration, it is clear that they need more support from the government. If the South African government wants the agricultural sector to excel, it needs to invest time and funds to improve the current state of the sector.

5.6 CONCLUSION

The results of the survey confirmed the negative perceptions commercial farmers have of land reform and also brought to light the constraints and fears of commercial farmers. Even though some
respondents indicated that they would not purchase more land, the majority believed that their farmland was secure. With the majority of the farmers in the Matzikama municipal area involved in viniculture, it is not surprising that the results indicate that farmers are struggling to produce enough grapes to sustain themselves. With the sin tax being extremely high, commercial farmers are under immense pressure and have no way to negotiate prices to decrease this pressure. The fact that most of the farm portions in the Matzikama municipal area are small correlates with the results that point out that farmers cannot afford to start ESS projects on their farms without creating a financial dent in their own business. For ESS projects to flourish in this area, the government has to help identify land that can be used and provide the necessary support to ensure success. The discussion will now reveal how ESS projects have succeeded and failed in the Matzikama municipal area by examining an existing and a failed ESS project. This will be done by examining the business plan and the shareholders’ views on the projects.
CHAPTER 6: ESS PROJECTS IN THE MATZIKAMA MUNICIPAL AREA

This chapter examines the success and failure of ESS projects by discussing an existing ESS project and what respondents said about a failed project in the Matzikama municipal area. The discussion starts with a brief examination of state-owned land in South Africa, and specifically in the Matzikama municipal area. The focus then shifts to an examination of the business plan of ESS projects and the perceptions of the shareholders of the specific project in which they were involved.

6.1 STATE-OWNED LAND

With the government being the sole driver of land reform implementation, it is expected that, if suitable, land already owned by the government would be considered for land reform projects, thus distributing land to the previously disadvantaged. According to official data released by the DLA (2002), the state owns 12.6 million ha out of South Africa’s total area of 122 081 300 ha, and only 2% of state-owned land is viable for redistribution. The DLA (2002) revealed that, of the 12.6 million ha state-owned land, 59% comprises communal areas (which include, for example, land held in trust for African traditional communities by the DLA), 29% is protected areas (SANParks), and 12% is land allocated to national and provincial departments (which include, for example, national departments such as the South African Police Service and provincial agricultural land, schools, etc.).

Kleinbooi and Dubb (2013) point out that, even if all 12.6 million ha owned by the state would be redistributed to the previously disadvantaged, it would only cover 50% of the land redistribution target set by the DRDLR. The government’s target to redistribute 30% of white-owned land (24.6 million ha) by 2014 has clearly been over-ambitious, taking into consideration that Nkwinti (2012) revealed that only 7.95 million ha of white-owned land had been transferred to the previously disadvantaged by 2012. “It is clear that very little state land is available for redistribution” (Kleinbooi & Dubb 2013:2). Kleinbooi and Dubb (2013) suggest that municipal commonage can be used to enhance beneficiary livelihoods by giving the poor access to municipal grazing land, fields and wild resources. However, it is unclear at present precisely what amount of commonage is available for the previously disadvantaged wanting to obtain land (Kleinbooi & Dubb 2013).

The South African government could purchase more land and then lease the land to emerging farmers by making use of PLAS, but the point of redistribution is to redistribute the land among people (emerging farmers) who want to own their own land and have a right to obtaining it. The government could consider ESS projects to give emerging farmers a chance to get mentored by experienced commercial farmers and eventually buying out the commercial farmers’ shares, although Sityata said he believed ESS projects were not ideal (Sityata 2013, pers. com.). Currently, ESS projects consist of
farm workers working together with the commercial farmer who has employed them for years, but, as mentioned by Karaan in Chapter 4, it should not just be farm workers who get this kind of opportunity (Karaan 2013, Pers com). People who are willing to work hard and get the necessary education to farm successfully should also be considered.

As for the Matzikama Municipality, it consists of 4 176 land parcels. All the land owned by the government in the Matzikama Municipality is illustrated in Figure 6.1a and Figure 6.1b. According to Donaldson et al. (2013:56), 489 out of 4 176 land parcels (11.7%) were definite as state owned, including owners classified under the state e.g. the South African National Roads Agency Ltd. By including owners that can be classified under the state, it was possible to scan all the owners of the land parcels and identify which was state-owned or privately owned land, although the State Land Audit is incomplete (Donaldson et al. 2013).

From visiting the study area, and by examining Figure 6.1a, it is evident that the land owned by the government in the northern parts of the Matzikama municipal area can never be suitable for agricultural production, because it is situated in the Knersvlaktes, known for being a dry, semi-desert region. The state-owned land in the north is situated far from any major town in the Matzikama Municipality, like Vredendal or Vanrhynsdorp, and with the lack of water that farmers situated on the banks of the Olifants River have it will be very difficult to start a land reform project. With the majority of the previously disadvantaged people in the region being used to farming with sheep or being involved in viniculture, it is essential for government to acquire land that will be suitable for the crop or livestock being farmed with. However, some land parcels are being used for land reform, as indicated by an (A) in Figure 6.1a.

From an examination of Figure 6.1b and doing fieldwork in this specific region, it is clear that the land owned by the government situated next to the river banks could be ideal for land reform projects. According to Donaldson et al. (2013), however, some of those land parcels were without owners and were indicated by the Matzikama Municipality as probably being state-owned land, e.g. road reserves. With the state owning land on the banks of the Olifants River, the DRDLR should look into including this land for land reform projects and pair up with commercial farmers to help plan how to start a new farm if nothing has been planned for that specific land parcel that has been chosen to be redistributed to emerging farmers. Why take land from successful commercial farmers if the government has access to arable land and a chance to increase agricultural production by adding more farms in the region? ESS projects could be a stepping stone to help ease emerging black farmers into commercial farming, although it cannot be seen as an easy way to do so. Examining the case studies identified in the Matzikama Municipality, it is clear that there are some obstacles hindering ESS success.
Figure 6.1a: State-owned land in the Matzikama Municipality

Source: Donaldson et al. 2013
6.2 CASE STUDIES OF ESS PROJECTS IN THE MATZIKAMA MUNICIPAL AREA

Currently there are not many ESS projects in the Matzikama municipal area. According to Jacques Pheiffer (2012, Pers com), the deputy director of the Clanwilliam district’s DRDLR, there currently ARE only four ESS projects that have been supported financially by the DRDLR (see Figure 6.2). The Alfalfa land reform project, which has not been recognised by the DRDLR but has received LRAD grants in the past, has been selected for investigation (see Figure 6.3). While conducting fieldwork amongst the commercial farmer members of the Vredendal farmers’ association, one respondent (Mr Alro van der Spuy) indicated that he was the co-owner of the Alfalfa land reform project. This made it easier to acquire the business plan and get permission to speak to some of the shareholders because the respondent was familiar with the purpose of the study. The business plan of the Alfalfa land reform project provided the necessary information to indicate how the project began and how it is run.

The other ESS project, namely the Eikevlei land reform project, failed miserably and was used by some of the commercial farmers in the region as an example of why they believed land reform was impractical. With the help of Sityata, the business plan of the Eikevlei land reform project was acquired to understand the project better. With the project being a failure there was no specific person to talk to, so with the guidance of a commercial farmer some of the shareholders were found and were asked their opinions on the failure.
Figure 6.2: Land reform projects in the Matzikama Municipality

Figure 6.3: Locations of ESS project case studies
6.2.1 Alfalfa land reform project

6.2.1.1 Insight into the reason for establishing the ESS project

The owners of Tlakaan Boerdery, Messrs Melt and Alro van der Spuy, decided to empower their farm workers by starting an ESS project (Van der Spuy 2012, Pers com). This project was designed to achieve the objectives of both the DRDLR and the Tlakaan, Bruinklip and Alfalfa farm workers, which are the following:

- Increase access to agricultural land to the previously disadvantaged;
- Facilitate long-term empowerment by assisting the previously disadvantaged to acquire their own land;
- Overcome the racial and gender discrimination related to agricultural land ownership of the past;
- Stimulate economic growth through agricultural activities;
- Create development opportunities for the youth from the previously disadvantaged community;
- Empower beneficiaries by improving their economic and social position in society;
- Ensure long-term sustainability and profitability; and
- Use economic principles when starting the project, like aimed growth objectives, ownership, participation and responsibility of the beneficiaries.

This project was designed as and facilitated to be an economically viable agricultural venture, with mentoring being provided over the long term. The success and empowerment of the majority of shareholder in and new entrants to agriculture is ensured by the positive actions, proven expertise and support of the co-shareholder in all areas of the new farming initiative.

6.2.1.2 Ownership of farm

According to the business plan provided by Mr. van der Spuy, the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust, which was established in 2006, is a proprietary company that is the registered owner of the wine farm known as Alfalfa and its farming equipment. The Alfalfa Boerdery Trust is managed by the Alfalfa Werkerstrust (workers’ trust) and Tlakaan Trust, with the relationship being as follows (see Figure 6.4):

![Figure 6.4: Alfalfa Boerdery Trust shareholder relationship](http://scholar.sun.ac.za)
As mentioned in the business plan, the Alfalfa farm was bought with capital loaned from a commercial bank by the Tlakaan Trust and with capital from the Alfalfa Werkerstrust, which was obtained from an LRAD grant from the government. This relates to what Pienaar (2013, Pers com) said about the land acquisition process needing to focus on acquiring land that is already in the market. The Tlakaan Trust consists of two shareholders, namely Messrs Alro and Melt van der Spuy. Mr Alro van der Spuy serves as the mentoring general manager of the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust, which he will do until the business is financially independent. Then it will be up to the trustees of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust to choose a new general manager. The structure of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust is illustrated in Figure 6.5.

The main objective of the Trust, as highlighted in the business plan, was to create a structure through which pre-selected persons, at the discretion of the founder and the trustees, had the opportunity to be enabled to acquire land as well as to be involved in related farming activities. A total of 13 women and 13 men participate in this project. The project has empowered 15 families and a total of 26 farm workers. As mentioned in Chapter 4, land should not only be made available to people who are farm workers, and it is notable that this project was used as an opportunity to enable women to participate as well. Due to the lack of specific programmes or policies focusing on empowering women in the agricultural sector, this project is a tiny step in the direction that government needs to think when addressing women’s equity.

The project is being run as an equity trust with six trustees, meaning that each beneficiary has a share equivalent to his/her contribution. The trustees of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust, along with fellow shareholders, selected a management team that acts as the executive committee of the business. The Alfalfa Werkerstrust, and in particular the trustees, protect and promote the interests of all members. In this regard, the trust is assisted by the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust in relation to the following aspects:

- Retirement plan for members
• Scholarship plan for promising individuals
• Estate planning
• Tenure of beneficiaries
• Human development
• Training

The aspects mentioned above contribute to increasing the beneficiaries’ capacity to farm efficiently, but these aspects are not necessarily funded by the government. Post-reform support from the government has been abysmal to say the least, thus the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust took the initiative to try to address issues that relate to the aspects identified above.

The board of Alfalfa Boerdery Trust consists of six trustees – three representatives of Alfalfa Werkerstrust, two representatives of Tlakaan Trust and one independent trustee (farming auditor). The Alfalfa Werkerstrust is entitled to buy the other shareholders’ shares in the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust if all parties give consent, and at a value determined by an independent assessor that is acceptable to both parties on the day of acquisition. This buyout process will not be an option within the first 10 years to ensure financial and production stability. Profits are declared and distributed according to normal trust rules. No profits will be claimed before the trust is sound and financially independent. It was envisioned that the project would be profitable after five years, but with the financial crisis worldwide and the redundancy of wine in the market, no profit had been generated by 2012 to divide amongst the shareholders.

Even though this project has not reaped the financial benefits that were expected after five years, it has the potential to become a successful ESS project that eventually could contribute to the upliftment of the shareholders. Post-reform support could possibly have helped this venture to become profitable faster. Many programmes for building the beneficiaries’ agricultural capacity exist, like NARYSEC and CRDP, but these programmes clearly are not being implemented correctly (Karaan 2013, Pers com). More financial support and skills-building opportunities are needed to increase the success rate of land reform projects (Crosby 2013, Pers com).

6.2.1.3 Views of shareholders of Alfalfa Werkerstrust on the Alfalfa land reform project

While doing fieldwork, the Alfalfa farm was visited and some of the shareholders of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust were questioned about the project. Out of the 26 shareholders, seven shareholders (five men and two women) were asked how they felt about the project and whether it had improved their circumstances. Having informal conversations with the shareholders, undertaken with the help of a small questionnaire (see Appendix C), without the commercial farmer being present revealed how they truly felt.
Regarding their level of education, none of the interviewed shareholders had a tertiary qualification. Three shareholders revealed that their highest level of qualification was primary school, two shareholders had not finished secondary school, and two shareholders had a matric certificate. When asked about their annual income, one respondent indicated that he earned R24 000 per annum as a farm worker, thus he was very eager to become a shareholder when the opportunity arose to become part of this project.

These shareholders agreed to become part of this project to better their livelihoods and empower themselves. The respondents indicated that it took almost two years to receive the LRAD grant with the farm was purchased for the ESS project. The shareholders were asked what they thought about farmers getting compensation for their farms, and all the respondents believes people should purchase land, whether with private capital or a grant received from the government. One shareholder mentioned that if people get land at no cost, the previous owner is left financially crippled for no significant reason. According to another respondent, people who invest their money in a project will be willing to go the extra mile. These comments made by the respondents link to Crosby’s (2013, Pers com) perception of the land acquisition process that must be implemented by the DRDLR.

Conflict between shareholders in ESS projects is always a possibility; however, the shareholders of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust revealed that, even though there had been issues between the shareholders they had resolved them through peaceful mediation. The three members of the Alfalfa Werkerstrust who also serve on the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust that manages the ESS project are responsible for expressing the grievances of the shareholders to the trustees of the ESS project and to give feedback to the shareholders. This relates Karaan’s (2013, Pers com) perception of collective land ownership being prone to conflict amongst beneficiaries/shareholders, although this project has made provision for raising grievances.

With the project currently not generating any profit, the shareholders have not received any dividends thus far. This has raised some uncertainty amongst the shareholders about the project, although the respondents said that they were confident that their hard work would pay off soon. Some respondents indicated that they would like to know more about how the ESS project works and be more involved in decision making, even though representatives have been elected to be trustees and provide the necessary feedback on the progress being made. One respondent mentioned that only the trustees really knew what was going on, thus giving them the power to make decisions without consulting all the shareholders. The communication between the trustees and shareholders has to improve.

Communication is a key aspect in making any project operational and requires participation from management and all parties involved. As mentioned in Chapter 4, one key operational aspect that is crucial and also currently is lacking in the implementation of land reform projects is participation (Crosby 2013, Pers com; Karaan 2013, Pers com). If all parties participate by communicating what their
expectations are and in what capacity they can contribute, it will be beneficial to all parties and could increase the chances of the project being successful.

One thing that all the participants indicated was that it is essential to improve their educational circumstances. Empowering people through training and mentoring is the best way to uplift people. Giving the shareholders the necessary skills to continue managing the ESS project successfully is the only way to ensure that the Alfalfa farm will remain productive after the Alfalfa Werkerstrust acquires all the shares of the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust. To have a competitive edge you need to be on the same level as your competitors. The respondents want to receive training that will improve their ability to farm and to maintain the business aspect of farming. Mentoring by the commercial farmer, who has the knowledge and experience, has been implemented since the start of the project. Training that the respondents indicated they wanted was business training and a course to improve their computer skills. These workshops should be hosted and funded by the DRDLR to improve their current lack of post-reform support, as mentioned in Chapter 4.

Financial support from the government is something that all the respondents want and also links with the post-reform support that the DRDLR currently is not providing (see Chapter 4). The respondents want to be financially stable, but to do so they need the capital to invest in crops for future farming and for the essential fertiliser, etc. that is needed to ensure quality produce. With the project not breaking even yet, it is essential that the government helps these shareholders to improve the chances of the ESS project to succeed. As a collective, the shareholders have a vision to empower themselves by getting all the necessary training and mentoring to ensure the successful management of the farm after buying out the commercial farmers’ 50% share in the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust.

When the respondents were asked about the relationship with the commercial farmers in the region, they all indicated that there were no problems and that everyone was friendly towards one another. They felt that the opportunity their employer had given them was great and that they wanted to work alongside him to make a success of the project.

6.2.2 Eikevlei land reform project

6.2.2.1 Summary of the project

According to the Western Cape Government (2010:s.p.), the “KEP (Kapel-Eikevlei-Pomptuin) Boerdery Trust was established by community development worker, Paul Klaase, who originally secured the Eikevlei land through a local church”. The Eikevlei Community Trust was then established and included the previously disadvantaged people living in the Eikevlei community in Klawer. After media reports in June 2006 about the ministerial intervention in the Land Bank auction of the farms Kapel and Pomptuin, the Eikevlei Community Trust approached the owner of the two farms (Mr Atman Engelbrecht) and made an offer for them. The Eikevlei Community Trust bought both farms, with a
combined total of 195.14 ha, for R9 500 000 with an LRAD grant (R8 802 654) provided by the DLA and an additional loan of R3 000 000 (DLA 2007).

The Eikevlei Community Trust decided to give workers and residents on the two farms (permanent and seasonal) the opportunity to become part of the project. With the inclusion of these new beneficiaries, they and the Eikevlei Community Trust beneficiaries formed the KEP Boerdery Trust, which is made up of a total of 294 beneficiaries. The farms mostly produce table grapes to be used for raisins and wine, thus Mr Engelbrecht (Kapel Trust) was offered a share in exchange for his managerial knowledge of the vineyards, and for the availability of equipment and cold storage facilities.

The KEP Boerdery Trust had the option of buying Mr Engelbrecht’s share after five years. Negotiations were also undertaken with one of the biggest tomato production companies in South Africa, namely ZZ2, regarding a 20 ha tomato development on additional irrigation land on the farms. Figure 6.6 illustrates the management structure of the KEP Boerdery Trust. The KEP Boerdery Trust had a 60% share in the vineyard business. When these farms were managed by the Kapel Trust it was one of the biggest agricultural businesses in the region, with commercial production of table grapes and raisins.

After the owner struggled financially, the government decided to intervene and use these farms’ production capability to establish a good foundation for a land reform project. The Kapel Trust was offered a 40% share in exchange for their expertise concerning the vineyard business. According to the Western Cape Government (2010), the Eikevlei project was successfully exporting the grapes being producing to the European market and even received a Golden Accreditation from the UK, which verifies that the project followed European standards.

As for the tomato business, ZZ2 would have received a 74% share for its contribution (9.9 ML/ha water supply and R2 689 657) and the technical management skills they possess. The KEP Boerdery Trust would have been granted a 26% share for their R500 000 contribution, and for the provision of land and
labour. ZZ2 would act as the mentor and give the beneficiaries of the KEP Boerdery Trust the opportunity to receive training on how to run a successful tomato production business.

As for the communication structure of the KEP Boerdery Trust, the plan was that two directors from the Kapel Trust and two directors from ZZ2, along with 10 trustees chosen from the 294 beneficiaries, would serve on the board of the KEP Boerdery Trust. The board of trustees and directors were in charge of making executive decisions about the business. The directors had the business and managerial knowledge needed to serve on a board of trustees, while the 10 KEP Boerdery Trust trustees would be the communication link between the 294 beneficiaries and the directors, which included the mentoring farmer, Mr Engelbrecht.

In theory this project sounded like an innovative way of integrating the previously disadvantaged beneficiaries of the KEP Boerdery Trust into the world of commercial farming. According to the Western Cape Government (2010: s.p.), “this project is a prime example of a best practice for all land reform projects in this country”. When the community gets involved in recognising potential opportunities for empowering and uplifting the previously disadvantaged, it helps local government identify viable land for redistribution faster and thus can improve the efficiency of local government.

The Eikevlei project, however, was never able to rise to the occasion and failed miserably. The vineyard business was operational for a period, but when the funds dried up, so did the business. As for the tomato business, ZZ2 decided against investing in the project after realising that it was going to be a financial black hole. The project is a prime example of how the government has lacked the essential managerial and operational elements needed to improve the chances of the project being successful, not even to mention the lack of post-reform support.

Managerially there was a clear lack of institutional and organisational structure, specifically a lack of communication between national and local government. Operationally there was no transparency between the DRDLR, the directors and trustees of the project and the beneficiaries, thus hindering the potential of the project to be efficient and effective. As mentioned in the previous section about the Alfalfa ESS project, the lack of post-reform support is something that the shareholders really complained about during the interviews held with them. This was also the case with the beneficiaries of the Eikevlei land reform project.

6.2.2.2 The reasons for project failure

The first obvious reason why this project was bound to fail is the number of beneficiaries involved in the project. A total of 294 beneficiaries were needed to get enough LRAD grants from the government to be able to purchase the two farms. According to Sityata (2013, Pers com), the Cape Winelands District Officer of the DRDLR, the commercial farmer only used the beneficiaries to be able to obtain
funds from the government, thus exploiting the beneficiaries’ lack of knowledge regarding ESS projects and income.

These beneficiaries were made to believe that the project would empower them and improve their livelihoods, but there it is not possible that 294 beneficiaries would be able to get enough dividends from a 60% share to improve their livelihoods enough for them to actually be able to buy out the commercial farmer. Even if the farm had been big enough with good quality soil, it is inevitable that this project would have failed. If one commercial farmer can barely make enough to survive from farming on two farms, how are 294 shareholders going to benefit from two farms? With the beneficiaries’ expectations being set higher than what was accomplishable, it links to external factors influencing the overall outcome of a project – be it success or failure.

The second reason why this project would eventually fail was the different community groups included in the KEP Boerdery Trust. The members of the Eikevlei Community Trust were residents of the Eikevlei community situated in Klawer. They did not stay on the two farms purchased for the Eikevlei project, while the other beneficiaries were residents and farm workers of the Kapel and Pomptuin farms, consequently creating conflict between the beneficiaries. The operational aspects of the project were negatively affected by the conflict between the beneficiaries, because not all beneficiaries participated in the decision-making processed and/or agricultural production (Crosby 2013, pers.com; Karaan 2013, Pers com).

According to Respondent X (2012, Pers com), a farmworker on the Kapel farm, “the beneficiaries who live in Klawer thought they were the boss, but they do not know anything about farming and what is going on at the farm”. Including people who have no experience of or interest in farming in a land reform project can cause a rift between the people who actually want to participate. It is unfair for every beneficiary to get the same share if some are not even participating in the farming process, thus increasing conflict and decreasing morale amongst the beneficiaries who actually work on the farm. This rift can even influence the rate of production in the sense that the farm workers can become demotivated, particularly if beneficiaries who do not work are getting the same dividends as those doing all the work.

In addition to what has been brought to light by respondent X, Crosby (2013, Pers com) also made a valid point about access to land having to go through a selection process, making it possible to choose people who fit the criteria to farm successfully. As Karaan (2013, Pers com) mentioned, the people who get access to land do not necessarily have to be farm workers, but that they should be willing to learn farming skills and work hard.

When some of the beneficiaries of the KEP Boerdery Trust were asked why they thought the project failed, two causes were identified. The first was the lack of support from the government, particularly
the DRDLR. Respondent Y (2012, Pers com) mentioned that the DRDLR had promised the shareholders an additional R1.2 million to be used for the project, but this contribution was never given to the beneficiaries. One anonymous respondent accused the government official in charge of the project of being corrupt. The only governmental body that attempted to help the beneficiaries was the DoA (Respondent X 2012, Pers com). Respondent X (2012, Pers com) said that “the division of the two departments that focus on land, namely the DoA and the DRDLR, is a very bad idea”. The communication between the two departments is very poor, therefore decreasing the efficiency of both department in relation to land reform. Transparency and accountability of the DRDLR regarding this project have clearly been lacking and were identified by the beneficiaries interviewed as being problems, thus linking to the perceptions of the key role players on the DRDLR’s operational abilities.

Even though Respondent Y said that they did not receive any additional capital, the beneficiaries might not have been aware that they had received funding. The mentor of the project, Mr Engelbrecht, managed all the finances, thus financial decisions could easily be made without the beneficiaries’ knowledge or consent (Respondent Y 2012, Pers com). This links to the second cause identified by the beneficiaries, that being the lack of communication between the directors and the beneficiaries. Respondent X, who served on the board of trustees, said that there were no real problems between the management and the beneficiaries (Respondent X 2012, Pers com), while Respondent Y (2012, Pers com) and Respondent Z (2012, Pers com) expressed their dissatisfaction with the communication between the board of trustees and the beneficiaries. According to Respondent Z (2012, Pers com), the communication between the board members and the beneficiaries was non-existent, thus creating uncertainty and confusion amongst the beneficiaries.

With the vagueness regarding the progress of the project, the directors could have influenced the decision making to suit their own agenda. This links to why Sityata (2013, Pers com) believes, namely that ESS projects are being used by white commercial farmers to increase their own financial gain, thus using the beneficiaries to get funding from the government to purchase land.

The farmland currently is not being used. The residents who live on the Kapel and Pompuitin farms have no access to electricity, thus they use the wood from the grapevines that used to produce table grapes and raisins. The respondents were asked how the failure of the Eikevlei project could have been prevented. According to them, if the project would still be thriving if they had a better mentor and more support from the government. The idea of mentoring 294 shareholders, including people who have no interest in farming, is incomprehensible, thus making it inevitable that this project would have failed eventually.
6.3 CONCLUSION

Land reform projects in the Matzikama municipal area have thus far not succeeded as the beneficiaries and the government would have wanted. The Alfalfa land reform project has demonstrated how commercial farmers can uplift farm workers who are willing to participate and increase their skills set. With the Alfalfa Werkerstrust consisting of only 26 shareholders with a 50% share in the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust, it is more realistic that these shareholders would get adequate dividends to increase their financial situation if the business broke even.

In contrast to the Alfalfa project, the beneficiaries of the Eikevlei land reform project would never be able to receive an adequate dividend payment that could be life changing. It is naïve to think that 294 beneficiaries could make a decent living off two farms with only 60% of the shares. What has been learnt through this discussion is that the only way projects will have a chance to succeed is to increase the support of the government and make sure that these projects consist of a rational number of shareholders who could one day reap the benefits of success.

The DRDLR should allocate more resources, be it financial or skills training, to the current land reform projects and take state-owned land into consideration when acquiring land for land reform projects. An evaluation should be done to see if the mentor of the project has the shareholders’ best interests at heart, and also ensure to that the shareholders know that being successful in agriculture does not happen overnight.

This discussion will now continue to the concluding chapter, which provides an analysis and synthesis of the study. Problems identified with the current implementation of land reform will be discussed and recommendations will be made on how to improve the current state of the land reform programme. Suggestions for future research will also be made for other researchers who are interested in doing similar research.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUDING SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The main aim of this study was to determine the farmer perceptions of land availability and land reform in the Matzikama Municipality. This concluding chapter summarises the analysis and synthesis of the main findings, identifies problems with the current implementation of land reform and makes recommendations to improve it, re-examines the objectives, addresses the limitations of the study and provides suggestions for future research.

7.1 SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS OF STUDY

The perceptions of the different groups involved in land reform, namely the commercial farmers, beneficiaries of the land reform projects and key role players (including government officials, agricultural organisations and academics), can be used by the government to improve the current state of the land reform programme. This study focused on how these different groups felt about the current progress with and implementation of the land reform programme, specifically in the Matzikama municipal area. With South Africa’s history of colonialism, racial discrimination, traditionalist and nationalist resistance (CDE 2005), the new government had to correct the injustices of the apartheid regime that resulted in the white minority having 86% of the agricultural land in South Africa. Government created the land reform programme and other policies and strategies to address this uneven distribution of land amongst the citizens of South Africa, but these policies and the programme itself have not been as successful as anticipated by the government and previously disadvantaged citizens. It was established that the people who were included in this study agree that the government’s approach to restore the balance of land ownership based on the demographics of South Africa has not been as remarkable and sufficient as needed. The main findings on the perceptions of land reform in the Matzikama municipal area and South Africa in general are divided into three viewpoints, being the perceptions of commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area, the perceptions of the beneficiaries of ESS projects in the Matzikama municipal area, and the perceptions of the key role players on land reform.

7.1.1 Perception of key role players on land reform

The land reform programme and other policies associated with land reform have different aspects that influence the success of land reform overall. By doing structured interviews with the identified key role players (see Chapter 6), it was possible to identify how these role players feel about how land reform is currently being implemented and progressing in South Africa. The overall perception of the policy aspects (see Chapter 6, Section 6.2) was that the government had a consultative, top-down approach to implementing land reform and had specific strategies to acquire land while following the correct procedures concerning compensation; however, strategies to improve women’s equity and the
environmental sustainability of land reform projects were non-existent. The overall perception of the managerial aspects (see Chapter, Section 6.3) was that the DRDLR was decentralised in theory, although there were gaps between national decision making and grassroots implementation, thus indicating that the DRDLR was not efficient enough and does not have the institutional capacity to handle the land reform programme. The overall perception of the operational aspects (see Chapter 6, Section 6.4) was that the participation, transparency, accountability and efficiency of the land reform programme were not up to standard, although the rule of law concerning acquiring land was impartial and fair to all parties involved. The overall perception of the post-reform support (Chapter 6, Section 6.5) provided by the government was that programmes were in place (NARYSEC and CRDP) to provide beneficiaries with the necessary training and technical assistance, although these programmes were not being implemented effectively, thus contributing to the failure of land reform projects.

The overall perception of the external factors (see Chapter 6, Section 6.6) influencing the land reform programme is that the DRDLR tries to take the beneficiaries’ capacity into consideration, but not all beneficiaries have the same level of capacity and, without the essential skills and experience, their expectation of becoming successful commercial farmers is unrealistic. The overall perception of the impact of land reform (see Chapter 6, Section 6.7) is that land reform projects have not made such a big impact on the beneficiaries’ livelihoods and that the beneficiaries’ expectations are not being met, leaving them unsatisfied and making them impatient.

7.1.2 Perceptions of commercial farmers in Matzikama municipal area

The snap survey with the commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area, specifically the members of the Vredendal farmers’ association who were willing to participate in the study, confirmed the notion of land reform being a sensitive topic in South Africa, as the respondents were hesitant to give their perceptions on land reform. Some commercial farmers feel threatened by the land reform programme because they might lose their farms as a result of this programme. Even though some of the respondents felt threatened by the land reform programme, the majority (57%) indicated that they felt secure in their ownership of their farm and would even purchase more farmland to expand their business if financially possible. In spite of this, some of the respondents revealed that they were struggling to sustain themselves through farming. With the majority of the farmers in the Matzikama municipal area involved in viniculture, it is not surprising that the results indicate that farmers are struggling to produce enough grapes to sustain themselves. With the sin tax being extremely high, commercial farmers are under immense pressure and have no way to negotiate prices to decrease this pressure. With this pressure on them, farmers are discouraging their children from continuing farming, as they might not be able to sustain themselves financially, and the further possibility of the government acquiring the farm does not help. The commercial farmers’ perception of the land reform programme being used as a strategy to accelerate national reconciliation is very negative. They believe that the land reform
programme has divided the agricultural community even more than it was before. Some of the respondents felt that land reform had increased racism in the farming community even more since 1994, and that this hinders the relationship between the respondents and their employees.

With the overwhelmingly negative response from the commercial farmer respondents, it was anticipated that their overall perception of the progress and implementation of the land reform programme would also be negative. The farmers felt that the failure of land reform had been ascribed to white commercial farmers not being willing to participate and help with the process. From the perceptions of the commercial farmer respondents on land reform projects it is clear that some farmers are willing to help start ESS projects, although without the financial support of the government it is impossible to make a success if these farmers struggle to support themselves. The farmers felt that government should be more selective of whom they give agricultural land to when it comes to establishing land reform projects, because if the emerging farmers/beneficiaries do not have the passion and skills to farm the project will fail. The expectations that are created amongst emerging farmers are of farming being some sort of utopia, while the younger generation might not be interested in farming.

7.1.3 ESS projects in the Matzikama municipal area

With the success rate of land reform projects in South Africa being 10%, one out of every ten projects succeed, according to the Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform (SAPA 2010). It therefore is not unexpected that land reform projects in the Matzikama municipal area have not been as successful as anticipated by the beneficiaries and government. To be able to examine ESS projects in the Matzikama municipal area, two case studies were investigated – a successful ESS project (Alfalfa land reform project) and a failed ESS project (Eikevlei land reform project). The business plans of both case studies were examined to see how each project planned to empower its beneficiaries and use the funds provided by the government through the LRAD grant.

The Alfalfa land reform project, one of the projects in the Matzikama municipal area that is still operational, has proven that there are commercial farmers who are willing to uplift the farm workers who worked with them by starting a business with them. The shares of the Alfalfa Boerdery Trust, which is the registered landowner, are divided equally between the Alfalfa Werkerstrust (26 shareholders with a 50% share) and the Tlakaan Trust (the commercial farmers’ families with a 50% share). With the small number of shareholders of this project, it has a more realistic chance of providing the shareholders with adequate dividends when the business breaks even. In contrast to the Alfalfa land reform project, the Eikevlei land reform project had too many beneficiaries expecting adequate dividends from the venture. It is impossible for 294 beneficiaries to receive adequate dividends from two farms with only 60% of the shares.
A comparison of the two case studies has revealed that, even though the government provided LRAD grants to help the projects get started, it was still difficult to keep the projects up and running without additional support after acquiring the land identified for the project. The government should allocate more resources to increase the probability of successful land reform projects and to ensure that the mentors and beneficiaries are willing to work hard together.

7.2 PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED WITH THE LAND REFORM PROGRAMME AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Throughout the course of this study it has been evident that land reform in South Africa has major flaws that have contributed to the slow progress and failed projects of the land reform programme. The main problems with the current implementation of land reform in South Africa that have been identified will now be discussed briefly and recommendation for improvement will be made.

7.2.1 Policy and decision making approach

There is not sufficient coherence in new policies being created, thus the disjointedness must be addressed by the government. The current approach to policy formulation on land reform is that of a consultative top-down approach. The government is too dependent on private consultants to help with the formulation of strategies and plans and does not include the beneficiaries who ultimately will reap the benefits of these strategies and plans. In Chapter 6, Prof Karaan (2013, Pers com) revealed that he believed the government should take the lead and retain the consultative approach, but that it has to increase the institutional capacity of the DRDLR to be able to manage its responsibilities. If the government wants to improve the implementation of the land reform programme, it should increase the amount of input the beneficiaries have in the strategies and plans being created. If the beneficiaries are involved from the start it could increase the satisfaction of their expectations and could indirectly increase their willingness to make a success of farming.

As for the decision-making process concerning the land reform programme, the DRDLR believes that it is decentralised enough to handle the demanding task of land reform, but there still are massive gaps between national decision making and implementation on a local level. The decision-making process relies on the institutional capacity of the governing system in charge of land reform implementation, and the DRDLR clearly lacks the needed capacity to ensure that the decisions being made on the national level are being implemented correctly at grassroots level. The government should ensure that it appoints employees who have the skills and experience to manage and implement whatever needs to be done concerning the land reform programme. To increase the efficiency of the decision-making process, the DRDLR should be held accountable for the decisions it makes. However, the accountability of the DRDLR varies from province to province. If accountability is increased in the DRDLR it will be
easier to identify which provinces or districts needs more funding and where there is corruption and inadequate staff.

7.2.2 Acquisition process

The current acquisition process for the redistribution of land is slow due to a cumbersome bureaucracy, thus making the governing system of the DRDLR the real problem. The WBWS approach to acquiring land was declared as unsuccessful by the government, although Agri SA believes that it failed due to poor implementation. Other strategies implemented by the DRDLR, like SLAG and LRAD, have also failed miserably due to the number of beneficiaries who have to be part of a land reform project to receive enough funds from government to be able to purchase the desired land. The DRDLR newest strategy, namely PLAS, which makes the government the landowner who leases the land to the beneficiaries on a five-year contract, has the potential to improve the success rate of land reform projects, although the beneficiaries are not the owners, thus defeating the main objective of land reform, viz. the redistribution of land to the previously disadvantaged or people who were discriminated against.

For the acquisition process to speed up, the government should allocate more of its funds to land reform to increase the DRDLR’s capacity to handle the demanding task of acquiring land for redistribution. According to the NDP (see Figure 3.1), the DRDLR should identify land that is or will be available for transfer, thus making acquisition easier because the commercial farmer is already willing to sell his/her land. The government should also consider including local communities in helping to identify available agricultural land for acquisition, thus decreasing the amount of time spent on research by the DRDLR that could have been used differently.

7.2.3 Lack of partnership and integration between government departments, the private sector and beneficiaries

For land reform to be successful in South Africa, all sectors involved should communicate with one another to ensure that every sector knows what is expected from them. Land reform is not just about redistributing agricultural land to beneficiaries, but also about creating an integrated agricultural sector in which the government and the private sector combine forces to help the beneficiaries financially and to provide opportunities for these beneficiaries’ produce to be accepted in the commercial market. This, however, is still far from a reality in South Africa, e.g. the DRDLR and DoA cannot even decide who should take the lead in post-reform support. The government should encourage a partnership between the private and public sector to increase the chance beneficiaries have to enter the commercial agricultural market. The government should also provide more opportunities for consultation between them and the beneficiaries, thus improving transparency. Transparency between the government and the public sector is crucial to be able to implement the land reform programme effectively, but the government lacks the level of transparency needed to increase the success rate of the land reform
programme. The beneficiaries might be well informed about the land reform programme itself, nevertheless the beneficiaries still struggle to realise what exactly their obligations are concerning land reform. It is evident that the red tape that comes with applying for a land reform project discourages beneficiaries and might be the reason why the beneficiaries are not sufficiently informed about their obligations as emerging farmers – the reason being that there is too much incoherent information available, thus confusing the beneficiaries in the process.

7.2.4 Lack of government support

The lack of government support, be it pre- or post-reform, was identified as a problem by all parties interviewed and questioned for this study. Some of the commercial farmer respondents mentioned that they were interested in starting an ESS project, but that they would never be able to make their idea a reality without support from government. For ESS projects to uplift the beneficiaries, the government should assist commercial farmers in purchasing land and provide post-reform support that could help the project break even faster so that the beneficiaries can reap the benefits and then be able to buy out the commercial farmer’s share. The case study of the Eikevlei land reform project has shown how poorly ESS projects perform if no additional support and supervision is provided by the government. Government should consider a proactive planning process for the future, thus thoroughly plan every step of the implementation of land reform. To enforce proactive planning the government will have to allocate more funds to land reform to be used to start land reform projects and help the beneficiaries to become successful commercial farmers. Post-reform support will always play an important role in improving the success rate of land reform in South Africa, although if sufficient funds are allocated to land reform they should be spent appropriately. The objectives will now be re-examined to determine if they have all been met.

7.2.5 Beneficiaries’ inexperience and lack of skills concerning farming

Land reform projects do not only fail due to a lack of government support. Government does not take the beneficiaries’ experience and skills, or lack thereof, into consideration when transferring agricultural land to them. Government should provide opportunities for beneficiaries to build their agricultural skills that will give these emerging farmers the chance to compete with commercial farmers who have been farming for generations. Without the necessary skills the beneficiaries will never be able to cope with the stress that goes with farming. To farm is a lifelong commitment and, without passionate and skilled farmers, land reform projects will never flourish.

7.3 REVISITING THE OBJECTIVES

The first objective of this study was to examine the literature on land reform to establish an understanding of what land reform is, what overall objectives it has, what types and approaches exist,
and how it has been implemented internationally. This investigation was done in Chapter 2, where it was evident from the literature that every country that decides to implement land reform aims to provide land to the landless, to empower the poor and to ensure that the injustices of the past are corrected. Internal and external forces put pressure on governments to resolve injustices, and this can be done by formulating objectives that can address social, political or economic crises.

Objective two was to investigate policies, legislation and the land reform programme in South Africa, and how the programme has been implemented; this was done in Chapter 3. The ANC drew up an election manifesto and programme that would be used to neutralise the relocation of millions of black South African citizens during the previous colonial and apartheid eras. The land reform programme is seen as the main instrument for the implementation of land reform in South Africa, as it uses various policies and legislation to enable and enforce strategies to correct the injustices of the past. Even though the land reform programme has tried to address the land question of previously disadvantaged South African citizens, it is still struggling to make a success of the land reform project. With only a 10% success rate (nine out of 10 land reform projects fail) (SAPA 2010) it is clear that the South African government has to reassess its current land reform programme.

The third objective was to identify the perceptions of key role players on land reform and to use these perceptions to assess the current state of the land reform programme in South Africa. It was established in Chapter 4 that the key role players believe that the current implementation of land reform in South Africa is not satisfactory for all stakeholders, whether the beneficiaries or the government. The rate at which land has been transferred to previously disadvantaged citizens has been too slow, and the lack of support from the government has contributed to the negativity that surrounds the land reform programme. The key role players interviewed suggested that, to improve the perception of land reform in South Africa, government should implement strategies more proactively and be held accountable for the decisions they make. Transparency also plays a major role when assessing land reform and, according to the interviewed key role players, the DRDLR lacks the transparency needed to ensure its strategies are being executed efficiently.

The fourth objective was to identify the perceptions of the commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area on land reform. In Chapter 5 it became clear that most of the commercial farmer respondents had very negative perceptions of land reform, even though some respondents indicated that they would be willing to help uplift their farm workers if they received support from the government. These respondents revealed that commercial farmers believe that the government is against the white farming community and that government is decreasing the food security of South Africa by giving inexperienced and unskilled emerging farmers agricultural land.

Objective five was to determine how successful or unsuccessful land reform projects have been in the Matzikama municipal area by investigating farms that have implemented it. Two case studies were
examined in Chapter 6 – the Alfalfa land reform project (classified as a successful land reform project) and the Eikevlei land reform project (classified as an unsuccessful land reform project). Even though the white commercial farmer who established the Alfalfa land reform project still owns 50% of the farm, the farm is still productive and will generate the dividends expected by the shareholders to uplift themselves. As for the Eikevlei land reform project, it was identified by the commercial farmers in the Matzikama municipal area as one of the most unrealistic projects initiated by the government.

The sixth and final objective was to identify the problems that the land reform programme is experiencing and to make recommendations on how to improve the current condition of land reform in South Africa that was discussed in the previous section (Chapter 7, Section 7.2). The five major problems identified with the current land reform programme are the following:

1. The incoherence of the current policy-making approach and the massive gaps between national and local stakeholders in the current decision-making approach;
2. The slow acquisition process for agricultural land due to cumbersome bureaucracy;
3. The lack of partnership and integration between government departments, the private sector and beneficiaries;
4. The lack of government support, which has contributed to the poor success rate of land reform projects; and
5. The beneficiaries’ inexperience and lack of skills concerning farming.

To address these problems associated with the land reform programme, the government should reassess the DRDLR approach to implementation and decision making. This can be done by appointing employees who have the skills and experience to implement strategies and who can be held accountable for the decisions they make. Government should also consider using the local community to help identify land that is available for transfer and to take the local communities’ expectations into consideration. Lastly, government should allocate more funds to supporting the beneficiaries of land reform projects and also create more opportunities for beneficiaries to become more educated in how to manage a successful commercial farm. Even though all six objectives were met, this study was not without some limitations. These will be discussed in the following section.

7.4 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study encountered a number of limitations that affected data collection, the way data was processed and the overall analysis to address the objectives set for the study. The first and greatest limitation of this study is the number of commercial farmer respondents who were willing to participate in the study. The only farmers’ association that was willing to provide its membership list was the Vredendal farmers’ association, which has approximately 100 members, of which 83 are commercial farmers. The first fieldwork opportunity was in the middle of May 2012 (14 to 25 May), which was not an ideal time,
because most farmers go on vacation after harvesting the last grapes in April. Due to the vast area the commercial farmers inhabit, and how time consuming it was to complete the questionnaire, it was difficult to know how many farmers could be interviewed. Without knowing exactly where each farm was situated it was unclear whether the farmers who agreed to participate in the study were in close proximity of one another.

After the first fieldwork opportunity it was decided to try mailing the questionnaires to the members. This method was not ideal because there was no way to monitor if all members received their letters, and the members had no incentive to complete the questionnaire. This method had a meagre 10% return rate. During the second fieldwork opportunity, from 24 October until 7 November 2012, the members who did not mail their questionnaires back were phoned to make appointments to deliver the questionnaire. With the period of visiting the study area for the second time being when farmers were preparing to harvest grapes, a great number of the farmers used this as an excuse not to participate.

Driving from farm to farm did not work either, because there was no guarantee that the farmers would be on the plot on which the farm house was built. Therefore, only 23 of the 83 members of the Vredendal farmers’ association completed the questionnaire, which was then used as a snap survey. The latter relies on making a generalised statement of what the respondents said as a collective unit. These generalisations might be seen as a limitation, although it was evident while conducting this survey that this farming community is closely knit in the sense that the respondents’ perceptions correlated with each other.

Another limitation was that of collecting sufficient data to analyse land reform projects in the Matzikama municipal area. After trying to get a hold of a list of previous and current land reform projects in the study area from the Rural Development and Land Reform District Office in Clanwilliam, the two case studies analysed in this study was identified by Alro van der Spuy, who started the Alfalfa land reform project. With limited time in the study area it was difficult to interview all the shareholders of the Alfalfa land reform project and, with the Eikevlei land reform project having failed, it was difficult to get a hold of previous beneficiaries to interview.

The beneficiaries of the Eikevlei land reform project who were approached had no real interest in being interviewed because they were disappointed with the failure of the project and were under the impression that this study was being done for the government, even after having been informed clearly that it was not. A questionnaire had been designed for the emerging farmers, although after realising that some questions were not applicable to the shareholders and beneficiaries interviewed it was considered to make a list of questions.

An additional limitation concerning the perception of the key role players was the number of role players interviewed. Only one government official, one representative of an agricultural organisation,
a law professor and a commissioner of the NPC were interviewed. However, the amount of qualitative
data obtained from the interviewees was enough to analyse the current state of land reform in South
Africa. No study is without some limitations, but the majority of the limitations were addressed in a
manner that would not affected the overall contribution that the study could make to the field of
geography. Suggestions for future research are made in the next section.

7.5 FUTURE RESEARCH

The research undertaken would suggest that the following topics could be incorporated into future
research done on land reform in South Africa:

- In partnership with the government, studies should be done on how funding allocated for land reform
can be used more efficiently and how the government can be more accountable and transparent.
- Research must be done on methods to improve agricultural production and economic success that
will contribute to stabilise food security in South Africa.
- Studies should be done on identification criteria that can be used to ensure that the people who claim
to want to become emerging farmers will be able to make a success of the agricultural land they
receive, thus ensuring that these emerging farmers have or receive the necessary training needed to
be a proficient commercial farmer.
- Studies should be done on which combination of government departments, private sector entities
and the public sector will improve the success rate of land reform in South Africa.
- Studies should be done on ways to increase women’s equality in the implementation process.
Strategies should be in place to identify women who are interested in farming and give them an
opportunity to obtain access to agricultural land.
- Studies should be done on current training programmes that are in place to assess why they are not
sufficient to assist emerging farmers to obtain the skills needed to farm successfully.
- Research should focus on identifying a realistic timeline that will enable the DRDLR to meet the
deadlines it has set.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTION LIST FOR DRDLR OFFICIAL

Policy Aspects
1. Policy formulation approach - Which approach is used for policy making (top-down, bottom-up or both)? Which approach do you believe should be used?

2. Access to land - How is it determined which people are eligible to become beneficiaries? What is the provision for getting access to land?

3. Equity - How is it ensured that women have equal access to land?

4. Tenure security - Are the land rights registered? What is the level of security of land rights? What happens to expropriated land parcels in terms of compensation? How often do cases cause conflict or disputes in communities where land reform has been or will be implemented?

5. Land acquisition - Which processes are used to acquire land for redistribution? How are the human rights of the landowners being ensured during the land acquisition process?

6. Sustainability - Which strategies are or should be in place to ensure economic sustainability? Are there any strategies to ensure environmental sustainability?

Managerial Aspects
7. Institutional and organisational arrangement - Is the land reform administration centralised or decentralised? Is the authority to deal with the implementation of land reform sufficiently delegated?
8. Managerial efficiency and capacity - How effective is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR)? Does the DRDLR have the institutional capacity to deal with the land reform programme?

Operational Aspects

9. Participation - Do all beneficiaries participate in the implementation process? Are the interests of the beneficiaries being addressed?

10. Rule of law - Are legal provisions being enforced impartially?

11. Transparency - How well are the beneficiaries informed about the land reform programme, the benefits and their obligations?

12. Accountability - How responsible is the staff of the DRDLR in implementing the land reform programme? Is there any provision of grievance reporting and hearing?

13. Efficiency and effectiveness - Are the procedures that beneficiaries have to follow complex? How efficiently are resources being utilised? Are deadlines being met in time?

Post-reform Support

14. Capacity building - Are there any programmes in place to provide beneficiaries with the necessary training and technical assistance? What is the condition of the basic infrastructure? Is any other support provided to the beneficiaries that will improve the productivity of their farms, like fertilisers or seeds?
External Factors

15. Beneficiaries’ expectations - What are the expectations of the beneficiaries? Are their expectations realistic and achievable?

__________________________________________________________________________________

16. Beneficiaries’ capacity – Is the beneficiaries’ capacity taken into consideration before strategies are formulated and implemented? Do the beneficiaries have the capacity to invest in and utilise the acquired land and its resources?

__________________________________________________________________________________

Impact

17. Socio-economic condition - Has the land reform programme improved the income level of the beneficiaries?

__________________________________________________________________________________

18. Beneficiaries’ satisfaction - Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the land reform approach being used? Did the programme meet their expectations?

__________________________________________________________________________________

General Questions

19. What is your perspective of the progress of land reform in general? Is there a list of current and failed land reform projects in the Matzikama, municipal area?

__________________________________________________________________________________

20. Why has the “willing buyer/willing seller” approach been considered unsuccessful? What alternative approaches can be/have been implemented?

__________________________________________________________________________________

21. Is land that is already owned by the government taken into consideration for land reform projects?

__________________________________________________________________________________
22. How does the government plan to align land reform and economic growth? Is there evidence that agricultural production is down as a result of land transfers? If so, what can be done to reverse this trend?

23. Why do you think commercial farmers transfer their farms into trusts?

24. Are equity sharing schemes a common phenomenon in the Matzikama municipal area, or have they been considered for implementation?

25. How is the relationship between the government and commercial white farmers? Do you think there are ways to improve this relationship?
APPENDIX B: STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTION LIST FOR OTHER KEY ROLE PLAYERS

Policy Aspects

1. Policy formulation approach - Which approach is used for policy making (top-down, bottom-up or both)? Which approach do you believe should be used?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

2. Access to land - How should it be determined which people are eligible to become beneficiaries? What is the provision for getting access to land?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

3. Equity - How is it ensured that women have equal access to land?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

4. Tenure security - Are the land rights registered? What is the level of security of land rights? What happens to expropriated land parcels in terms of compensation? How often do cases cause conflict or disputes in communities where land reform has been or will be implemented?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

5. Land acquisition - Which processes are used to acquire land for redistribution? Which methods do you suggest should be used to improve the redistribution process? How are the human rights of the landowners being ensured during the land acquisition process?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________
6. Sustainability - Which strategies are or should be in place to ensure economic sustainability? Are there any strategies to ensure environmental sustainability?

Managerial Aspects

7. Institutional and organisational arrangement - Is the land reform administration centralised or decentralised? Is the authority to deal with the implementation of land reform sufficiently delegated?

8. Managerial efficiency and capacity - How effective is the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR)? Does the DRDLR have the institutional capacity to deal with the land reform programme?

Operational Aspects

9. Participation - Do all beneficiaries participate in the implementation process? Are the interests of the beneficiaries being addressed?

10. Rule of law - Are legal provisions being enforced impartially?
11. Transparency - How well are the beneficiaries informed about the land reform programme, the benefits and their obligations?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

12. Accountability - How responsible is the staff of the DRDLR in implementing the land reform programme? Is there any provision of grievance reporting and hearing?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

13. Efficiency and effectiveness - Are the procedures that beneficiaries have to follow complex? How efficiently are resources being utilised? Are deadlines being met in time?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Post-reform Support

14. Capacity building – (1) Are there any programmes in place to provide beneficiaries with the necessary training and technical assistance? (2) What is the condition of the basic infrastructure? (3) Is any other support provided to the beneficiaries that will improve the productivity of their farms, like fertilisers or seeds? (4) What should be done to improve post-reform success?

1.________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

2.________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

3.________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

4.________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________
**External Factors**

15. Beneficiaries’ expectations - What are the expectations of the beneficiaries? Are their expectations realistic and achievable?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

16. Beneficiaries’ capacity – Is the beneficiaries’ capacity taken into consideration before strategies are formulated and implemented? Do the beneficiaries have the capacity to invest in and utilise the acquired land and its resources?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

**Impact**

17. Socio-economic condition - Has the land reform programme improved the income level of the beneficiaries?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

18. Beneficiaries’ satisfaction - Are the beneficiaries satisfied with the land reform approach being used? Did the programme meet their expectations?

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________
General Questions

19. What is your perspective of the progress of land reform in general?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

20. Why has the “willing buyer/willing seller” approach been considered unsuccessful? What alternative approaches can be/have been implemented?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

21. Land reform in South Africa is obviously a complicated issue, rooted in history, politics, race, economics and more. Given the current state of the situation, what are some of your recommendations for land reform as the South African government moves forward?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

22. Why do you think commercial farmers transfer their farms into trusts?

__________________________________________________________________________________

23. What perception do you think farmers have of land reform and how it has been implemented?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

24. What do you think is the relationship between the government and the commercial white farmers like? Do you think there are ways to improve this relationship?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX C: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR SHAREHOLDERS/BENEFICIARIES OF LAND REFORM PROJECTS

- What source of income did you have before the land reform project?
- Before joining the land reform scheme, did you farm?
- What type of land reform project are you currently involved in?
- Did you acquire the land in a group?
- Why and how was the group formed?
- How long did it take from the time that land was identified by you until the time that you settled here?
- Feeling towards land reform and if it is fair to pay for land acquired for reform.
- How is the land currently being used?
- How was the land divided among the group?
- Have there been arguments, and about what?
- Does a group of trustees/managers for the overall management of the project exist and how were they selected?
- Relationship between management and community/Relationship between commercial farmers and community.
- Do you generate any income from the farm? If not, why?
- What services do you make use of and what type of services do they provide?
- Do you need more help? If yes, what kind of support do you need?
- Did you receive any training? Do you think you need training?
- What are the greatest challenges for you as an emerging farmer?
APPENDIX D: SNAP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COMMERCIAL FARMERS

Geagte Mnr/Me,

Ons is Rése Potgieter van die Universiteit Stellenbosch en Colin Prins van Utrecht Universiteit (Nederland). Ons is besig met die insameling van data vir navorsing oor grondeienaarskap, grondhervorming en die nagevolge wat dit op die ontwikkeling van die Matzikama streek en die eienaarskap van grond mag hê. Die data wat deur middel van die vraelys ingesamel word, sal met diskressie hanteer word en die resultate sal net vir akademiese doeleindes gebruik word.

Maak gebruik van die kontakbesonderhede hieronder indien u belangstel in ’n kopie van die resultate van die opname en/of beskikbaar is vir ’n onderhoud. U samewerking word hoog op prys gestel.

Opregte dank

Rése Potgieter: E-pos: 15293440@sun.ac.za Selfoon: 0832830959
Colin Prins: E-pos: c.y.prins@students.uu.nl

Afdeling A: Besonderhede

1. Ouderdom:  
   | Jonger as 25 | 26 – 35 | 36 – 45 | 46 – 55 | 56 – 65 | Ouer as 66 |
2. Nasionaliteit: RSA Ander:
3. Geslag: Manlik Vroulik
4. Hoogste vlak van formele opvoeding voltooi:
   | Geen | Primêr (Graad 7) | Sekondêr (Graad 12) | Kollege diploma/sertifikaat |
   | Technikon diploma/graad | Universiteit diploma/graad | Nagraads |
5. Spesifiseer asseblief u primêre en sekondêre bron(ne) van inkomste en die persentasie wat dit bydra tot u totale jaarlikse netto inkomste (bv. Wingerd = 60%, Vee = 20% en Gastehuis = 20%):

   | Primêre bron van inkomste: | % |
   | Sekondêre bron(ne) van inkomste: | % |
6. Wat is u beraamde gemiddelde huishoudelike inkomste per jaar?

| Minder as R300 000 | R300 001 - R500 000 | R500 001 - R1 000 000 | Meer as R1 000 000 | Verkies om nie te antwoord nie |

7. Wat is die grootte van hierdie plaas in ha?_______

8. Hoeveel huishoudings is woonagtig op die plaas?_______

9. Hoeveel individue is woonagtig op die plaas?_______

10. Hoeveel mense werk op die plaas? (spesifiseer asseblief hul plek van oorsprong, indien bekend)

Afdeling B: Eienaarlik van die plaas

11. Sedert watter jaar is die plaas in u familie se naam (voorvaders ingesluit)?_______

12. Sedert watter jaar is die plaas in u naam geregistreer?_______

13. Op watter wyse het u die plaas bekom?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ge-erf</th>
<th>Met eie kapitaal aangekoop</th>
<th>Gekoop met ’n gedeeltelike lening van ’n kommersiële bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bekom/toegestaan deur ’n lening van ’n regeringsentiteit</td>
<td>Met ’n lening van die Landbank</td>
<td>Ten volle gefinansier deur die staat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Wat is huidig die hoofgebruik van die grond op u plaas (verskaf slegs een antwoord asseblief)?

Gewasse, spesifiseer asseblief:

Vee, spesifiseer asseblief:

Wildsplaas

Residensiële doeleindes

Toeriste akkommodasie

Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

15. Wat is die huidige sekondêre gebruik(e) van die grond op u plaas (meer as een antwoord toegelaat)?

Gewasse, spesifiseer asseblief:

Vee, spesifiseer asseblief:

Wildsplaas

Residensiële doeleindes

Toeriste akkommodasie

Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:

16. Indien wel, hoe het die gebruik van die grond op u plaas oor die afgelope 10 jaar verander?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

17. Indien u in die afgelope 10 jaar addisionele grond in die Matzikama munisipale area aangekoop het, spesifiseer asseblief die grootte van die grond in ha:1.____ 2. ____3. ____4. ____5. ____

Ander__________________________________________________________________________
Afdeling C: Grondhervormingsbeleide

18. Indien wel, hoe het grondhervormingsbeleide sedert 1994 die eienaarskap van u plaas beïnvloed?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

19. Hoe veilig reken u is u eienaarskapsposisie van die plaas op ’n skaal van 1 (onveilig) tot 10 (veilig)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. Volgens u, watter prosesse kan die sekuriteit van u plaaseienaarskap grotendeels ondermyn? Merk u opinie deur ’n kruisie te plaas in elke lyn (m.a.w. een per stelling).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stelling</th>
<th>Ernstige dreigemente beskou</th>
<th>Sommige dreigemente beskou</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Min dreigemente beskou</th>
<th>Geen dreigemente beskou</th>
<th>N.v.t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Huidige mark omstandighede vir produkte/vee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breër ekonomiese vooruitsigte/uitkomste:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuwe beleide van die provinsiale regering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuwe beleide van nasionale regering:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verkryging van grond vir nutuurbewaring:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familieverwante prosesse (bv. geen opvolg van kinders):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Indien wel, wat was die implikasies wat grondhervormingsbeleide op die landbou-produktiwiteit van u plaas in die afgelope 10 jaar gehad het? Merk u opinie deur ’n kruisie te plaas in elke lyn (m.a.w. een per stelling).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stelling</th>
<th>Baie skadelik</th>
<th>Skadelik</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Voordelig</th>
<th>Baie voordelig</th>
<th>N.v.t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grootte van oes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversifikasie van gewasse:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veegetalle:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwaliteit van vee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opprengs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markperspektiewe vir u landbouprodukte/vee:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ander, spesifiseer asseblief:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Watter ander implikasies vir u landbouproduktiwiteit is direk deur grondhervormingsbeleide oor die afgelope 10 jaar veroorsaak?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

23. Volgens u, tot watter mate het grondhervormingsbeleide oor die afgelope 10 jaar u vermoë om uself te onderhou, belemmer?
24. Tot watter mate reken u het grondhervormingsbeleide ‘n impak gemaak op nasionale versoening:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

25. Enige ander kommentaar oor grondhervormingsbeleide?

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

26. Is u betrokke by ‘n gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema (‘equity-sharing scheme’) ooreenkoms:

JA, gaan na vraag 28  
NEE, gaan voort met vraag 27

27. Sal u ooit oorweeg om deel te neem aan ‘n gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema ooreenkoms:

Ja  Nee

28. Verskaf asseblief rede(s) vir ‘n antwoord in Vraag 26:

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

29. Wat is die implikasies wat die deelname aan ‘n gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema ooreenkoms het op die volgende:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drasties afgeneem</th>
<th>Afgeneem</th>
<th>Neutraal</th>
<th>Verbeter</th>
<th>Drasties verbeter</th>
<th>N.v.t.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grootte van die oes van die plaas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversifikasie van die gewasse van die plaas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veetalle op die plaas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwaliteit van die vee van die plaas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opbrengs van die plaas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Brei asseblief verder uit oor die implikasies wat die deelname aan ‘n gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema ooreenkoms het op die landbou produksie van u plaas. Dui aan indien nie van toepassing (n.v.t.):

__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________

31. Op ’n skaal van 1 tot 10, hoe suksesvol is gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema projekte volgens u waar 1 = onsuksesvol en 10 = suksesvol?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

32. Wat kan dien as ‘n moontlike aansporing vir u om deel te neem aan ‘n gedeelde-eienaarsskapsskema projek? Verskaf rede(s) vir u antwoord.
33. As u betrokke is by opleiding/mentorskap van enige opkomende boer, brei asseblief verder uit daарoor:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

Afdeling D: Ondersteuning van die staat

34. Hoe gereeld maak u gebruik van dienste verskaf deur die volgende organisasies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nooit</th>
<th>1 keer ’n jaar</th>
<th>1 keer ’n maand</th>
<th>Weekliks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naasionale Departement van Landbou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provinsiale Departement van Landbou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naasionale Landbou Bemarkingsraad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landbou Navorsingsraad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landbank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departement van Waterwese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Noem 3 van die belangrikste dienste wat u van die staat benodig in terme van boerdery:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

36. Noem 3 struikelblokke wat u ondervind ten opsigte van boerdery:

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________