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Abstract

This study critically analyzed land redistribution and economic empowerment of farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. Past socio-economic and political policies have resulted in a racially skewed and inequitable distribution of land as well as overcrowding, overstocking and poverty in the countryside. It has become imperative that fundamental change is brought about in order to improve economical opportunities of all South Africans to access land for beneficial and productive use.

Land reform, as the central thrust of land policy, is not only part of the effort towards the creation of equitable land distribution, but also of national reconciliation and stability. This study analyzed the notion of economic empowerment of farm workers. It looked at historical overview of the evolution of politics in South Africa and contemporary legislative framework pertaining to land redistribution and farm workers in the Western Cape. A case study of Bouwland farm in the Stellenbosch agricultural area was used as an example of how land redistribution can contribute to economically empower farm workers.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

This study critically analysed the land redistribution and economic development of farm workers in the Stellebosch agricultural area. The notion of those who have been toiling our land from being farm workers to a farmer is a crucial one. Farm workers are among the poorest communities in South Africa. Despite legislation to protect the tenure rights of those who live on, and to secure the labour rights of those who work on them, there has been little improvement in poverty levels. Farm workers rank as the poorest people in South Africa in terms of many development indicators, including cash income, education levels and nutritional status. The harsh conditions that the farm workers, who have been working on the farms for a long time impacts greatly on their lives. Therefore, the idea of farm workers owning the land for economic development, especially in the rich wine lands in the Stellenbosch area is a crucial one for poverty alleviation.

The study will take the following format:
Chapter one will focus on the research proposal. Chapter two will address historical overview of the evolution of politics in South Africa with reference to farm labour in the Western Cape. This will be followed by Chapter three which will focus on a brief analysis of past and contemporary legislative framework(s) pertaining to land redistribution and farm workers in the Western Cape. Chapter four will be research methodology- literature search, empirical survey,
statistical analysis and interpretation of findings. Lastly, Chapter five will deal with recommendations and concluding remarks. This study is of vital importance as its findings offer information which might be fruitfully used in future attempts to improve land redistribution and the socio-economic lot of farm workers. It is hoped that the output of this research will influence different stakeholders in the land redistribution process.

1.2 THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

Land is a key resource in South Africa, affecting the food security and livelihoods of millions of people, and also acting as a major determining factor in the social and political power relations in the country. When dealing with land redistribution issue, you need to take into account the historical backdrop, the role of apartheid, as well as group areas act. The issue of blacks owning land in South Africa is also a historical backdrop. However, it is also of great significance to outline the fact of poverty and inequality in South Africa, where those who have land are rich and those who work the land are poorest of the poor is the context in which this study will focus on.

1.3 Key questions pertaining to the research

The primary concern of this study was to research land ownership by the previously disadvantaged communities in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. It also looked deep on the economic development of farm laborers and the pace at which the land redistribution program is going.
The question is how land redistribution would contribute to economic development of farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area?

What it is the take of farm owners on land redistribution?

The other question is the sustainability of some of the land redistributed to these farm workers, how would they sustain and continue making profit on the farms?

Have farm workers' incomes increased as a result of their involvement in the land redistribution programs?

1.4 Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to provide a critical analysis of land redistribution process in South Africa, specifically in the Western Cape province Stellenbosch agricultural area. The broad aim of the study is to find out whether land redistribution can lead to economic empowerment of the previously disadvantaged farm workers. In order to achieve this aim, major role players/stakeholders such as the government, farm owners, farm unions together with farm workers were identified as primary sources of information.

1.5 Delimitation of the research

This study presents a case-study that documents and analyzes how a group of farm workers in South Africa’s famous Stellenbosch wine region became shareholders in a recently established vineyard and wine company. The findings of this research report, will first give the background of the newly established Bouwland development farm. The reason for targeting this area of Bouwland is due to a fact that this in
an example of a land reform progress in the Stellenbosch agricultural area.

1.6 Research Design/Methodology

As we all know that the issue of land reform is a crucial one, this study dug deep on the available literature on the land redistribution topic. This study employed the technique of interviewing community leaders in the farms, farmers, and government officials. Interviewing farm workers and farmers respectively was best suited for this study, as it enabled to gather information from various stake-holders. The interviews helped to understand the situation of farm workers in relation to the land redistribution process.

The farm workers leaders were identified as key informant interviewee’s. They were asked open-ended questions such as “Who started the initiative of this economic empowerment project”. According to Zisk (1981:78), “the term “open-ended,” when applied to an interview question, implies the freedom of respondents to answer in their own terms”. This, therefore, gave the interviewee’s freedom to frame answers in their own terms and gave different perspective of land redistribution.

1.6.1 Literature Search (Data Stream 1)

This study draws heavily on existing literature, reports and reviews. Land dispossession during the colonial era and the decades of apartheid rule produced a highly unequal pattern of land ownership
and widespread poverty in South Africa. The land reform programme of South African government is conventionally described as having three legs: restitution, tenure reform and redistribution (Jacobs, Lahiff & Hall 2003:1). They argued that, “while restitution deals specifically with historical rights in land, and tenure reform with forms of land holding, redistribution is specifically aimed at transforming the racial pattern of land ownership” (Jacobs, Lahiff & Hall 2003:1). Redistributing land according to (Van Zyl 1996; Lipton 1996; Deininger & May 2000) is widely seen as having the potential to significantly improve the livelihoods of the rural poor and to contribute towards economic development. McKenzie also states that, “land reform forms a cornerstone of political and economic reconstruction in South Africa” (McKenzie 1993:1). Further literature review will be dealt with in the ensuing chapters.

1.6.1.1 Normative criteria Salient issues, types of literature

The literature reviewed included international and South African literature as well as local Western Cape documents and newspaper articles. This was done to understand issues of land redistribution in a broader and more detailed way. This also assisted in understanding of the land redistribution process and how it impact on farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. The types of literature that were utilized in this study were addressing a variety of issues pertaining to land redistribution and related topics, like land reform and restitution.

However, with neither tenure reform nor restitution likely to make a substantial contribution to redressing the gross imbalance in landholding in the country, attention has rightly focused on the
redistribution programme as the principle means of transferring large areas of land from the privileged minority to the historically oppressed. The original purpose of the redistribution programme, according to the 1997 White Paper, was 'the redistribution of land to the landless poor, labour tenants, farm workers and emerging farmers for residential and productive use, to improve their livelihoods and quality of life' (DLA 1997:36).

1.6.2  Empirical survey (Data Stream 2)

In the empirical survey the study investigated and collected data using various methods. An interview schedule was utilized (see Appendix 1) and focus group guide (see Appendix 2) as means of collecting data. This study employed questionnaire using Likert scale (See Appendix 3). Structured interviews were conducted with a number of key role-players, starting with the Provincial Departments of Agriculture, the provincial offices of the Department of Land Affairs, farmers and farm workers. Applicable documentation was collected from the internet.

1.6.2.1  Description of the research population

A number of areas in the Stellenbosch agricultural were considered as possible research population. However, Bouwland farm was a target population as an example of land redistribution and economic development of farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. Bouwland was utilized as a case study in this research.
1.6.3 **Statistical analysis**

As this is both qualitative and quantitative research, the study employed descriptive statistics. According to Burns (2000:43), “the descriptive aspect of statistics allows researchers to summarize large quantities of data using measures that are easily understood by an observer”. The study will draw on statistics that are already available from Statistics South Africa and other sources. Other statistical analysis methods will be determined by a Statistician.

1.6.4 **Expressing and interpretation of the findings**

The empirical data received will be interpreted meaningfully by the researcher. This interpretation must be carried out so that the findings can be related to the original study question and research objectives (McNabb 2004:75). This will be done by assistance of the statistician.

1.6.5 **Normative model/Recommendations**

This study combined the two data streams represented in respect of literature survey and empirical survey, the findings of statistical analysis of the empirical survey in order to construct a normative model. This addressed the problem statement pertaining to the land redistribution and economic development of farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. The study will then bring a number of recommendations which will be comprehensively described in point form.
1.7 Clarification of concepts

1.7.1 Land Redistribution:

“The purpose of the land redistribution programme is to provide the poor with land for residential and productive purposes in order to improve their livelihoods. Land redistribution is intended to assist the urban and rural poor, farm workers, labour tenants, women and entrepreneurs” (Green Paper on South African Land Policy 1996: iii).

1.7.2 Farm Workers:

Farm workers are those employees employed by a farmer to perform certain operations on the farm under the supervision of the farmer (as the employer), foreman and/or farm manager. These employees either live on the farm or off the farm i.e. in nearby townships or villages (MMBENGWA 2005).

1.7.3 Poverty:

**Poverty** is understood in many senses. The main understandings of the term include:

- Descriptions of material need, typically including the necessities of daily living (food, shelter and health care) Poverty in this sense may be understood as the deprivation of essential goods and services.
- Descriptions of social relationships and need, including social exclusion, dependency, and the ability to participate in society. This would include education and information.
1.8 List of Sources

See Bibliography

1.9 Summary

This chapter therefore, was giving introduction and the background of the study. It also highlighted key questions and objectives of the research. Research design or methodology including literature and empirical survey were dealt with in this chapter. The chapter also addressed Stellenbosch agricultural area as a possible research population with Bouwland farm being the target research population. As this study deals with complex topic of land redistribution, some concepts were clarified in this chapter.
Chapter 2: 
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

As stated in the previous chapter, the land reform programme of South African government is conventionally described as having three legs: restitution, tenure reform and redistribution (Jacobs, Lahiff & Hall 2003:1). They argued that, “while restitution deals specifically with historical rights in land, and tenure reform with forms of land holding, redistribution is specifically aimed at transforming the racial pattern of land ownership” (Jacobs, Lahiff & Hall 2003:1). Land reform is expected to realize a number of different purposes, which are reflected in different policies and legislative enactments.

These purposes include: the redistribution of land to landless poor and women who have denied access to land and decent living conditions’ and to the historically disadvantaged; promoting the emergence of commercial farmers previously denied opportunities to farm; the restitution of land to individuals and communities who were dispossessed of their land; securing tenure rights for labour tenants and farm workers and other claims to occupy or use land. According to Bowyer-Bower & Stoneman (2000:1), “land ownership, and rights of use of land, has been central issues for many countries throughout history, and for many are also issues of the day. They bear upon the livelihoods of rural and urban people, and can play a crucial role in economic development and environmental sustainability”.

2.2 Land redistribution

Land redistribution forms part of the government’s land reform programme, alongside restitution and tenure reform. According to Jacobs, Lahiff, and Hall (2003:2), “all three aspects of the land reform programme are ultimately derived from the Constitution of South Africa. Section 25(5) of the constitution states:

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 (RSA 1996).

Jacobs, Lahiff, and Hall (2003:2) argues that, “access to land is one of the socio-economic rights set out in the Bill of Rights, but nowhere is it stated that everyone has the right to land”.

However, the specific objectives and approach of the redistribution policy are set out in the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy:

The purpose of the land redistribution programme is to provide the poor with access to land for residential and productive uses, in order to improve their income and quality of life. The programme aims to assist the poor, labour tenants, farm workers, women, as well as emergent farmers. Redistributive land reform will be largely based on willing-buyer willing-seller arrangements. Government will assist in the purchase of land, but will in general not be the buyer or the owner. Rather, it will make land acquisition grants available and will support and finance the required planning process. In many cases, communities are expected to pool their resources to negotiate, buy and jointly hold land under a formal title deed. Opportunities
are also offered for individuals to access the grant for land acquisition (DLA 1997B:38).

However, redistribution of land according to (Van Zyl 1996; Lipton 1996; Deininger & May 2000) is widely seen as having the potential to significantly improve the livelihoods of the rural poor and to contribute towards economic development. McKenzie also states that, “land reform forms a cornerstone of political and economic reconstruction in South Africa” (McKenzie 1993:1).

2.2.1 Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development

However, the redistribution programme, in turn, has different components, or 'sub-programmes':

- Agricultural Development - to make land available to people for agricultural purposes
- Settlement - to provide people land for settlement purposes, and
- Non-agricultural enterprises - to provide people land for non-agricultural enterprises, for example eco-tourism projects.

The Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) sub-programme has two distinct parts. First, there is the part that deals with transfer of agricultural land to specific individuals or groups. Second, there is the part dealing with commonage projects, which aim to improve people's access to municipal and tribal land primarily for grazing purposes. These two parts of the sub-programme have in common that they deal with agricultural land redistribution. However, they operate according to different financial mechanisms, different target groups, and different delivery systems. NB Reference!
LRAD is designed to provide grants to black South African citizens to access land specifically for agricultural purposes. The strategic objectives of the sub-programme include: contributing to the redistribution of 30% of the country’s agricultural land over 15 years; improving nutrition and incomes of the rural poor who want to farm on any scale; de-congesting over-crowded former homeland areas; and expanding opportunities for women and young people who stay in rural areas. These objectives will be made possible by the sub-programme’s key underlying principles, which are as follows:

- LRAD is unified and basic, it is flexible and beneficiaries can use it in ways according to their objectives and resources
- All beneficiaries make a contribution (in kind or cash), according to their abilities
- LRAD is demand directed, meaning that beneficiaries define the project type and size
- Implementation is decentralised
- District-level staff assist applicants, but do not approve the application
- *Ex-post* audits and monitoring will substitute a lengthy *ex ante* approval process.

The mode of implementation is adopted in the interest of maximum participation of beneficiaries, speed of approval and quality of outcomes.

However, LRAD encourages participants to design what works best for them. To do this, beneficiaries can access a range of grants (R20 000 to R100 000) depending on the amount of their own contribution in kind, labour and/or cash. Beneficiaries must provide an own contribution of at least R5 000. The grant and own contribution are
calculated on a per individual adult basis (18 years and older). If people choose to apply as a group, the required own contribution and the total grant are both scaled up by the number of individuals represented in the group. The approval of the grants is based on the viability of the proposed project, which takes into account total project costs and projected profitability.

The Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development sub-programme is flexible enough to accommodate a number of types of projects. Purely residential projects would not be supported under LRAD unless beneficiaries seek to establish household gardens at their new residences, and unless funds for top-structure are sourced form elsewhere, e.g. Department of Housing.

The types of projects that can be catered for include – but are not limited to – the following:

- **Food safety-net projects**
  Many participants may wish to access the Programme to acquire land for food crop and/or livestock production to improve household food security. This can be done on an individual or group basis. Many of these projects will be at the smallest end of the scale, because poor families may be able to mobilise only the minimum own contribution in cash, labour and materials.

- **Equity schemes**
  Participants can make the requisite matching own contribution, and receive equity in an agricultural enterprise tantamount to the value of the grant plus the own contribution. Because under the terms of LRAD, the grant is intended for people actively and directly engaged in agriculture, the grant recipient in the case of the equity scheme will be
both a co-owner and employee of the farm. The purchased equity should be marketable in order to retain its value.

- **Production for markets**
  Some participants will enter LRAD to engage in commercial agricultural activities. They will access the grant and combine it with normal bank loans, approved under standard banking procedures, and their own assets and cash to purchase a farm. These farmers will typically have more farming experience and expertise than those accessing land for subsistence or food-safety-net-type activities.

- **Agriculture in communal areas**
  Many people living in communal areas already have secure access to agricultural land, but may not have the means to make productive use of that land. Such people would be eligible to apply for assistance so as to make productive investments in their land such as infrastructure or land improvements. These projects may take on the character of food safety-net projects, or may be more commercially oriented. ([http://land.pwv.gov.za/redistribution/lrad.htm](http://land.pwv.gov.za/redistribution/lrad.htm))

However, Atkinson, Pienaar, & Zingel (2004:2) argues that, land redistribution is the vehicle considered most appropriate for investigation, and for farm workers –through their unions - to access in pursuit of a more sustainable agriculture and rural development. They further state that, redistribution is grant supported via LRAD, based on a proportional beneficiary contribution on a sliding scale, and caters for food safety net projects, production for market projects, share equity schemes and schemes in communal areas (Atkinson, Pienaar, & Zingel 2004:2).
Farmworker equity-sharing projects were initiated by the private sector in the early 1990’s. Equity-sharing arrangements were thought to be suited to farming enterprises where it would be better to change the ownership structure of the enterprise rather than dividing the land into smaller units; for example, where the enterprise is indivisible due to technical, managerial or natural resource constraints (McKenzie, 1993: 51). Mather and Adelzadeh (1997:11) describe equity-share schemes as “a method of redistributing land without affecting the (operation) of individual farms or overall production levels; indeed, with better job satisfaction and greater participation, productivity should increase on farms where workers are also owners”. In 1998 it was estimated that about 50 farmworker equity-share schemes had been initiated in South Africa, mostly in the Western Cape (Lyne et al., 1998:2) and it is clear that this number has increased in recent years. For example, in December 2001 the Land Reform Credit Facility (LCRF) had approved loans for a further 11 FWES (LCRF, 2001: 3). Farmworker equity-share schemes are now spread across all nine of South Africa’s provinces and involve wine, fruit, vegetables, olives, poultry, flowers, dairy and eco-tourism enterprises.

Since the end of white minority rule in 1994, South Africa has embarked on a grand experiment to rectify past injustices. One of the campaign promises of the African National Congress (ANC) was to redress the legacy of discriminatory land ownership policies through land restitution and land redistribution (collectively known as land reform). Therefore, LRAD is designed to offer black South Africans an opportunity to access agricultural land so as to improve their nutritional status and/or incomes. LRAD addresses therefore the tenure insecurities of persons who have no land and who want to farm,
opening therefore an opportunity for previously disadvantaged persons who have no tenure security presently to access the program directly without necessarily first applying for assistance in terms of the Tenure Security or Restitution Programs. Such support would then be framed by the conditions prescribed by LRAD.


According to a study conducted by Knight, Lyne & Roth (2003), In November 2001 a detailed study of nine land reform projects intended to empower previously disadvantaged farmworkers was conducted to explore relationships between their institutional arrangements, financial performance, management and worker empowerment through skills training, gender sensitivity and participation in decision-making. Established projects producing deciduous fruit, wine, citrus and vegetables were selected as case studies in the Lutzville, Elgin, Piketberg, Stellenbosch and Paarl regions of the Western Cape. The enterprises were chosen to ensure variation across a number of known indicators including; use of external finance, size and gender composition of the beneficiary group, proportion of equity owned by farm workers, and certain institutional arrangements such as the choice of legal entities and business organisation. The sample was designed to control, where possible, for non-institutional determinants of financial performance such as enterprise type and geographic region. Actual financial performance was not known a priori, but based on anecdotal evidence; efforts were made to select enterprises ranging from poorly performing to the more successful. The final choice of projects was constrained mainly by the fact that few of the 21 FWES identified in the Western Cape had been operating for more than one year with their current set of institutional arrangements.
Also Surplus Peoples’ Project (SPP) in 1998—whose mission is “to promote the rights and interests of the economically and politically marginalised in South Africa”—conducted a study of four farm worker equity-share schemes namely, Hoogland Chickens, Ebukhosini, Whitehall and Warmwater, situated in the Western Cape and Mpumalanga provinces. The study attempted to find out if there was a difference between the advantages of equity share schemes as perceived by outsiders compared to how they were perceived by the farm workers.

2.3 Land restitution

Land restitution initiatives seek to return land (or cash payment) to the rightful owners dispossessed of this asset in the post 1913 period. Redistribution projects call for the acquisition of white commercial farmlands (often through purchase on the open market) for black and colored farmers. The Western Cape is arguably the most challenging locale for this reform as Europeans have been on the land here longer than in any other province of the country (since 1652).

However, land reform is often viewed in moral and political terms, as a necessary means by which land may be redistributed, for example to the landless and poor to help alleviate poverty, as reward for struggles for liberation, to help redress population-land imbalances (Bowyer-Bower & Stoneman 2000:1). Furthermore, South Africa’s leadership must grapple with glaring poverty as it addresses a white minority community that still holds the reins to large segments of the economy. Among a wide range of discriminatory policies upheld by the white
minority government during the Apartheid era were formal restrictions on the ownership of farm land by non-whites outside of the homelands or Bantustans (most formerly and broadly codified in the 1913 Natives Land Act). In many ways, this white land grab could be considered an *environmental injustice* of the highest order as it deprived black and colored farmers of their livelihoods, independence and dignity.

### 2.4 POVERTY

According to (May, 1998a: 1), individuals, households or communities are described as poor if they are unable to command sufficient resources to satisfy a socially acceptable minimum standard of living. Lipton and Ravallion (1995: 2553–2567, quoted by Booysen, 2001:130) further describe poverty as where 'one or more persons fall short of a level of economic welfare deemed to constitute a reasonable minimum, either in some absolute sense or by the standards of a specific society’. However, Max-Neef’s (1991:18) view refers to poverties rather than poverty, suggesting that any fundamental human need that is not adequately satisfied reveals a human poverty.

Similarly, Kgarimetsa (1992:8) describes poverty as multidimensional. It is argued that, in its two dimensions, poverty can be classified as being: absolute or relative, primary or secondary, physiological or social. On the one hand, absolute, primary and physiological poverties refer to extreme human deprivations where people are unable to obtain basic needs such as food, water, shelter and health facilities. However, on the other hand, relative, secondary and social poverties are viewed in terms of inequalities, where certain groups are denied
access to opportunities they need to improve their standards of living (Kgarimetsa, 1992:8).

2.5 Farm Workers

Farm workers are those employees employed by a farmer to perform certain operations on the farm under the supervision of the farmer (as the employer), foreman and/or farm manager. These employees either live on the farm or off the farm i.e. in nearby townships or villages. Farm workers are employed to do physical functions/elementary tasks such as holding animals, trimming hooves, shearing sheep, inoculating, vaccinating, guarding and counting the animals, preparing, sowing and harvesting fields, dusting with pesticides, weeding, transplanting and the maintenance and repair of farm implements (Mmbengwa 2005:11).

However, it is also a known fact that the nature of farm work and thus also the work that farm workers do, vary according to the type of farming enterprise such as crop farming, livestock farming, fruit, vegetable and grape farming. On most farms some form of mixed farming is usually practiced (Stavrou, 1987:138). All these functions form the basic component of farm operations. In the absence of these functions, there will be virtually no production taking place on any farm. Although some of these functions can be mechanised, it is important that farmers look critically at the cost of mechanisation as compared to that of labour.
2.6 Summary

However, access to land is one of the socio-economic rights set out in the Bill of Rights, but nowhere is it stated that everyone has the right to land. It is argued in White paper on South African Land Policy of 1997 that, “the purpose of land redistribution programme is to provide the poor with access to land for residential and productive uses, in order to improve their income and quality of life. The programme aims to assist the poor, labour tenants, farm workers, women, as well as emergent farmers. According to the Department of Land Affairs (DLA), redistributive land reform will be largely based on willing-buyer willing-seller arrangements” (DLA 1997B:38).

These issues Van Zyl, Kirsten & Binswanger, notes that, "the equity and equality case for land redistribution rests on the history of racial and economic policies which favoured white commercial farmers relative to the landless and smallholders (Van Zyl, Kirsten & Binswanger 1996:4). It is this light that this study is undertaken, which the freedom states that “The Land Shall be shared among those who work it!”. This tenet in South Africa’s Freedom Charter declared that “Restriction of land ownership on a racial basis shall be ended, and all the land re-divided amongst those who work it, to banish famine and land hunger”. The study focused on the context of land redistribution in the post-apartheid.

According to Van Zyl, Kirsten & Binswanger, "the most obvious motivation for land reform is the unsustainable – from political, social, economic and equity point of view - of the present distribution of the ownership of agricultural land" (Van Zyl, Kirsten & Binswanger
1996:3). Therefore, it is in this light that this study is focused on economic empowerment of farm workers.

Therefore, the next chapter will focus more on historical overview of the evolution of politics in Southern Africa with reference to farm labour in the Western Cape.
Chapter 3: HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF THE EVOLUTION OF POLITICS IN SOUTHERN AFRICA WITH REFERENCE TO FARM LABOUR IN THE WESTERN CAPE.

3.1 Introduction

From the beginning of colonialism and subsequently through the apartheid regime, black people in South Africa have been systematically and unjustly deprived of their land. In the colonial period dating back to 1652, under the Dutch and subsequent British occupation of the Cape, black people were gradually forced from much of their land by white settlers and colonial authorities. Initially, the aim was primarily to obtain the best agricultural land for farming, as in many other colonised regions.

Later, after the discovery of diamonds and gold in the late 19th century, the need for cheap labour on the mines provided an additional motivation. This was compounded as the economy grew and industry developed in the urban areas. The white labour force was unwilling to undertake the necessary unskilled jobs. Various means were found to deprive more black communities of their land and thereby create a vast pool of cheap migrant labour, dependent on whites for their livelihoods. [see eg. Letsoalo, 1987; Bundy, 1979]

3.2 Historical overview

In the colonial period dating back to 1652, under the Dutch and subsequent British occupation of the Cape, black people were gradually forced from much of their land by white settlers and colonial
authorities. Initially, the aim was primarily to obtain the best agricultural land for farming, as in many other colonised regions. Later, after the discovery of diamonds and gold in the late 19th century, the need for cheap labour on the mines provided an additional motivation. This was compounded as the economy grew and industry developed in the urban areas.

According to Jacobs, Lahiff & Hall (2003:1), Land dispossession during the colonial era and the decades of apartheid rule produced a highly unequal pattern of land ownership and widespread rural poverty in South Africa. In 1913 the Natives’ land Act was passed. It was a powerful piece of legislation which formed the basis on which South Africa was and is divided. The Act divided South Africa into areas where black people could only own land (called ‘reserves’) and the rest of the country, where they could not. Only 7% of the total land surface of South Africa was set aside for ‘Native Reserves’ throughout South Africa.

The schedule of land accompanying the Act was based on existing reserves and locations established during colonial period (AFRA 1999:13). Afra further argues that, the Act went further than this. It also regulated exactly who could live on white-owned farms, and under what circumstances. It did not immediately affect labour tenants. There have been many different explanations for why the 1913 Natives’ Land Act was passed. The three main reasons that have been given include the principle of territorial segregation, the increase of the provision of cheap African labour and the reduction of competition from African peasant farmers (AFRA 1999:14).
Thus, the push of Africans off ‘white’ land into the reserves led to overcrowding and the inability of people to derive a living from the land. As an alternative, people sought wage labour on white farms or moved to towns in search of employment. But settlement in urban areas resulted in more overcrowded conditions. This led to urban slums and increasing control measures. For people living on white farms as sharecroppers and cash tenants, their future was threatened by the provisions of the Act which had the intention of restricting these systems. This meant that many people could no longer keep their livestock on white-owned farms, and they left these farms for the reserves and black freehold farms (AFRA 1999:16).

In 1936, the *Development Trust and Land Act* was passed. This Act allocated already promised Land to the reserves. Squatting was also made illegal. In 1937, the *Natives Laws Amendment Act* was also enacted to prohibit Africans from buying land in urban areas. Furthermore, the *Group Areas Act* was promulgated in 1950. This Act racially segregated areas with respect to residence and business, and controlled interracial property actions. In a further attempt to ensure separate and unequal development, the *Bantu Authorities Act* was passed in 1951. This Act allowed the establishment of tribal, regional and territorial authorities. Also, to ensure complete illegality of squatting, the *Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act* was passed in 1951. This Act allowed the government to establish resettlement camps for surplus people evicted from white farms.

The Blacks Resettlement Act was also passed in 1954 to give the state the authority to remove Africans from any area in the magisterial district of Johannesburg and adjacent areas. The
Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act was also enacted in 1959, to establish the Bantustans and make the reserves the political homeland of black South Africans. In the early 1960's, the first relocation camps were established. This was an attempt to remove displaced labour tenants, unwanted farm workers and unemployed urban people. In 1964, the Black Laws Amendment Act was enacted. This, alongside the Native Trust Act, was used to finally abolish labour tenancy and squatting on farms.

This historical summary indicates the extent of inequality in resource allocation in South Africa. However, the state began to acknowledge that black people should have permanent land rights in urban areas, and thus introduced the 99-year leasehold system in 1978, and abolished the Influx Control Act in mid-1980 (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). This however, did not affect land rights in rural areas where the status quo remained. There is therefore no doubt of the need for redistribution of resources and hence wealth.

### 3.3 Regional Context

According to van den Brink, Thomas & Binswanger, “in countries with highly unequal distribution of land, the case for land redistribution – redistributing property rights from the rich to the poor, from large to small farmers – is a strong one, from both theoretical and empirical perspective” (Ntsebeza & Hall (Eds) 2007:154).

However, Lahiff (2003) argues that, Southern Africa today presents a wide spectrum of land policies, embracing a variety of forms of
redistribution and tenure reform initiatives, utilising methods that range from consensual, market-based approaches to forcible confiscation. Having remained marginal to political debates in most countries of the region for much of the 1980s and 1990s, land and land reform are back on the policy agenda to an extent unknown since the liberation struggles of the 1960s and early 1970s. Recent events in Zimbabwe, in particular, have had strong resonance for political parties and landless people in those countries – most notably South Africa and Namibia - where severe racial inequalities in land holding persist, and struggles over land have become central to external perceptions of the region. Critical questions, therefore, are whether the Zimbabwean case is exceptional or an indication of tensions throughout the region, and whether the heightened political importance of land in the region is a product of changes in the regional or global economy, or a culmination of long-running processes at a more local level.

Like South Africa, Zimbabwe and Namibia faced the need to redistribute land ownership after liberation and initially adopted market-based policies. Unlike South Africa, though, their governments bought land from willing sellers and identified suitable beneficiaries for resettlement. Both programmes proceeded slowly, hampered by limited funds to buy land but also by limited political will.

About 4 000 mostly white farmers own half of Namibia’s land, including the best arable land. Through land reform, the Namibian government has bought 69 farms over the past five years. While it has a right of first refusal, it has issued certificates of ‘no interest’ to about another 600 landowners – either because the land was deemed
unsuitable for resettlement or because its market value exceeded state funds available for land purchase – N$157 million in 2004/05. A policy shift towards expropriation was announced in February 2004. This marks a new course of action for land policy in Namibia but is unlikely to bring down the cost of acquiring land unless the government revises its current position of paying market-related compensation to landowners. The first expropriations were due to proceed before the end of 2004 and 19 commercial farmers received expropriation notices by July.

Fast-track land redistribution and occupations of farmland in Zimbabwe from 2000 led to the rapid decline of the commercial farming sector, as well as the withdrawal of investment and donor support to Zimbabwe. These followed the willing buyer-willing seller strategy pursued during the 1980s, and the introduction of a right of first refusal with market price compensation during the 1990s. The occupation of commercial farms by war veterans and others grabbed headlines internationally and underlined the potential political volatility of the land question in the region. It resulted in an estimated 150 000 farm workers being displaced and many more losing their jobs. A government-appointed committee was established in August 2004 to consider paying compensation to landowners whose farms were forcibly acquired. Little is known about the nature of land use and production on fast track land, though it appears that while some occupiers have left, others have commenced with production themselves or entered into a range of tenancy agreements with those farm workers remaining on-farm (Hall 2004:10).
3.4 Evolution of Politics

President Thabo Mbeki refocused the debate around the stubborn persistence of poverty and underdevelopment in South Africa in 2003, when he reintroduced the concept of the two economies into the policy discussion. Since then, policy-makers and practitioners in the development community have debated the existence of two economies: is the concept an apt description of the South African reality, or is it merely a metaphor, and if so, what is its value? Opponents argue that the two-economy conceptualisation runs the risk of distorting perceptions of the real problem, making solutions harder to find. Nevertheless, the introduction of the two-economy discourse has been remarkable for the extent to which it has drawn attention to the question of the persistence of underdevelopment in South African society. And despite concerns that the metaphor may lend itself to simplistic prescriptions along the lines of “how to bridge the gap between the two economies”, it has in fact stimulated us to think more deeply about why poverty has turned out to be so difficult to defeat, and what an effective anti-poverty programme might look like.

Economic dualism is rooted in the system of cheap, forced, migrant labour introduced with the beginnings of the mining industry and reinforced during apartheid (HRSC Synthesis Report 2005).

However, the legal and cultural order of the Cape linked rights and power to racial identity, and created a paternalist ideology that legitimised and regulated the relationship between ‘masters’ and servants (Worden 1985; Elphick & Giliomee 1989; Crais 1992; Trapido 1994). Paternalist ideology refused to recognise slaves and servants as mature human beings. Although slaves and servants were morally
entitled to protection and care, they were, in most respects, entirely subject to the final authority of their white ‘masters’ (Ross 1983; Dooling 1992). The social identities and institutions that had been shaped during more than 170 years of slavery did not simply vanish. Instead, they continued to influence farmers’ responses to their changing environment, enabling them to mount a century-long rearguard action against any reforms aimed at freeing or protecting rural labour.

It is argued that, despite the abolition of slavery, the farmers managed to introduce a series of progressively harsher Masters and Servants Acts which gave agrarian employers powers over farm workers that far exceeded those of any other type of employer over any other category of worker (Marincowitz 1985; Rayner 1986; Keegan 1987; Crais 1992). Although this legislation was finally abolished in 1974, it introduced into South African law a distinction between farm labour and other types of labour, which served to exclude farm workers from the rights won by urban workers until the early 1990s (Bundy 1979; Armstrong & Worden 1989).

However, in the 1980s, the Rural Foundation’s project of modernisation infused paternalist discourse with a new emphasis on scientific and productivity-oriented management and the ‘development’ of what was already being called ‘previously disadvantaged communities’ (agtergeblewene gemeenskappe). But these attempts at modernisation still preserved much of what was distinctive about Western Cape paternalism (Du Toit 1995; Mayson 1990). Even progressive farmers who accepted the modernisation of labour law were at pains to point out that workers were better off in
the ‘wise’ care of the farmer, and would not be much helped by the meddling of lawyers, trade unionists or other outsiders (Du Toit 1993).

According to (Du Toit & Ally 2003), labour relations continued to involve much more than the exchange of cash for labour. Above all, the institution of tied housing persisted on Western Cape wine and fruit farms and farmers continued to rely on on-farm permanent labour. They further argue that, to fully comprehend the nature of the shifts taking place in the farming sector of the Western Cape at present, it is important to understand the nature of the paternalist system of labour and social relations that is being affected by these changes (Du Toit & Ally 2003). This system has been shaped by the Western Cape’s more distant past and, in particular, by the legacy of slavery and colonialism.

3.5. SUMMARY

This chapter dealt with evolution of politics in South Africa with reference to farm labour in the Western Cape. The challenge to undo centuries of colonial and apartheid dispossession, repression, segregation and exploitation through the migrant labour system is huge and complex. The countryside was deliberately skewed and underdeveloped to create a highly subsidized, modernised and protected White commercial agricultural sector and a cheap labour force. The following chapter deals with past and contemporary legislative framework(s) on land redistribution.
Chapter 4: A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF PAST AND CONTEMPORARY LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK(S) PERTAINING TO LAND REDISTRIBUTION

4.1 Introduction

The Natives Land Act 27 of 1913 "started a deliberate and systematic legislative framework to deny black South Africans their birthright". The renowned black South African politician and author of the time, Sol Plaatjie, wrote: "Awakening on Friday morning, June 20, 1913, the South African native found himself, not actually a slave, but a pariah in the land of his birth". [cited in DLA, Land Info, Vol. 1, No. 3, Nov/Dec 1994, p. 5] By this Act, "black occupancy was restricted to some 10.4 million margin of land (less than 8 percent of the country's area), with the promise of more land in the future.

The Cape was excluded from the Act as its application in that province would diminish black franchise rights entrenched by the South Africa Act. In the Free State, where similar provisions were already supposed to be in force, the Act prompted the eviction of black squatters from white farms as happened in other provinces or else transformed them into labourers." (Cameron 1987:235)

4.2 Past and contemporary Legislative framework(s) on Land

In 1936, the Development Trust and Land Act was passed. This Act allocated already promised land to the reserves. Squatting was also made illegal. In 1937, the Natives Laws Amendment Act was also enacted to prohibit Africans from buying land in urban areas.
However, there was the 1936 Act, which was the policy of segregation, with the effect of increasing the supply of labour, was reinforced by the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936. It is argued by (Harley & Fotheringham 1999:13), that, “The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act, finally passed by Parliament in 1936, is one of the most significant pieces of legislation in the history of 20th century South Africa. It touched the lives of all African people, giving added shape and content to the reserve policy and establishing new controls over Africans living on white-owned farms”.

Furthermore, the Group Areas Act was promulgated in 1950. This Act racially segregated areas with respect to residence and business, and controlled interracial property actions. In a further attempt to ensure separate and unequal development, the Bantu Authorities Act was passed in 1951. This Act allowed the establishment of tribal, regional and territorial authorities. Also, to ensure complete illegality of squatting, the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act was passed in 1951 (Land Research Action Network).

This Act allowed the government to establish resettlement camps for surplus people evicted from white farms. The Blacks Resettlement Act was also passed in 1954 to give the state the authority to remove Africans from any area in the magisterial district of Johannesburg and adjacent areas. The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act was also enacted in 1959, to establish the Bantustans and make the reserves the political homeland of black South Africans. In the early 1960's, the first relocation camps were established. This was an attempt to remove
displaced labour tenants, unwanted farm workers and unemployed urban people. In 1964, the *Black Laws Amendment Act* was enacted. This, alongside the *Native Trust Act*, was used to finally abolish labour tenancy and squatting on farms.

The Land Acts and other related land laws settlement planning, forced removals and the Bantustan system contributed to overcrowding in the former homelands. It is estimated that more than 3.5 million Africans were forcibly removed and relocated to the homelands and black townships between 1960 and 1980 (Human Awareness Programme, 1989).

Furthermore, 88% of all whites compared to 39% of black South Africans lived in urban areas in the 1980. It was also estimated that in 1985, whites had a housing surplus of 37,000 units. On the other hand, black South Africans in urban areas and homelands had a backlog of at least 342,000 units and 281,269 units respectively (Human Awareness Programme, 1989).

This historical summary indicates the extent of inequality in resource allocation in South Africa. However, the state began to acknowledge that black people should have permanent land rights in urban areas, and thus introduced the 99-year leasehold system in 1978, and abolished the *Influx Control Act* in mid-1980 (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). This however, did not affect land rights in rural areas where the *status quo* remained. There is therefore no doubt of the need for redistribution of resources and hence wealth.
The land dispossession of the black population in South Africa was driven by the need to reduce competition to white farmers and to create a pool of cheap labour to work on the farms and mines and, later industry. The pattern of land ownership and control also fundamentally structured the social mechanism of control over black workers and the population surplus to the needs of the capitalist economy. As such, the highly unequal access to land was, and remains, an integral component of the political economy of South Africa as a whole. It must be emphasised that any post-apartheid land reform would be dependent on the extent and character of economic reconstruction.

4.3 Apartheid Legislation pertaining to Land

Later, a series of laws were passed to prevent blacks from living in towns, and outside reserves and homelands. Following the National Party victory in 1948, the apartheid system was legislatively formalised. This involved "territorial separation of races, the enforcement of bastardised customary law practices in the former 'native' reserves, the denial to blacks of land and other rights in white South Africa, the denial of freedom of movement, and the perfection of influx control. The economic development of the reserves [homelands] was stifled, and a labour market was created that ensured that labour remained as cheap as possible" (Wildschut and Hulbert 1998:4).

When the Nationalist Party (NP) came to power in 1948, their apartheid policy built on the foundation already laid by previous governments – urban and rural segregation, the control of movement between urban and rural areas, and a legislative and policy framework
enforcing this. It was clear even at this stage that the Nationalist Party intended to move beyond mere segregation to a far more comprehensive policy of social engineering (AFRA 1999:30).

Between 1960 and 1982, over 3.5 million people were forcibly removed in terms of apartheid policy. In addition to the largest category of removals, farm evictions, and the second largest, Group Areas removals, three other categories of removals were used to enhance the Bantustan policy: black spot removal, consolidation, and urban relocation. "Over 614,000 black people were removed from 'black spots' between 1960 and 1982, in terms of the National Party's consolidation policy. Many of these people owned their land through title deeds, and others had resided on it for decades. Communities were removed, against their will, to barren resettlement areas and incorporated into Bantustans. In most cases forced removals impoverished communities and caused bitter suffering. These communities never lost the desire to go back to their land and rebuild their homes and lives. Many communities continued to bury their dead on the land and regularly visited the graves of their ancestors." [NLC, Land Update, No. 8, May 1991, p. 3]. The Land Acts and other related land laws -- settlement planning, forced removals and the Bantustan system -- contributed to overcrowding in the former homelands. It is estimated that more than 3.5 million Africans were forcibly removed and relocated to the homelands and black townships between 1960 and 1980 (Human Awareness Programme, 1989).

As a result of these policies, South Africa has an exceedingly skewed pattern of land distribution. Whilst whites constituted only 13% of the population in 1996, they owned 87% of the land. In terms of rural
land available for current or potential agricultural use, at the beginning of the 1990s, within the homelands more than 12 million black people lived on only 17.1 million hectares of land, whilst less than 60,000 almost exclusively white-owned farms occupied 85.7 million hectares of the best arable land (Wildschut and Hulbert 1998:6). Further, white commercial farms benefited from an array of subsidies, loans, tax breaks, research, marketing facilities, etc. which were not available to black farmers. The skewed land distribution is consequently accompanied by skewed income distribution and standards of living.

4.4 Current legislation on Land Redistribution

With the beginnings of the political transition, the release of political prisoners and the freeing of political activity in South Africa, and the repeal of some of the most noxious apartheid legislation, came the opening of debate on the issue of land. In 1991 a White Paper on Land Reform was issued by National Party government. It proposed the repeal of the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, the Group Areas Act and other discriminatory land legislation.

In contrast to the NP government's position, the ANC put forward a series of policy proposals which included the following:

- "Redressing the injustices caused by apartheid's policy of dispossession;
- Addressing demands and grievances concerning land restoration and ownership by the creation of a special land court through which competing claims to land can be resolved;
- Creating institutions through which the homeless and the landless will have access in order to obtain land, shelter, and necessary services;
- The recognition and protection of the diversity of tenure forms in South Africa;
- The promotion of a policy of affirmative action within a viable economic development programme to ensure, among other things, access to land with secure rights for residential settlement, as well as access to good agricultural land, which will create new opportunities."

[NLC, Land Update, No. 14, June 1992]

The National Land Committee lobbied for changes to draft clauses in the Interim Constitution dealing with property and restitution rights. In September 1993, 500 rural community members participated in a protest march aimed at the multi-party CODESA negotiations in Kempton Park outside Johannesburg. In December 1993, they argued in a press release that "We believe that the draft clause would entrench unequal ownership of property and would prevent any significant land reform from taking place". This resulted in revision of the clauses, although not entirely to the satisfaction of the NLC. They were still concerned about the clause which stipulated that expropriation was permissible only for "public purposes" -- which could be interpreted to exclude land reform. A significant gain was the granting of full legal status to women in rural areas, giving them ownership of land in their own right. [NLC, Annual Report, Jan 1994 - Apr 1995, p. 5] Their failure to achieve the elimination of the property clause became an ongoing source of contention between the NLC and the ANC.
Before the finalisation of the new Constitution in 1996, the ANC had committed itself in its policy framework document, The Reconstruction and Development Programme [1994], to pay urgent attention to the land issue. Section 2.4.14. of the RDP stated: "The land reform programme, including costing, implementing mechanisms, and a training programme, must be in place within one year after the elections. The programme must aim to redistribute 30% of agricultural land within the first five years of the programme..... The land restitution programme must aim to complete its task of adjudication in five years." As will be seen below, this proved to be an unachievable target, and served largely to raise communities' expectations of the new government. It caused unneeded problems for the ANC with regard to its record of governance.

The Constitution adopted in 1996 includes the following provisions with regard to land reform [Chapter 2, Section 25, Property Rights]:

- The duty of the State to 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";
- The right to tenure security or comparable redress through an Act of Parliament for persons or communities whose tenure is legally insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices;
- The right of persons or communities dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913, as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices, to restitution of their property, or to equitable redress through an Act of Parliament.
The property rights, protected in the Constitution, may not prevent the State from taking legislative and other measures to achieve land, water and related reform to redress past racial discrimination provided that these measures are reasonable and justifiable.

Later policy documents and statutory laws drafted by the new government, including the 1994 Reconstruction and Development Programme and the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy, further committed the government to redistribute 30% of agricultural land and complete the adjudication process on land restitution claims in the first five years of South Africa's democracy (1994-1999), and to a land reform programme that would address "the injustices of racially-based land dispossession of the past; the need for land reform to reduce poverty and contribute to economic growth; security of tenure for all; and a system of land management which will support sustainable land use patterns and rapid land release for development," respectively.

The Provision of Land and Assistance Act, 1993 (Act 126 of 1993) provides for the designation of land for settlement purposes and financial assistance to people acquiring land for productive and settlement purposes. The Act was amended in 1998 to allow for land to be purchased without necessarily being designated. The Act also makes allowance for commonage land acquired by Municipalities to be funded. This amendment shortened to two months. The amended legislation also provides the Minister of Land Affairs with the power to expropriate land in line with section 25 (4) of the Constitution.
4.5 Summary

The current legislation on land redistribution is significant in order that land reform works to improve sustainable productivity from the precious land resource base of a country. This as stipulated in the land redistribution policy will give opportunities for the poor to access land. This chapter therefore, highlighted the past and contemporary legislation pertaining to land in South Africa.

The next chapter deals with research methodology in this study.
Chapter 5: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

5.1 Introduction

This study was carried out on farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. This was both a qualitative and quantitative study. The study employed various methods of data collection.

5.2 Overview of research methodology

The best suited theory for this study was institutional studies theory, which looks at rules, procedures and organization of the political system with regard to the land redistribution program. The institutional studies theory helped in understanding procedures and which was utilised is that of Holism, as the research focused on land redistribution and economic empowerment, which is a social system. This research focused on farm community in Stellenbosch; therefore holism approach best suited the research.

5.3 The empirical survey

Bouwland farm in the Stellenbosch agricultural area was utilized as a target research population where interviews of farm workers involved in the economic development project were interviewed. Data was collected through questionnaires.
5.4 Methods of data collection

According Casley and Kumar (1992:2), “there are two types of data collection methods: qualitative and quantitative. The most obvious distinction between the two is that quantitative methods produce numerical data and qualitative methods result in information which can be best described in words”. This study therefore, employed both methods of data collection described above. This study collected quantitative data through structured survey, which entailed a written questionnaire to target population respondents. However, as argued by Casley and Kumar (1992:4), “quantitative data may be obtainable from records of project agencies and other institutions”. This study collected data through available records on land redistribution in the Western Cape. This study also collected data through in-depth interviews with farm workers leaders. Data was gathered by the researcher. The researcher used two sets of questionnaires i.e. one set designed to illicit qualitative information (Appendix 1&2) and the other to illicit quantitative information (Appendix 3).

5.4.1 Elements of Questionnaire design

McNabb (2000:149) further states that, researchers use two different approaches when gathering data in quantitative research studies; they may collect data by observing and counting overt acts of behavior, or they may use a questionnaire to generate responses to specific questions, including questions about attitudes, opinions, motivations, knowledge, demographics, and many more categories of data. He further argues that, questionnaires are the most popular way to gather primary data (McNabb 2000:149). This study therefore, utilized
questionnaire as a quantitative method of data collection, as questionnaires can be used to gather information about large number of respondents (populations) and from small groups (samples) (McNabb 2000:150). It is argued that, questionnaires have many advantages. The greatest of these is the considerable flexibility of the questionnaire. Questionnaires can be custom-designed to meet the objectives of almost any type of research project. One of the advantages of questionnaires is that they can be designed to determine what people know, what they think, or how they act or plan to act.

According to McNabb (2000:260), attitude scales are the scales used most often in public administration research. Many different types of scales for measuring attitudes have been developed. The types of attitude scale that are used most often today include: (1) Thurstone scales, (2) Likert scales, (3) semantic differential rating scales, and (4) a related semantic differential approach, the Stapel scale. However, the element of questionnaire design that this study followed was that of Likert scale. This argues McNabb (2000:161), by far the most favored attitude-measuring tool in use today is the Likert scale, developed in the early 1930s. Likert scales do not require a panel of judges to rate the scale items. The objective of the Likert scale is to measure the extent of subjects’ agreement with each item. The extent is measured on a five-point scale: strongly agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree (McNabb 2000:161). The Likert technique presents a set of attitude statements. Subjects were asked to express agreement or disagreement of a five-point scale. Each degree of agreement is given a numerical value from one to five.
5.5 Various approaches to research methodology

In order to answer the key questions outlined above, the research involved a two-pronged approach. A quantitative survey of how land redistribution can lead to farm workers economic development was conducted. This survey was conceptualised as a baseline study, and basic information about land redistribution was collected. This study approached both qualitative and quantitative approached to research methodology.

5.5.1 Quantitative method

According to McNabb (2004:113), “and underlying objective of most political science research is to uncover information needed to expand and improve the level of awareness and understanding of one or more political phenomena”. This study also utilized quantitative research method in order to be able to critically analyze land redistribution and economic empowerment for farm workers in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. This quantitative approach is coupled with qualitative approach. McNabb (2004:113), argues that, ”often, the proper use of numbers-statistics-with words makes communicating easier, faster, and far more effective than the use of words alone”.

5.5.2 Qualitative approach

The approach that was employed for this study was qualitative approach, as Silbergh states that “it is the methodological tradition that encourages the researcher to make sense of their chosen political
problem through personal academic... accepted that political questions are in large part questions about values” (Silbergh 2001:23). Therefore, land redistribution is about values and human rights issue.

Focus group was another technique, which this study employed as a technique of data collection. This best suited this study because; focus group methods involve bringing together small groups of people in order to learn how they think about the issue of land reform. According to Manheim & Rich (1995:370), "focus groups can be used for different purposes at different stages of the research process. They can help formulate hypotheses for future studies, develop indicators to be used in data collection, improve the interpretation of data collected by other means, or produce data that are directly useful in answering a research question". Therefore, this technique contributed in data analysis. As this was a qualitative study, data will be presented in the form of words, quotations from transcriptions and documents. **

However, Manheim & Rich notes that, "as qualitative method, focus groups do not produce numerical data that can be analyzed using statistics to identify patterns and relationships" (Manheim & Rich 1995:370). Focus group discussion on any subject generates a large amount of raw data, and Glitz argues that “to be useful, the ideas expressed in the group must be organized, and condensed and analyzed” (Glitz 1998:97). It is in this light that this study analyzed data collected from the focus groups.

This study wanted to get as realistic a view of farm workers thinking about land redistribution and economic empowerment as possible, hence the focus groups. This method enabled the farm workers to
interact among themselves generated insights into the subject under study. According to Manheim & Rich (1995:372), “participants have a chance to express their true feelings on the topic under study and can bring up any aspect of that topic that they feel is important”.

Therefore, these qualitative researches utilized analytical strategies to analyze data collected in this research. This included data coding, as the information is collected. The data is to be categorized in age and gender as indicated in the questionnaire. Wisker states that, “analyzing qualitative data involves close and thorough reading and coding” (Wisker 2001:250). Therefore, data analysis involved coding and content analysis. The study used close-ended questions in the questionnaire, which therefore, made it easier to sort out the information when it came to data analysis.

5.6. Collecting the data

This study collected data through questionnaire, interviews and focus groups. A questionnaire using Likert scale was utilized where, correspondents were asked questions regarding land redistribution and economic empowerment in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. In-depth interviews were conducted with the manager (frequently, the previous farm owner), worker-trustees, and local officials from the Department of Land Affairs (DLA). Interviews with the manager and worker-trustees were conducted using a structured, open-ended questionnaire to identify institutional arrangements and their impact on internal rules, practices, management, compliance, incentives, and access to finance. Interviews with external financiers, local officials from the DLA and the firms contracted to help with project planning, training and
facilitation were less structured and explored project-specific problems. The questionnaires sometimes required respondents to rate their perception of a particular issue (e.g. management quality) using a Likert-type scale with scores ranging from one to five.

5.6.1 The total research population

The total research population was that of Stellenbosch agricultural area. This is an area where many farmers farm grape for wine production.

5.6.2 The sample (target population)

A target population was determined as Bouwland farm in the Stellenbosch agricultural area. Farm workers were involved in focus groups and farm leaders as key-informant interviewee’s. A Likert scale questionnaire was utilized to collect data from the target population.

5.7 Statistical analysis and interpretation of findings

Firstly, 60 people from 39 Previously Disadvantaged Group (PDG) families became beneficiaries of the Bouwland Deelnemings trust (Bouwland Participation Trust) which was established to organize the PDG in a legal entity. These 39 households (132 people) are all part of the PDG and represent a motivated farm community (because of their long history at the estates and now also because they take pride in ownership). It was established that the main long term focus of Bouwland is to provide a more opportunity rich future for the households and their future generations.
Secondly, the study found that, financing was arranged to fund the procurement of vineyard and equipment. The funding was to come from three sources: (1) equity from the commercial farm owners (Truter, Halliday); (2) equity from the farm workers obtained through a land grant from the government; and (3) a low-interest commercial bank loan. The next section provides more detail on the financing structure.

The concept for the new Bouwland was worked out in detail in 2002 and 2003. The land grant application was filed in April 2002. In November of 2003, Byers Truter and Simon Halliday (representing Beyerskloof) sold 74% of the 56ha section of the old Bouwland as well as the Bouwland label to the Bouwland Trust and the new Bouwland was established as one of the first and largest empowerment schemes in the Cape’s wine industry.

However, the study found out that, training on farm management has been a major challenge for the farm workers. They rely heavily on the experience of the farmers. The study established a need for training and development of the farm workers in management and marketing courses in order to sustain the project. This is order to assist the new owners with skills development. This is has been one of the downfalls of many of the land redistribution programme. Have farm workers’ incomes increased as a result of their involvement in equity share schemes? In some cases, yes, workers who work and hold shares in an enterprise that is profitable have received dividends (their share of profits) and continue to hold an asset that is equal to or greater than the initial investment of their land reform grant.
In sectors of agriculture which have experienced turmoil and decreasing product prices, some farm workers have not received any dividends and the value of their shares has declined along with the overall profitability of the sector. The study found out that, there are no short financial benefits in projects. However, the farm workers feel that they are looking at long term goals. The study also found out the issue of housing is a huge challenge for the farm workers.

It was also found out that 56 hectares of grapevines lay stretched on the horizon, Bouwland has not yet produced their own wine but promise that their first harvest of fruits of the wine will be in 2006. Their first official Bouwland wine should be on the shelf by 2008/9. In her address, Minister Didiza applauded the beneficiaries of Bouwland for their efforts and commitment to the project. “I have no doubt that they will succeed in the plans that they envisaged. The Freedom Charter states: ‘The land shall be shared among those who work it and the people shall share in the country’s wealth.’

These people have been working this land for many years and now they have the opportunity to share in the wealth of the country. The Chairman of Bouwland Deelnemingstrust stated that, “we have worked for somebody else for most of our lives but now there’s sense of pride in working for ourselves”. They are an example to other farming communities who received grants. This is an example of a community who stood up for themselves and did not expect government to spoon feed them and gives them everything they need. This community, on the other hand, showed that they are competent, committed and eager to do what they can.
Even though Bouwland has not provided an extra income for the trust members, it has actually restored their dignity and opened opportunities for them to own land. There is no income from new jobs as the trust members have kept working at their old jobs at the various wineries while providing free labor to Bouwland as part of their “sweat capital” contribution. However, some of the currently outsourced management jobs that Bouwland plans to bring in-house could provide better paying jobs to some of the trust members.

Furthermore, Bouwland will provide farm workers with an extra source of income once dividends are paid out. Dividends are not expected for the next five to ten years. This also implies that most of the social benefits of the project (e.g., improvements in housing, education or farm worker income) are a secondary priority. The assumption here is that if the firm is profitable and grows in size, volume and profitability, it will in the long term create social benefits indirectly through the increased incomes and net worth of the beneficiaries.

5.8 Summary

Agricultural policy (1998:2) highlighted the fact that in South Africa agriculture plays a central role in building a strong economy and in the process, assists in reducing inequalities by increasing incomes and employment opportunities for the poor, while nurturing the inheritance of natural resources.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUDING REMARKS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Introduction

Farm workers are ranked as the poorest people in South Africa in terms of many development indicators, which include cash income, education levels and nutritional status. The average cash wage received by farm workers is currently less than R600 per month. Farm workers, on average, have less education than other groups, including rural, unemployed people (Statistics South Africa, 1996). One out of every three children who grow up on a farm is stunted because of malnutrition (Department of Health, 1999). Most farm workers live on the farms on which they work and are provided with housing, the quality of which is in most cases very poor. In certain areas, largely in KwaZulu-Natal, Mpumalanga and the Northern Province, the practice of labour tenancy continues to exist, by which farm workers gain access to land as part – or all – of their remuneration for their labour.

6.2 CONCLUSIONS

Most farm workers, though, have no access to or control over land for cultivation or grazing purposes. For farm workers and farm dwellers, the democratization process in the 1990s had raised expectations of rural development, increased job opportunities, better wages and working conditions and access to land. According to Wegerif (2004:10), “the RDP saw land reform as ‘the central and driving force of a programme of rural development’ and set a specific target of redistributing 30% of agricultural land”.

However, in a context of high land prices and an inflexible grant system, a new kind of land reform has been developed for farm workers through the redistribution route. Equity share schemes provide opportunities for farm workers to become beneficiaries while they continue to earn cash income as employees. While ESTA was aimed at ensuring long the term security of tenure for farm worker households, equity schemes allow for farm workers to acquire shares in agricultural enterprises. Equity schemes aim to promote partnerships between farmers and workers in a manner that can produce benefits for both parties. Farm workers are able to apply for redistribution grants and use these grants to buy shares in the farm on which they are employed. This does not necessarily improve job security or tenure security, but has been seen as a means to bring about greater cash incomes among farm workers, provide them with a long-term capital asset and to shift the power relations between employers and workers (Centre for Rural Legal Studies (CRLS), 2000).

Debate continues on whether equity schemes qualify as a kind of land reform and whether they meet their objectives. Farm workers do not get to own land directly, as the shares are normally in the operating enterprise rather than being shares in the land itself. A critical question has centered on whether equity schemes can and do really result in the redistribution of power and resources. According to this measure, many equity schemes have performed poorly.

While workers do recognise the future potential for dividends and capital gains, field interviews show that workers’ immediate interest in joining equity-sharing projects centres more on the opportunity to influence managerial decisions that affect wages, working conditions,
housing and tenure security for their families (Department of Land Affairs, 1998:5). Concerns about the lack of worker empowerment in early FWES projects (Surplus Peoples Project, 1999) appear to have been addressed in more recent projects (Knight and Lyne: 2002). Case studies, which were analysed by Knight et al. (2002), show that both skills transfer and gender representation is positively related to the workers’ share of equity in the enterprise. In essence, empowerment requires that workers buy a significant shareholding. Initially, farm workers had to finance their equity in the company with loans, which creates the usual cash flow problems. This situation changed in 1996 when the DLA allowed farm workers to finance equity with SLAG grants and, more recently, (in May 1999) when it piloted the LRCF. The LRAD programme explicitly supports equity-sharing projects (Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs, 2001:5), as does the Strategic Plan for South African Agriculture (Department of Agriculture, 2001:9).

6.3 Recommendations

The study therefore, recommends the following:

- A key objective of sustainable development should be to encourage people away from economically inefficient and environmentally destructive activities towards more economically, socially and environmentally beneficial ones.
- The post-land transfer training is significant in order to sustain the land reform empowerment projects. Also, by virtue of receiving training ex ante and ex post the transfer of land,
beneficiaries would be in a better position to improve their livelihoods.

- It is recommended that farm workers who have benefited from any form of land reform, should be extensively strengthened and supported by the government and farmer’s associations for more successful redistributive land reform.
- The forms of support should be debated, shared and designed with emerging farmers, as well as the provincial and local government within the relevant ministries over time.
- Capacity-building programmes should be incorporated into farm equity share schemes projects.
- Training on how to manage farms and how to source funding for post land transfer projects should be implemented, which this would enable farm workers to understand the financial management of the farm itself.
- Broadening the base of services, which are offered by unions to promote a ‘development agent’ or ‘broker’ role between the possible beneficiaries of the land redistribution programme and the programme itself (becoming a civil society based service provider to government –but not an NGO), should be considered. This would enable the union to effectively offer its members a menu of choices when faced with eviction, retrenchment or any expropriation of their workplace. Detailed land reform options then become one of a suite of possibilities for members, which would support improved livelihoods.
- Unions should be supported in order to, more formally, address the nature of communication with actors within the agricultural sector, particularly at national and local government levels, with a view to broadening the base of discussions, which ranges from
labour issues to matters of common concern. The ideal would be that unions, while they retain their rights-based approach, should also be seen as ‘social partners’ by others within the sector and as stakeholders in the land redistribution process.

- Attention should be directed at formulating the detailed role of farmer’s unions in support of land redistribution, as one agency provides either technical support or acts as an instrument of oversight. This recommendation is sensitive and would require detailed and locally specific dimensions.

- At provincial levels of government, several provinces have already initiated forums under the aegis of the provincial MEC for agriculture. These include provincial commercial farmers’ associations, representatives from agribusinesses, as well as representatives from the provincial departments of land affairs and agriculture, as well as other parties who have an interest in agriculture within the region. Therefore, beneficiaries of land reform should be part of these forums.

- It is recommended that municipalities form similar forums, involve all institutions that are active in agricultural matters within the particular municipality.

- Relevant NGO’s and farmers associations, with extensive track records, should be supported to play a strong role in the aforementioned capacity-building and training programmes.

- NGO’s should be supported to form partnerships with emerging farmer’s with a view to provide training to its members in the related areas of selecting best-bet land redistribution options, the ‘economics of farming’ as well as in the areas of financial management and in effective farming techniques. These arrangements would find support from the DLA, since the
officials who were interviewed indicated that unions could play a helpful role in briefing applicants about the challenges that would face them once land has been transferred.

- It is suggested that farmer’s associations are supported to approach unions with a view to institutionalising such meetings and that land redistribution is placed on the agenda of issues that should be discussed.

- Local farmer’s associations can be supported to begin to provide training to farm workers who have benefited from land redistribution in both the financial aspects of farming as, well as farming techniques. This would place these emerging farmers in a better position in order to sustain their projects for future generations.

- It is recommended that land redistribution cannot occur in isolation to other socio-economic rights. Therefore, the study suggests that provincial departments support farm workers who presently own farms. For example, the Department of Housing should provide farm workers with proper housing on their land.

- It is recommended that more education and information dissemination of land reform be done in order for farm workers to benefit in the process.

- It is also recommended that provincial governments of Agriculture and Land Affairs assist in the of loans for post land support.

### 6.4 Summary

In summary, therefore, land is presently not only one of the most defining political and development issues, but also perhaps the most
intractable. Farm workers who have worked, for generations, on the farms, may benefit from the government’s land reform programme. However, the study has shown that there are challenges, which face the pace of the land reform programme. Although farm workers are excited about land redistribution, there is a need for post land transfer support. Farm workers regard share-equity schemes as a way of improving their standards of living and securing their jobs and homes on the farm. As shown in the study, farm workers believe that these projects will not only benefit them now, but that it will also benefit future generations.
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Appendix 1: Interview Schedule

Position: Chairman of Farm workers

Name: Date of Interview: Time:

This interview is being conducted as a part of research report on the subject “Land redistribution and economic empowerment of farm workers in Stellenbosch”. The objective is to get your views about Land redistribution and specifically regarding Bouwland farm.

1. How did the project start?
2. How many farm workers have benefited?
3. Is it a sustainable Project?
4. What challenges are they faced with?
5. Have the power relationships between farmers and workers changed as a result of equity share schemes?
6. Have farm workers' incomes increased as a result of their involvement?
7. Do women and men benefit equally?
8. What is your take in land redistribution?
Appendix 2: Focus group discussion guide.

A focus group interview was conducted where a small group of farm workers who are share holders were sampled. Same questions were asked as in the key informant interview.

1. What is your take on land redistribution?
2. How did the project start?
3. How many farm workers have benefited?
4. Is it a sustainable Project?
5. What challenges are they faced with?
6. Have the power relationships between farmers and workers changed as a result of equity share schemes?
7. Have farm workers' incomes increased as a result of their involvement?
8. Do women and men benefit equally?
APPENDIX 3

LIKERT SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE

For each of the following statements below, please indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement by placing a tick in the appropriate box.

The response scale is as follows:

1. Strongly Disagree
2. Disagree
3. Undecided or Neutral
4. Agree
5. Strongly Agree

1. Land should be shared by among those who work in it.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Land redistribution would contribute to economic development of farm workers

1 2 3 4 5

3. Transferring land to the previously disadvantaged is crucial for land reform in SA

1 2 3 4 5

4. There is only a small fraction of commercial agricultural land in the possession of the State.
5. Land in South Africa is expensive and buyers including the State cannot afford to purchase land.

6. There is often inadequate post land transfer support

7. Land reform cannot happen in isolation to other socio economic rights.

8. Farm worker equity-share scheme is a good method of redistributing farm assets to land reform beneficiaries.

9. Land distribution will restore people’s dignity and identity.

10. Land distribution will bring total peace and stability to South Africa.
Figure 1. Research Region