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ABSTRACT

The government that was voted in, in 1994 initiated and implemented the Land Reform Programme that had three key elements, namely; Land restitution, redistribution and tenure reform. This study was undertaken to examine the limitations that resulted in some of the projects not to succeed. The study took a form of a case study of two farms that were redistributed in 1997 under the Land Redistribution Programme in the Blue Crane Route Municipal area in the Eastern Cape.

The findings confirmed a variety of weaknesses that led to the collapse of these farms. Whilst acknowledging that there are some measures that are put in place to address those limitations the, study shows that there is still scope to do more.

It is therefore one’s sincere wish that what transpired out of this study will make a positive contribution by providing some elements that can be used as a remedy in advancing the Land Reform Programme.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND CONTEXT

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The advent of democracy in South Africa in 1994 did not raise only political hopes, but economic expectations too for South Africans and particularly for Blacks. One of the obvious challenges that the democratic government had to face up to was the resentment by a large number of African people who have become aware of their history of dispossession of land through a series of legislation (Land Acts of 1913, 1936 and others) by the racist government before 1994.

It should however be borne in mind that these acts were not only to give land to Whites but had an extra economic reason: that of addressing the labour shortage. This conflict has been and is still well documented by both domestic and international scholars and institutions. All of them are not shy to point out the extreme damage it did to the indigenous African majority, hence the submission by Ntsebeza (2007) that compared to other countries on the continent, the extent of land plunder in South Africa was extraordinary. It is for this reason among others that land reform activists uncompromisingly pushed for the land reform to be on top of the national agenda as the question that has to be resolved in the process of addressing the injustices of the past and to satisfy the restorative justice agenda. It must, however, be stated that there also seems to be a sense that many of those activists were certain about the need for the redistribution of the land although they could not clearly articulate how the land was to be utilised for livelihoods and sustainability. It is for this reason that this research has focussed on the use of land which was redistributed as part of the new government’s programme of land reform.

The ANC, being one of the stakeholders and leading the Government of National Unity, had to satisfy the articulation of the clause that deals with the land question in the Freedom Charter which called for

- The division of land among those who work it, the banishment of famine and land hunger.
• The assistance by the state to those who would occupy the land in the form of implements and other support.

the last bullet being not a farfetched ambitious wish at all, if one considers Denoon’s (1998) submission that for first-time White farmers, after the 1913 land dispossession, the state assisted them with subsidies for exportable crops, tariff protection against overseas competition, state coercion of the labour force, provision of credit and extension services and educational institutions to enable them to become a prosperous bourgeoisie. What Denoon emphasises here is that key to the promotion of beneficiaries of the land reform programme to be prosperous, is an enabling environment in the form of interventions that will enhance the idea of a successful land redistribution programme.

It is in the realisation of satisfying that need that the South African constitution of 1994 advocated among other things the Land Reform Programme, with land redistribution as one of its pillars. The land redistribution programme, according to the government’s strategic goals and vision of the land policy, aimed at providing the disadvantaged and the poor with access to land for residential and productive purposes whose scope included the urban and rural poor. What one can deduce from various articulations is that the land reform programme was launched in 1994 to develop equitable and sustainable mechanisms of land redistribution in certain areas as a kick start to a wide reaching national programme. According to a document for submission to the portfolio committee on agriculture and land affairs by the South African Council of Churches (14 October 2004) by February 2004, a sum total of 1 683 275 hectares of land had been transferred under the land redistribution programme to an estimated 157 110 households.

1.2 THE CONTEXT OF THE PROBLEM AREA

It is within the context of that constitutional provision that in 1997 two farms, namely, Prinsloo and Karkotskraal, well known for their productive capacity, located within a kilometre from the town of Somerset East, Blue Crane Route Municipality, Eastern Cape, were bought for a sum total of R5.8million, and were distributed to 388 randomly selected beneficiaries (Memorandum dated 03/07/97 sent by the Director-General of Land Affairs to the Deputy Director-General and the Eastern Cape Provincial Director ).
A beneficiary list was compiled which ran up to 388 members. It should not be surprising as some if not most of them were under the impression that their shares of the grant would be presented to them personally. This surely suggests that no consideration was given to the definition and description of who wanted the farm for what. Having realised that error the Department of Land Affairs initiated a process of reducing the beneficiary number. A trust with ten members elected by the beneficiaries was established to take care of the process of fixing the beneficiary number and simultaneously running the farms. By November 2000 the beneficiary list was at fifty, all of them up to now reported to having received formal training in farming.

**PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY OF FARMS**

1. **PRINSLOO FARM**

Total size is approximately 1500 hectares, consisting of Kikuyu veldt and irrigable land with water rights. It is suitable for both dairy and beef cattle stock, all types of sheep and goat farming. There are all sorts of farm facilities. With the availability of water from the meandering Little Fish River the farm with the 152 hectare capacity of agricultural land lent itself to the production of various agricultural products that included maize, lucerne, and potatoes for the East London and Port Elizabeth markets.

2. **KARKOTSKRAAL**

Total size is approximately 2025 hectares, consisting of mixed veldt and irrigable land with water rights. It is suitable primarily for beef cattle. It is also suitable for all types of small stock farming. Like Prinsloo it also has all sorts of farming facilities. Despite the agricultural land capacity this farm was not used to produce any agricultural products.

Fifteen years down the line, these farms lie fallow. Almost every physical structure is in a dilapidated form. The fence around the farm has been removed. Productive land has not been utilised since the departure of the previous owner. Records indicate that some ventures such as goat cheese production, a piggery and chicken broilers have been initiated, but all in vain. Then out of embarrassment comes the threat from the government of the day, through the minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Minister Xingwana that agricultural land recipients
who have allowed the land to lie idle will have the property taken away from them (Realestateweb, 5 March 2009). This could be problematic as it seems to reflect that the position has been taken without proper prognosis of the causes for those lands to lie idle.

1.3 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

It is the task of this study to illustrate that there is an observable strategic relationship between the land the government redistributes, the needs of the intended beneficiaries, their skills, the technical and structural support, and their attitude and commitment to land use. This is the disjuncture that Walker (2004) refers to that exists between the national political debate around land reform and its targets on the one hand, and local imperatives around actual land reform projects on the ground on the other that require attention to process in beneficiary identification, participation, institutional development, planning and the provision of services, and probably more rather than less official time per project to work better.

While there is much literature on the subject, it must be pointed out that much of it seems to be focussing on issues such as, (1) the pace of reforms, (2) ethical and ideological considerations (3) discrimination against marginal groupings.

This study has to fill that gap in order to:

1. Look at what went wrong and suggest how the situation could be remedied and be avoided in future.
2. Assess the capacity of the Department of Land Affairs to do a well-researched needs analysis before handing over farms.
3. Demonstrate how crucial structural support is for any venture to be successful and how disastrous its absence can be.

1.4 RESEARCH PROBLEM

What are the underlying causes of the limitations on land reform programmes?

1.5 SUB FOCI

For this study to achieve its intended purpose it needs to answer the following questions amongst others;
- Was there a needs analysis done?
- What is the credibility of such analysis?
- Are there any support structures put in place?
- Is this type of land reform sustainable?
- Were those beneficiaries credit worthy in case of needing access to finance capital if needs be?
- How does this programme talk to markets?
- How would the changing fortunes of farming affect the beneficiaries?

1.6 THE SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

These questions will be answered through a case study of the two mentioned farms. A case study is preferred here as it is generally believed that it offers an intensive investigation involving measuring, analysing and allowing for recommendations for practical improvements. It will cover the period from hand-over of the farms (1997) to the present.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The much-debated land reform implemented by the democratically elected government in 1994 is an act of honouring the constitutional requirements on land. Judging from the lengthy, never-ending debate and the tone of the arguments it is clear that the intentions of the programme might have been good, but the execution of the plan can be said to be far from satisfactory. All of the three following pillars of the land reform seem to suffer from the same fate of being eluded by success;

(1) Land Restitution
(2) Land Redistribution
(3) Land Tenure Reform

For the purpose of this study the focus will be on land redistribution. Given the fact that there is much written coverage of the topic, this study will to a certain degree combine primary and secondary sources and will aim at showing that there is an intricate relationship between access to the land and the post settlement support. This study seeks to argue that the absence of that support, whether by design or default, is creating an environment of no success and thereby reducing the justified land reform process to mere tokenism.

2.2 LAND REDISTRIBUTION

The definition to be given here is for the purpose of the study. There appears to be a consensus among scholars on the definition of land redistribution as a process of giving access to land to previously disadvantaged communities who so happened in the context of South Africa to be black people. To be precise it aims to provide the disadvantaged and the poor with access to land for residential and productive purposes whose scope includes the urban and rural poor, labour tenants, farm workers and new entrants to agriculture (GAP Matters). This was meant to be complementary to the strategic goal and vision of the land
policy, which was the need to reduce poverty and contribute to economic growth (White Paper on Land Reform).

The justification of the concept of land redistribution should also be understood within the theoretical framework provided by Mbongwa (2005) where he argues that the role that the land ownership could play in the creation of a new rural structure by the removal of the ‘whites-only’ territorial land ownership is necessary to lay the basis which will ensure that the benefits of land ownership are also received by black people and emphasizing that only land redistribution to blacks will guarantee the emergence of the new rural economy.

To give legitimacy and legality to the mandate, the South African Constitution (1996) Section 25 was enacted which included three fundamental rights clauses on land reform, one of which stands out for the purpose of this research, as follows:

(5) “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.”

The contentiousness of this section did not go unnoticed as a concern has been raised that the provisions of this section was open to challenges.

This echoes what de Klerk (1988) cautioned against long ago before this programme was in place, that bringing about effective change to what has become firmly entrenched pattern of ownership and occupation, without at the same time seriously impairing the productive capacity of agriculture, will be no easy undertaking.

Be that as it may, the beginnings had been made as the land question had to be resolved, not only for political reasons but also for the potential the land has for economic imperatives; as Ferrer and Semalulu (2004) argue that the deracialization of land holdings in South Africa is viewed as an urgent imperative for political stability and growth of economy. This view is also expressed by McKenzie (1993) who submits that the land reform forms a cornerstone of political and economic reconstruction in South Africa. And thus adding to the view forwarded by Lipton (2004) that land redistribution has the potential to significantly better
the livelihood of the poor and contribute to the socio-economic reconstruction in South Africa.

What one may deduce from the above submissions is that the land redistribution programme cannot be seen in isolation from the broader picture of the country’s reconstruction and development programme as articulated in the RDP 1994 document that advocated for the implementation of a fundamental reform programme that will see the providing to the disadvantaged and the poor, access to land for residential and productive purposes (Department of Land Affairs 1997). This was meant to be in line with one of the outputs as stated in the land redistribution strategy that asked for the enhancement of household income security, employment and economic growth throughout the country (White Paper on Land Reform Programme 1997).

Sustained economic growth is necessary for poverty reduction, hence the conclusion that we should aim at a redistributive development process that would include redistribution of basic assets, and other resources to create safety nets that would ensure that the poor benefit from development that is associated with land redistribution.

2.3 FUNDING

Much of the land that has hitherto been redistributed had to be bought from private commercial farmers. Given the fact that the intended beneficiaries were said to be poor it was a foregone conclusion that the government was to stand good for the poor beneficiaries. Between 1994 to 1999 the South African government was vigorously in pursuit of a policy of market liberalization in commercial agriculture and at the same time implemented the Settlement Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) of R 16 000, which was initially R 15 000 per beneficiary household (Darroch and Lynne 2003).

In terms of the SLAG the poor and the landless historically disadvantaged South Africans could apply for the grant to buy land and develop farm land. Given the grant sum for each beneficiary of R 16 000 and the average cost of farms on the market (millions of rands), beneficiaries households had to pool together their grants to secure a purchase in what Hall (2007) describes as a ‘rent-a-crowd syndrome’ that led to fears of overcrowding and unsustainable land use.
Given the above, it is quite surprising how the White Paper on Land Reform (1997) saw this grant funding that they implemented, as an asset to a landless poor person whose application would be treated flexibly to give access to land with care to avoid indebtedness. Particularly if one looks at the envisaged use as a contribution to the capital required to make the land productive.

2.4 BENEFICIARIES SELECTION

There is a body of evidence that suggests that the beneficiary selection system had serious limitations. Nothing seems to counter the argument that there was no process of making sure that almost all those beneficiaries raked into the process had declared their interest in farming as in the case of the DLA commonage programme, where it is stipulated that one of the underlying principles is that there must be identified users that articulate a need for land for a specified and identified agricultural need (Govender-Van Wyk, 2007). The land reform programme focuses on not disturbing the market framework in which it operates, rather than on beneficiaries’ interests. Land beneficiaries’ issues should not be taken for granted (Sihlongonyane 2005).

This points to a much emphasized approach that the government should engage itself in an exercise of beneficiaries’ needs analysis, and not assume that there is a need for people to live in a farming environment. There is still a case to be argued on whether the ‘land need’ is a fact or an assumption. More so if one looks at the results reported in a submission by Tupy (2006) that 60% of all black South Africans wish to live in the towns and cities, and the question asked by Mondli Makhanya whether we should be spending so much energy and effort on land redistribution when the instinct of rural South Africans is to head for the city to seek employment and upward mobility there (Tabloid 20 October 2009).

Some of the intended beneficiaries could not be considered to be willing buyers as they were not even directly involved in the buying of farms (Lahiff 2005). AgriSA proposes that instead of the government acceding land to communities, it should consider giving priority to current and ex-farm workers, many of whom have spent a lifetime on farms and very often have all the practical know-how (24 News.com 25/03/2009). This thinking may not be free of limitations or criticism. Firstly it presupposes that every farm worker is passionate about
being on a farm. It undermines the view that some farm workers find themselves not where they are by choice but by forced economic circumstances and were they to be offered an alternative their allegiance could change. Secondly it seems to deny that those who are not in the farming environment could do better given a chance.

Notwithstanding the limitations of this thinking, it can be appreciated as it provides a plausible basis for one option for beneficiary selection.

Levin Richard (2000) summarises the whole beneficiary selection as that the terminology of beneficiaries which characterizes the land redistribution programme reflects the top down character of its implementation procedures. This is evident in an argument that policy debate and planning can move beyond the vague wish-lists of who should benefit – the disadvantaged, the poor, aspirant commercial farmers, women, farm workers, the disabled and then youth – and towards real-world prioritization (Walker 2004).

2.5 POST REDISTRIBUTION SUPPORT

No project can survive without proper planning and subsequent support. This assertion can be said to be true and applicable to the programme of land redistribution. The focus on land transfer and the lack of support for the productive use of land were widely recognized as key failings of the programme, which is considered to have made limited contributions to beneficiaries’ livelihoods (Turner 1997; May and Roberts 2000). There is also no clearly defined land use model, the government focuses on meeting quantitative targets at the expense of the qualitative (Greenberg 2009). And according to Greenberg (2009) the remedy lies in answering questions such as;

1. What is the model of a productive farm?
2. What is the government’s role in ensuring that land is used productively in post redistribution era?

In its submission to the committee for Agriculture and Land Affairs, the South African Human Sciences Research Council (2004) points out that some of the causes of the failures of the projects on redistributed land can be said to be the lack of adequate post-transfer support and an inadequate mechanism of monitoring and evaluation of the system.
The Land Redistribution Strategy as articulated in the White Paper on Land Reform (1997) is emphatic that the success of land redistribution should not end with access to land but should add on the provision of support services, infrastructural and other developmental programmes that are essential to improve the quality of life.

All of the above should be linked to the capacity of the personnel who are tasked with these developments. Scarcity of personnel and the lack of capacity in the personnel are also main constraints and a drawback to any programme. Most of these officials spend little time if any on the project sites and are not too knowledgeable about their tasks. It has to be noted that the expertise and capacities of these extension officers dealing with land reform projects - often concerning large amounts of households or even entire communities - is totally different to those needed on a normal commercial farm. Different tasks including project management, community management, and community psychology are needed to serve a new type of farmer (Anseeuw and Mathebula 2004). In certain instances this manifests itself as a mismatch between products and needs when the land reform project officers often provide products based on what they know and are able to deliver, rather than on what is needed by land reform participants (Levin Richard 2000).

2.6. NON-COORDINATION OF SERVICES

At the time of the formulation and implementation of the land reform policy and the subsequent land redistribution, the South African political structure (government departments) had been characterized by separation of functional mandates in the departments namely, agriculture, land affairs and water affairs - that had to do with agricultural development.

Problems of alignment between land affairs and agriculture, in terms of their policy and operational frameworks which negatively affect their budgeting arrangements also explain in part the chronic failure to provide adequate support to enable beneficiaries to derive substantial benefits (Hall 2007).
The causes of this situation are more complex than what seems to be apparent to most of us. Hall and Ntsebeza (2007) submit that the institutional separation of the departments of Agriculture and Land Affairs is part of the problem, but the artificial divide between state policies on land and agriculture is fundamentally a political problem that arose out of South Africa’s emerging macroeconomic economic policy framework in the 1990s. They further argue that among the factors driving agricultural reforms was the ANC’s commitment to ending the era of apartheid subsidies for white farmers, and having also to please the international pressure to deregulate the economy and to liberalise trade, in global pressures towards liberalized economic policy, including in agriculture and the result of which was a rapid process of dismantling the apparatus of state support to agriculture, including subsidies and marketing boards..

Ben Cousins (2009) submits an argument that says whilst it is crucial on the one hand to proceed with land reform, it is equally crucial for the government to commit itself and support the new owners of land to become productive users by ensuring access to credit facilitation, farming inputs, water for irrigation, marketing arrangements, information and training. If this is the package to ensure success in land development for the programme of land redistribution, how then does one do it with fragmented mandates from fragmented departments? How does the system work in favour of development when one has the department of Land Affairs being responsible for land acquisition, the Department of Agriculture responsible for post settlement support, and the department of Water Affairs responsible for water supply? (Cousins, 2009). This whole exercise is reduced to a scenario of the right hand not knowing what the left hand does.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter seeks to explain how information for the purposes of my research was obtained, what data collection methods were used, and why those particular methods were employed. According to Suzan Boyd one should envision the methodology chapter as a place to clarify how one has conducted one’s research as it is considered to be the framework for one’s research. This flows from the research philosophy which is a belief on the way in which data about a phenomenon should be gathered, analysed and put to work. This philosophy suggests that there is what is known to be true as compared to what is believed to be true.

It is in the realisation of the above that Benbaset (1987) observes that in the research methodology field, no method may be considered to be better than the other for a specified task. It is therefore advised that for one to come up with a better and even improved research, one needs to look at the task at hand to determine which method to use as some tasks may require a combination of procedures. Based on the above I have satisfied myself that the qualitative approach was most suited for this research.

3.2 WHY QUALITATIVE APPROACH?

There is a school of thought in research that advocates that all research methodologies rest upon a bedrock axiom that the nature of the data and the problem for the research dictate the research methodology. Simply put this school of thought suggests that if the data is verbal, qualitative methodology should be considered and if the data is numerical then the method to be considered should be quantitative. Qualitative study is believed to be preferable when dealing with a social phenomenon. According to McBride and Schostak people change and the social situation is too complex for numerical description. According to them qualitative methods do not avoid the complexity of the social life. They argue that instead great efforts are made to illuminate and understand social situations and human feelings through
immersion and detailed in-depth explanation. It is further believed by a number of researchers that qualitative studies tend to be field focussed.

On the strength of these arguments my research was qualitatively orientated. It was conducted using a case study of two farms, Prinsloo and Karkotskraal, in the Blue Crane Route Municipal area in the Cacadu District in the Eastern Cape.

3.3 WHY A CASE STUDY

In pursuit of the goals and objectives of the research, data was collected from individuals who were and are still directly involved in the farming project of the farms in question.

According to Charles Warner, there are two types of case studies, namely (1) factual ones depicting real organizations, people and situations. (2) fictional ones that although based loosely on actual people and events they do not use real organisations or people’s names. For the purpose of this study I am going to use the former.

A case study is more appropriate here because one of the purposes of this study is to show where problems are, how they occurred and how to solve them. Many advocates of case study agree that it accommodates an analytical exercise. It allows detailed research and application of theories, a broader understanding of concepts and knowledge commonly discussed in the field of study.

The field of study is land reform, specifically land redistribution in South Africa. The detailed research is on the reasons for lack of productivity in two farms which were redistributed to beneficiaries in 1997. In a sense this is what Yin (1993) calls a causal case study that will look for cause and effect relationships, and search for explanatory theories of the phenomenon. And according to Yin this situation offers the most suitable conditions for adopting the case study as the research strategy of choice.

Case study research strategy marks the capture and understanding of context and can be used to achieve a variety of research aims using diverse data collection and analysis methods (Pare and Ellen 1997). This becomes effective if one considers what Monteolegre (1995) suggests-
that case studies permit a comprehensive approach to the historical and social analysis of complex phenomenon.

There is a further logic in using a case study as Walshan (1994) further advocates that the case study further gives the researcher access to a continuous or sometimes cyclic movement as the researcher will move to and fro with some findings and interpretations. This flows from understanding of Yin (1994) of a comprehensive description of the phenomenon under study.

The case study was conducted in the two farms namely, Prinsloo and Karkotskraal not farther than a kilometre from the town of Somerset East, Blue Crane Route Municipality, in the Eastern Cape.

Since my case study was field focused it was advisable to start this process in the field by checking for completeness of the data and performing quality control checks so that one could be aware of unanswered questions and uncollected necessary data. This was done to fit in a plan that would help the researcher to ensure that all the information needed has been collected and in a standardised way.

That being the case, the following combination of procedures were used:

**3.4 DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

**3.4.1 QUESTIONNAIRES**

Though this method may have weaknesses of leading the interviewee towards a certain expected response, an interviewer may determine specific questions to avoid randomness but at the same time ensuring that there is theoretical selectivity. This falls in line with Ralph’s desirability of the researcher looking for a material whose quality would be sufficiently rich in content to several specific themes.

This data collection method is accepted by scholars of research as being popular because it is known to be interviewee friendly despite the possibility of it being time consuming. This was developed to suit the relevance of this research. Preferably open ended questions were used
as they are known in obtaining factual information. Most researchers advise that this method offers a researcher a wider variety of advantages not available in other approaches.

According to most researchers this approach offers one correspondence efficiency, it is more friendly and non-prescriptive to respondents, thereby making responding to it easier so that a researcher can conveniently compare the responses to the questions. This type of information gathering goes deeper into detail. Its non-prescriptive nature allows one to get a better feel of what the interviewee/s has/have to say. Some of these questionnaires were sent to the respondents who happened to work for the Department of Land Affairs in offices outside the area. Given the literacy and the illiteracy levels of beneficiaries it was preferred to do a combination of questionnaires and unstructured and informal, face-to-face interviews.

The researcher hand-delivered the questionnaires to those participant respondents who are in the area of research. This serves two advantages: (1) ensure deliverability and receipt and (2) foster trust relationships that will be built out of face-to-face contact. However one must make sure that a respondent is comfortable by earning his or her trust. One of the ways the researcher did that was to attach a cover letter that covered the purpose of the questionnaire, identity of the researcher, how and when the questionnaire should be returned, confidentiality around the responses and the privacy attached to the respondent and the response. Straight forward questions constituted the questionnaire to avoid ambiguity.

Questionnaires with structured and open ended questions were distributed to 10 board members of the trust as they were entrusted with the running and the management of these farms. Only three members returned the questionnaires. On further inquiry from those who did not return the questionnaires it was established that;

(1) Three people did not participate because of fear of reprisal despite the assurance that this was an academic exercise and the outcomes are going to be kept confidential.
(2) Two were not sure of how to respond to the questions,
(3) Two lacked interest and they were no longer interested in the project as they were grossly disappointed by the whole process.
3.4.2 INTERVIEWS

This is the method that is characterised by an interaction between two or more parties with the purpose of obtaining information that would otherwise be not forthcoming. In support of this assertion Gay, (2003) submits that when an interview is well conducted, it can produce in-depth data that would not have been obtained through for an example a questionnaire, and to Gay, a researcher could be satisfied with the outcomes.

As for an informal interview as Cachalia notes, it allows the interviewee to be more relaxed as compared to a formal interview, and has the potential to produce a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often enhances valuable data gathering.

There was a combination of structured and unstructured interviews. The advantage here was to have the benefits of both the structured and unstructured interviews. This assisted in controlling the flow of information. Advocates of this approach argue that it accommodates both literate and illiterate participants, permits clarification of questions and has a potential to yield a higher response rate than a written questionnaire. For a better understanding of the answers provided in the previous interview and to strengthen the trust between a researcher and the participant, a follow up interview was at times conducted. At times these followed with telephonic conversation when the need arose. Handelson (1996) prefers this type of interaction as the argument is advanced that it gives the researcher access to a complete and detailed understanding of the issue at hand. An audio recording was used for the interviews as it provided a back up, and as the researcher could revisit the interview at his convenience as it is always available. It is also time effective as it saved the researcher from writing whilst interviewing, risking losing focus under the circumstances.

For the purposes of this exercise interviews were conducted with the available beneficiaries, previous commercial owners of the purchased farms, neighbouring commercial farmers and people that did official work for the departments involved, members that served on the trust, and managers that rendered services in the post-redistribution period. These interviews cut across age and gender. The nature of interviews and responses determined how economically the time was spent.

Interviews were conducted with;
➢ 16 beneficiaries, all of them Trust members. Through purposive sampling, 3 were women.
➢ The previous owner of Prinsloo. No interviews could be conducted with the previous owner of Karkotskraal. He is late and his family has since left the area.
➢ One retired extension officer who has left the Department of Agriculture and residing in Somerset East.
➢ One extension officer who is still in the employment of the same department.
➢ One former estate agent.
➢ The neighbouring farmer who shares the borders with Prinsloo.

3.4.3 FOCUS GROUP

This is a guided conversation where the researcher facilitates discussion in response to open-ended questions. A group of people, ideally not more than ten, are collectively interviewed. This approach is useful as one can obtain maximum information without spending too much time. There is significant benefit when these responses are corroborated and as respondents correct each other; the result is a consensus response. This form of data collection is employed as it best suits the study as it can be used according to some researchers for different purposes at different stages of the research process, and can be useful in the improvement of data interpretation. It is also useful according to Glitz in the organisation and condensation of the loose views expressed by the group.

That is why the interviews were followed up by two focus group discussions. The first group had eight and the other had six respondents. These people were the beneficiaries and trust members. Amongst them were those who were previous workers on the Prinsloo farm. It was a combination of men and women. What is interesting here is that in the midst of the focus groups were the twelve people who were separately interviewed. This was intentionally done so as to achieve a corroboration of the responses that were given in the individual interviews.
3.4.4. WRITTEN LITERATURE

To make sense of a number of actions taken, a perusal of the legal framework, government documents, minutes that give guide to some of the actions taken and some reviews of those documents was conducted. This proved to be useful as much of what could not be vividly remembered by the participants was illuminated by the following documents found in files;

(1) Minutes of the meetings held
(2) Correspondence between Department of Land Affairs and local council.
(3) Workshop documents used in workshopping the potential beneficiaries
(4) Deed of transfer

3.5. SAMPLING

3.5.1 INTRODUCTION

For this to be appropriately executed one had to do sampling which as understood by Polit et al (2001) is a process of selecting a certain number of participants to represent a population. This group as understood by Delport et al (2007) has a particular set of identical characteristics. My target population were those who have been involved in the farms that were redistributed in 1997, the year of the farm purchase, up to now. This included officials from the Department of Land Affairs, previous officials from the Department of Agriculture and members of the Zamukuphila Trust. This involved a total of 364 beneficiaries, of whom more than 90% live in town, less than five kilometres from the farms.

3.5.2 POPULATION SAMPLING

Understanding that the population that was to be involved in the study is too broad, as we are talking about more than 300 beneficiaries, it was therefore only logical for the practical considerations such as time, the limits of the study and the difficulty in analysing the voluminous data that was to be collected, to select a representative sample. My sampling frame was based on a combination of age, gender and their sources of income and this is
known in research circles as purposive sampling. It is also imperative to consider the following profile of the 50 beneficiaries who has been recorded as having reregistered;

- Out of 50 beneficiaries 15 are women
- 20 are below 35 years of age
- The average age of beneficiaries is 40 years
- 25 are employed somewhere
- 20 are ex farm workers
- 80% illiteracy rate

The final sample selected was thus representative of the beneficiaries population.

3.6 CONTENT ANALYSIS

After the data had been collected, the researcher had to extract meaning from the data by coding and interrogating it for thematic identification, whereafter the themes were examined for pattern formation. Whilst doing that the researcher had to keep in mind what Agar (1991) advises that it is advisable to start by intensively examining a small bit of data rather than intensively coding the data. This process has to be treated carefully as most researchers agree that there are no standard rules on how one can code as identification of the core meaning can be compromised if focus is lost, thereby not being able to maintain the balance between social and theoretical values. This data analysis process is said to be non-linear and is iterative as it is not a process that will have to start when the data has been collected in its totality but as it is collected, so some elements of noting and interpreting are being executed whilst the data is still collected. This has implications for the process of validating responses. These responses have to be put into their correct context. This is important as the contextual issues may have an influence on difference as reflected in convergence and divergence of views. Because of the nature of the methodology and the type of data collected in this study, thematic analysis and to a lesser degree content analysis was used as most of the study was narrative and observation. This in a way assisted the researcher in extracting meaning, explaining some phenomena and what they implied, as the standard analysis procedure for qualitative data is more a matter of describing, summarising and interpreting the data
obtained. This procedure is useful as it normally assists a researcher in identifying a saturation point which is described by Polit et al (2001) as a point where no new information is forthcoming and the whole exercise of extracting new information becomes redundant and serving no useful purpose in pursuing it.

3.7 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The researcher is satisfied that the combination of data collection methods has yielded findings that can be said to be conforming to the definition of validity as defined by Cook and Campbell (1997) as they are showing characteristics of being approximate to the truth. They confirm that there are indeed limitations in the land reform process. It is also the view of the researcher that the repeatability of responses from the interviews confirms the reliability of the information.

3.8 SUMMARY

As stated before the study was qualitatively orientated. A case study approach was used. Sampling of the population was executed to make sure that the information needed had been received without bias. Data was collected, processed, analysed and its credibility was ascertained according to the stipulated measures. In short what has been employed here is a framework developed by Miles and Huberman (1994) that summarises data analysis process as follows: data reduction, data display, conclusion drawing.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

4.1 THE PURCHASE

What the study found was that the previous owners of both farms, Prinsloo and Karkotskraal, approached the government in early 1996 with an offer to sell their farms. One previous extension officer, then employed by the Department of Agriculture who did the evaluation was sent to valuate the lands without the knowledge of the previous owners. The ex-owners are not sure how the valuation was done but what they are certain about is that they got less than what they believed their ground was worth. This begs the question of why would they settle for less? From what one can deduce from the responses by one previous owner one is left with the understanding that there are two major reasons. Firstly, the financial pressure which was experienced by the previous owners. Secondly, the future farming prospects were not so promising with the changes under the new government; the uncertainty about the agricultural markets and the security of farming which was aggravated by the proximity to town which lent itself to stock theft. All those threats militated against them holding on to the farms.

According to the interview with Mr C Wilken, who was an estate agent at that time, it was however noted that they received an above-average price for that time. This price has been determined on the basis of rand per hectare. At the time of the final negotiations between Minister Hanekom and the sellers of the farms Prinsloo and Karkotskraal, the prices were quite stable. Soon afterwards prices skyrocketed dramatically within a short time. At the time of agreement the land price per hectare that the owners received for Prinsloo and Karkotskraal were the highest ever received in that district. Subsequently to the purchase of these two farms the prices of farms sold thereafter achieved even higher prices.

The charge of receiving a higher price is echoed by a neighbouring farmer who states that Prinsloo farm was long in the market and the other farmers who had an interest in buying it could not because of the exorbitant price that was asked for it. The process of farms being bought for redistribution provided the owners of Prinsloo with an opportunity to get what
they wanted. One farmer even pointed to the fact that even the brickyard was itemised as a purchasable item on its own. According to him, that is an anomaly as it was only the quarrying that was executed on the brickyard and no physical structures were built to justify any claim for costs on it.

That is why according to Mr. Wilken, this farm sale actually upset prices in the rest of the district as this high price became the norm for future farm sales.

What also was interesting was that Prinsloo had two homesteads. From the minutes (06/08/1997) of one of the meetings, held between the Trust members, representatives of the Somerset East Transitional Council and the officials from Land Affairs, to confirm the purchase of the farms, it is reflected that Prinsloo’s seller was allowed to rent one homestead according to his request. It is also reflected that he was also allowed to rent the brickyard where he made bricks to sell. All the payments for the rental, as he was no longer an owner but a tenant, were made to the trust.

4.2 THE MANAGEMENT

It emerged from the study that the two farms were both bought and handed over to the beneficiaries together as a single unit. What is evident is that these farms were bought without having any business plan that would chart the way forward on the management and administration. That is why subsequently the Trust had to be established. The trust option was preferred over the option of a Communal Property Association. It was felt that the option for the former was more convenient as the latter option would be time consuming. The Zama Ukuphila Trust (registration IT 767/95) was established in 1995 and became operational in 1996 subject to the Land Reform Act. All the 388 beneficiaries were acknowledged as members of the Trust. The Trust was a private institution, governed by a management board consisting of ten members from the beneficiaries. Their term of office ran for two years. The board of the trust met monthly. Meetings with the general membership of the trust were held quarterly to give feedback and discuss some operational matters. Annual General Meetings were normally held in early February. The trust operated on two farms, the first being Prinsloo which is geographically situated next to the town of Somerset East, bordering on the eastern side. The homestead can be reached via the Cookhouse or Somerset East tar road and is located seven kilometres from the town. The walking distance is at the most two kilometres
from the edge of the town and less than a kilometre from Mnandi Township. The second farm is Karkotskraal which is bordering on the southern side of the Somerset East commonage and can be reached via a gravel road two kilometres from town, which could also be a walking distance. The distance between these farms is about five kilometres by road and two kilometres on foot. For the first few years the administration was done by the office of Department of Land Affairs in Port Elizabeth.

The study further shows that there was an agreement that the farms would be managed by the Somerset East Transitional Council on behalf of the Department of Land Affairs. This task the TLC performed until 2000 when they declared no further interest in continuing with it. It is for that reason that the Trust in April 2000 advertised the post and employed a farm manager. Whilst the TLC was administering it on behalf of the Department of Land Affairs, which was the owner, the Department of Land Affairs leased the farms to the trust and the TLC would collect levies. The Trust as the lessee was given the prerogative to determine what its monthly payment would be. This relationship did not work out well as the TLC would sometimes act without consulting the lessee. There is a case where it is alleged that some of the TLC officials decided to sell off the dairy and its equipment during that time without the prior knowledge of the lessee and according to the lessee that constituted a breach of the lease agreement. The dairy venture seemed to be the most profitable on the farm and could have provided a cash flow that would have made the farm more viable. Also sold at that time were some of the tractors and irrigation equipment. The revenue created from the sale was used to purchase beef cattle and the rest was used for administrative purposes.

There were several attempts to transfer the property to the trust and its beneficiaries but that never succeeded because of the large number of beneficiaries and all the administration attached to such a move. Throughout the data collection process the response to the question of ownership was common that the beneficiaries were still uncertain and concerned about the ownership of the land and they were unanimous on the wish that the land be transferred to their ownership.

It was then decided that the farm be leased to the trust in the mean time until such a transfer could take place. The farm was leased to the Trust through a leasing agreement that also stipulated that the Trust could sublet, which they eventually did. It also emerged that a resolution was taken by the board of Trustees in consultation with the Department of Land
Affairs to sub lease, between 1999 and 2003, a portion of the land to commercial farmers because the beneficiaries were not utilising the land. At Karkotskraal not only grazing land but also water rights were leased to adjacent land owners.

The other problem that they had to face according to the beneficiaries was the high bills of electricity from the Transitional Local Council and the severance of water supply by the owner of the neighbouring farm. Prinsloo is sharing borders with Glen Avon farm. Prinsloo has been receiving a fair amount of irrigation water supply from Glen Avon farm. It is stated by the beneficiaries that as soon as the owners of Glen Avon farm learnt of the news of the purchase of Prinsloo, they cut the water supply in what the beneficiaries believe was a political move driven by racist attitudes.

This is however vehemently denied by the owner of Glen Avon farm. He charges that the water supply to Prinsloo was contained in the contract that was terminated long before the farm was sold to the beneficiaries. He cites that water scarcity in their own situation militated against supplying water to others. On being interviewed on his attitude towards assisting in Prinsloo he stated that he and his brother offered plans to make Prinsloo workable but unfortunately this fell on deaf ears. According to their plan Prinsloo and Karkotskraal were to be given to four beneficiaries and be divided into four portions. They would sit down with the four potential emerging farmers to chart the way forward by drafting a business plan for the farms. This would include coaching them and being sent to a credible agricultural training college. During their attendance at the college the neighbours at Glen Avon farm would take care of Prinsloo and Karkotskraal. According to this farmer, had that happened we would be talking of four successful black farmers in that area.

4.3 THE BENEFICIARIES

The beneficiary selection did not reflect any needs analysis. Originally there were 388 beneficiaries on a voluntary basis. These beneficiaries were randomly recruited in a public meeting in a community hall. What is further evident is that no special effort was made to accommodate gender interests. From the beneficiaries no one can recall any call that referred to a specific number of beneficiaries to be women. This omission is not just an undermining of the spirit of the Land Redistribution Strategy that emphasises that special attention will be given to the needs of women, but also a neglect of women empowerment as a national
agenda. Ten of the beneficiaries were previous employees from the farm Prinsloo. No beneficiaries could be recruited from Karkotskraal as nobody stayed there. It was used just as grazing land by its previous owner. The ten beneficiaries who were previously employed at Prinsloo farm remained in the houses. The first hurdle that they had to overcome was to ensure that those beneficiaries remaining on the farm Prinsloo were not worse off with the purchasing of that farm. This was what was stressed in the meeting by the official from Land Affairs, that money would have to be generated as soon as possible to pay those staying on the farm (Minutes, 06/08/1997). From the perused documents (Memorandum from Director-General to Deputy Director-General and Provincial Director 03/07/1997) it emerges that the then minister Mr Derek Hanekom was aware of this and had reservations about the workability of such a system with so many beneficiaries. In his view the minister was concerned firstly with the number of beneficiaries involved, and secondly the lack of information on how they proposed to use the land. These two factors combined did not suggest that the beneficiaries would be able to jointly manage the land, hence his belief that the arrangement would better suit a commonage project.

However, doubtful as he was, after meeting the trustee members who convinced him that (1) the number of beneficiaries was not a problem and (2) despite the uncertainty of the land use; i.e. whether it was to be residential, agriculture or both (there was no provision made for residential purposes, except for the few who were ex-employees of the farms who had nowhere to go as provision was only made for grazing, dairy, and irrigation land), he proceeded with the purchase of the farms and the hand-over was conducted on 1st October 1997.

Given the number of beneficiaries, the board of trustees, that was elected, had to find a way of reducing it to a manageable number. Many of the beneficiaries who received low-cost housing subsidies were removed from the list as it was not permissible by law to be doubly subsidised. Had consideration been given to Section 6 of the White Paper on the Land Redistribution Strategy that calls for the establishment of a national data base with the Department of Housing to assure the orderly administration and disbursement of the settlement/Land Acquisition Grant, this double subsidisation could have been avoided. Others, because of the protracted process, decided to leave for other towns for better opportunities whilst others passed away and there was no certainty of whether the beneficiaries could be replaced by relatives. This added a legal problem as most beneficiaries
did not have legal wills and could have caused major administrative problems. The beneficiaries’ list was updated and by 2001 not more than fifty beneficiaries were reregistered. There was no clarity on the ownership. Currently there is still uncertainty from the beneficiaries about who owns the farm. However documentation reveals that the Department of Land Affairs is still the owner of the farms as is reflected in the ‘Minutes of the Meeting’ with stakeholders in 1997.

4.4 POST REDISTRIBUTION SUPPORT

There was no mentoring and training plan in place. It has also emerged from the minutes that the minister was to be convinced that beneficiaries could be sent for training free of charge on farm management. The details on this issue are not available save to say that from what can be read from the available documents there was a launch of the training held on May 2002, five years after the handover, which was to be conducted by Lovedale Further Education and Training College. It is evident from the interviews that not every beneficiary was taken to training at this college. Only the managers of the ventures attended courses in that institution and were given training on business skills and how to operate those ventures and financial management. It also emerged from the study that the Department of Agriculture did promise to assist with other logistics. Whilst it could not deliver on the promise of the tractor and other land tilling equipments that was to be donated to the farm, it managed to contribute material to a tune of about R561 856. The material included fencing, dairy equipment and chicken broiler equipment. Sadly the researcher noted that much of that material is missing and no one can account for it except to say that it is missing due to theft.

4.5 MEANS TO FINANCE THE PROJECT

After sorting out the legitimacy of beneficiaries, the trust management decided to develop a system in which all beneficiaries were advised to participate if they so wished. The financial situation was such that the trust had only the means to manage the operations of the trust but had no capital to accommodate development of beneficiaries. Several meetings were held involving the management and the beneficiaries. It was decided that the trust management will source means to develop a few different ventures that could be utilised to involve beneficiaries. Several institutions, public and private, were identified and engaged to attempt to get involved with the Zama Trust. Most financial institutions were reluctant to assist
except the Department of Agriculture and an international company Land-O-Lake that also
got involved. This behaviour from the financial institutions can in no way be viewed as an
anomaly. It is an established axiom that our private sector financial institutions are operating
on the principle of profit making and profit maximisation. The beneficiaries in this project
with their financial and economic status would surely have a high risk rating in the categories
of the private financial institutions. This has been identified as a constraint by the
government, hence the ‘risk sharing agreement’ proposed in the Land Reform Programme
White Paper (1997) where the state is envisaged as providing funds which act as both an
incentive and a safety net to financial institutions which begin to lend to a newly targeted
clientele. Why this was not executed in the case of this project leaves us to question the
commitment on the provisions of the Land Reform Credit Facility which was supposedly
created by the Department of Land Affairs to enable the commercial banks to provide loans
to land reform beneficiaries to enhance their liquidity.

Even the very few institutions which were willing to provide grants were problematic as their
application requirements had hiccups and response time delays. The rest would look at
providing loans to beneficiaries. But again the primary problem that cropped up was that the
financing institutions were all seeking collateral for the loans. The trust management after
consultation, fearing to risk beneficiary assets, considered the Land Bank as it was the only
one that showed flexibility as it was willing to provide the loans without attaching assets such
as homes as a collateral arrangement. However these beneficiaries had to undergo credit
worthiness scrutiny.

Out of the total of 78 beneficiaries only twenty two went through the credit worthiness
screening process of the Land Bank. These loans were taken up to buy beef cattle. The
repayment period was ranging between two to three years. With most of the farm land being
leased to commercial farmers, the carrying capacity of the farm was hugely reduced. With the
added stock being bought for beneficiaries, the farms’ carrying capacity was to be exceeded.
To ensure that carrying capacity was not exceeded a plan was devised by which the
beneficiaries then bought some cattle from the trust.

The plan devised to stay within limits of Prinsloo carrying capacity:

The carrying capacity of Prinsloo = 210 LSU (Large stock Units)
The trust had cattle equalling $150 \text{ LSU}$ (spare capacity of 50 LSU at that stage)
+ 22 beneficiaries @ 4 new LSU each $= 88 \text{ LSU}$

238 LSU’s thus exceeding the carrying capacity with 28 LSU’s

Plan: Sell 38 LSU cattle belonging to trust to beneficiaries : $150 - 38 = 112 \text{ LSU’s}$
+ Buy 50 LSU cattle from commercial farmers equal to another 50 LSU

Total now on farm Prinsloo:
- 112 LSU from Trust ($150 - 38$)
- 38 LSU’s bought by beneficiaries from trust
- 50 LSU’s bought by beneficiaries from commercial farmers
- 200 LSU’s (In line with capacity for farm)

These were the cattle that were bought by the trust entity since inception of the legal entity from profits made from other ventures. The majority of cattle were bought from other commercial farmers. The trust then used the money received from the sale of their stock to purchase good quality bulls for the beneficiaries’ cattle. All the income went to the trust. The implications of this deal were as follows:

1- Carrying capacity of the farm not exceeded.
2- Beneficiaries got the opportunity to build their own herds.
3- Great improvement in quality of weaner cattle.

It must be said that out of the total number that received loans only four could not repay.

4.6 BENEFICIARY VENTURES

There was an attempt to launch beneficiary ventures in Prinsloo in the following fields;

4.6.1 Dairy products

The milking parlour was built for this venture with the assistance of the Department of Agriculture. Between ten to fifteen cattle were milked a day. The milk was sold to the
township and portion of it consumed by the beneficiaries themselves. This went on for a period of two years and collapsed. Drought conditions prevented a full supply of milk and the beneficiaries had no funds to buy additional fodder to keep cows in condition to supply milk.

4.6.2 Broiler chicken unit

This venture was promising. They used to slaughter up to a thousand chickens per month. These were sold in the township. Most of the chickens were sold on credit. There was an intention to sell the chickens to the retailers but poor marketing betrayed those intentions. This too collapsed. Group work was the downfall of this venture. While the majority of beneficiaries kept returning the income that they received for sale of broilers, a few would disappear with large amounts of money. This exhausted the funds of this venture, until the remainder of the beneficiaries could not carry the financial burden of keeping up with production. This in itself should be interpreted as a result of poor management of a cooperative venture, that reflected a lack and a need of training that would lead to a tighter structure of accountability for the sellers.

4.6.3 Stock ventures

After bilateral discussions between the trust and the beneficiaries it was decided to request the Land Bank to address the beneficiaries on the issue of stock loans. Three meetings were held and everything explained to beneficiaries. Most of them seemed to understand the procedures and decided to proceed with the loans but as soon as the interests were levied against their loan accounts they pleaded non comprehension of the loan process.

Out of the total of seventy eight beneficiaries, only twenty two went through the credit worthiness screening process of the Land Bank. Each of the participating beneficiaries received loans of R40 000 to purchase beef cattle. Cows and heifers were bought and in the end the beneficiaries had a total of 150 head of cattle. The repayment period was ranging between two to three years. They bought these from the trust as well as from external sources. Those that they bought from the trust were the cattle that were bought ‘lock, stock and barrel’ with the farm. All the income went to the trust.
This venture was the most successful of all the ventures. Today at least 5 beneficiaries have established herds of up to 150 head of cattle and are full commercial farmers in their own right. Most of the others are still farming with small herds of stock. From interaction with the beneficiaries it emerged that the success of this venture was premised on the pre-knowledge of the people with beef stock. They know this type of farming and all were involved through various experiences since an early stage of their lives in beef farming.

4.6.4 Goat milk cheese

This project had the potential to become a real money spinner for the beneficiaries. It was very well planned and organized. A USA dairy company “Land O Lakes” assisted in the funding of this project through finance of stock, construction of a dairy facility and the necessary expertise. Fifteen beneficiaries were trained to milk the goats, take care of them and then to produce cheese. All went well with the production and the selling of cheese. When the manager who was instrumental in the organisation and operations of this venture left, there was unfortunately no direction as there were too many uninformed instructions from self imposed individuals who knew very little about the venture itself. The undesirable ultimately happened - the project fell flat. Nobody took care of the animals. The goats were stolen and others were sold in the nearby townships. All the money made upfront was used for personal expenses by beneficiaries. Some of the equipment was allegedly sold by certain beneficiaries with no one wishing to assist in laying a charge with the police. Other goats perished as they succumbed to drought conditions.

4.6.5 Piggery

This is one venture that did not have a promising start. There was a lack of infrastructure such as holding pans. It was dropped within the first year of its existence.

4.6.6 Geese farming

This venture was well established and realized a good income for beneficiaries for almost a year, whereafter the geese were stolen by somebody. Once again it was the issue of personal income against that of good business sense that made this venture collapse.
4.6.7 Vegetable growing

This venture was established by the trust itself and started off very well as profits were made by at least 20 beneficiaries. The lands were well attended to and several different types of vegetables were grown. Water became a problem in the dryer times and of course the normal theft of produce took place.

This was once again a venture which the beneficiaries had previous knowledge of and could associate to the farming type. If it was not for the issue of theft this venture could have grown into a sustainable money spinner for the trust and beneficiaries.

4.7 IMPACT ON BENEFICIARIES’ LIVES

From all the interviews what was certain was that no beneficiary demonstrated happiness. Some beneficiaries bemoan the fact that they never understood how the loan system through the Land Bank worked and it never worked for them as they enjoyed no benefit as some of the cattle they bought were either stolen or died. Some beneficiaries lament that they were left with loans that they are not sure how to repay, whilst they never received any income from the farm. The ventures that were established did not yield any positive benefits, instead some had to augment with their own money to keep the ventures going with the hope that they will kick off to a successful ending. But all this was in vain.

The ex-employees were the ones that were grossly disgruntled. There was a feeling that the process short-changed them as it robbed them of their stable wage when they were the employees. They felt that what the trust offered them fell short of providing them as they missed their monthly wage, the ration of groceries and meat. According to them, whilst in the employment of the previous owner they could approach their former employers for bail-outs when they were in financial dire straits, but that has come to an end with the new system. They even bemoan the fact that the previous owners turned a blind eye on them going to hunt with dogs but the trust imposed very strict rules of no hunting. They also could not understand how are they beneficiaries but they don’t know how the monies the trust claims to earn are spent. They feel that they are sideline when decisions are made but only to be told what happened after everything was done.
Be that as it may they still harbour the ambitions of continuing with the project if a new start could be made with the restructuring of the beneficiary list. They feel that only those showing commitment should be allowed to continue. They are still of the view that the Department of Land Affairs should give them ownership of the land as they cannot continue with their plans on someone else’s properties. It is also their view that the Department of Agriculture should provide them with someone who is knowledgeable about land and agriculture who is going to spend his or her time on the farms full time.

4.8 THE CURRENT STATE OF THE FARMS

According to the available records both farms remain the property of the Department of Land Affairs.

4.8.1 PRINSLOO

There is now an attempt to launch another project with the intention to utilise 100 hectares of land from Prinsloo for a pomegranate fruit operation to produce and sell pomegranates. This area has been so chosen because it has the right climate, soils, and enough water supply as the Little Fish river meanders through the farm. If the project comes to fruition about 90 jobs will be created and there is a commitment according to the business plan that the beneficiaries will be the co-owners in the form of a workers trust with a 49% shareholding.

The other portion of Prinsloo, which according to the lease document is portion B of the remainder portion 17 of the farm Prinsloo in extent of about 924 hectares, has been leased to Siyazama Trust. This trust consists of 25 members. Only 11 are from the original beneficiary group. According to them the number 25 was suggested by the officials from the Department of Social Development. They applied to the Department of Social Development for funding and their grant under a food security programme of R750 000 was approved. This amount is to be paid in two tranches. They intend to grow lucerne on the irrigable land. A first tranche was drawn and the amount was used to connect the water pipe from the canal which is almost five kilometres from the canal, to the lands. However looking at the whole proposition, there are indicators that are a cause for concern. The first concern is that there is no one who mentors the whole process. The lease has been entered into for three years commencing on 01/08/2008. The rental fee payable is R12 320, plus water fees at R46 003 per annum. Clause
8 further states that the lessee shall be liable for the payment of all rates and taxes and other monies which any irrigation board or other competent body may legally levy during the tenancy. This three year lease has to be viewed in the context of the period of the growing of the lucerne. The R750 000 will be enough for the lucerne establishment costs. The farmers consulted estimate that lucerne will only be in full production in three years. One gets six cuttings per year and it lasts up to seven years. The first year net income is believed to be around R4000, R6000 on the 2nd year and R8000 on the third year. Going through all these statistics and figures, given that the lease period that will lapse before the first harvest has been realised, it is difficult to see how 25 beneficiaries are going to make a success of the activity. Again, here we witness the non-coordination of resources from different departments. An ideal situation would have been the coming together of the Departments of Agriculture, Land Affairs, Water Affairs and Social Development to formulate a ‘best package’ for this venture. Once more the conclusion can be drawn that a cardinal mistake is committed by ignoring the role the neighbouring commercial farmers could play in this venture.

Few cattle and Boer goats are still roaming on the farms. On investigation, it has been established that some of the livestock do not belong to the beneficiaries but to people in the townships. From observation the infrastructure that was used for the collapsed ventures still remains intact. It is only the houses that are in a badly dilapidated state. Only three of the remaining beneficiaries are staying on the farms. Others have moved to town where they received houses under the low cost housing scheme, leaving the question of whether they still qualify to be beneficiaries given the provisions of the law that forbid double subsidisation.

4.8.2 KARKOTSKRAAL

However a different picture seems to appear in Karkotskraal. Flowing from the understanding that the carrying capacity of the grazing land at Prinsloo is limited, a plan was developed to accommodate those who would own a large number of livestock to be moved to Karkotskraal. Four individuals from the original beneficiary group with an average ownership of 150 herds of beef cattle each thus moved to Karkotstraal. The grazing land was divided into four grazing sub components. Their rent payment ranges from R12 000 to R13 500 per annum depending on the square metres one is grazing his or her cattle on. The toiled land is rented by one individual who is not from the original beneficiary group. Lucerne for feeding
his cattle is grown on this land. They all pay the rent to the Department of Land Affairs and the conditions are contained in a contract that is reviewed within a three year period.

The three individuals with herds of cattle are already holding discussions with the Department of Land Affairs to look at the possibility of the following options;

1. To be allowed to rent the underutilized grazing led at Prinsloo, as their cattle are breeding at an accelerated rate.
2. The Department of Land Affairs assist them to acquire another farm through the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme.

4.8.3 STATUS OF THE ZAMUKUPHILA TRUST

According to the chairperson of Zamukuphila Trust, the trust is still a registered entity. It is dysfunctional as it no longer holds meetings. A number of its board members have since died and others have left the town. Those who are around have expressed indifference in serving the trust.
CHAPTER 5

5.1 DISCUSSION

5.1.1 STAKEHOLDERS

The absence of non-governmental organisation stakeholders that have an interest in land issues might have been a drawback in this instance. Non-governmental organisations, though not an essential part of every social project, by nature are a useful resource and a socio economic asset. They more often than not possess a bank of knowledge that can have relevance on subject matters and could provide administrative and management support that the beneficiaries are in need of. The advantage with them is that they have a reputation of not harbouring selfish interests that would when not served jeopardise the chances of success to the project. It is on the basis of that strength and their delivery rate that they are in most cases trusted by the government and the civil society.

5.1.2 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

There is evidence that the support in the form of a donated material to enhance the infrastructure that the Department of Agriculture provided was meant to advance the interests of the project. From the study this is acknowledged and appreciated by the beneficiaries. However having said so, one cannot help but imagine that more could have been achieved out of that assistance had it been supplemented with monitoring and evaluation. Any amount of resources, being material or human that are injected in any project that has collapsed, borders on resources being thrown down a bottomless pit. It also poses the question of the strategic positioning of the policies that deal with the land redistribution programme. It has to be said that policies by definition, purpose and nature are nothing else but principles and long term goals that form the basis for guidelines that would provide a platform for planning and development and they would remain as such. It should be noted that even some of the best developed policies are known to possess a propensity to produce unintended consequences.

What this implies is that policies in themselves and by themselves cannot be trusted to produce best results unless they have a structured back-up. This is the back-up one would enjoy from the personnel that are tasked to give meaning to the policy. This then talks to the
importance of having an efficient and competent human resource. What one has observed from the study and could be suggested is that efficiency and competency were lacking. This is reflected by the manner of management of the processes involved. By and large a deduction can be made that there is a general capacity problem that hampers the effective implementation of policies in these departments. And if the departments wish to see a more improved service they should accede to the requests of the existing personnel to employ more officials, as by their own admission the current staff is under resourced; and to train their personnel in various management skills that are relevant to the programmes.

What could be deduced from the study is that the limitations and gaps identified are the symptoms of a difficulty in dealing with and managing an emotive issue such as land reform. It is also a reflection of how difficult it is to strike a balance between the country’s political, socio-economic programme and agenda on one hand and its implementation on the other. One may not be at fault by suggesting that the government was within its political right to initiate and proceed with the land reform process in the form of redistribution at its earliest convenience, as it had a case that is rationally justifiable. Simply put, it was satisfying the country’s constitutional imperative. There are two issues that need to be responded to here that are linked to the satisfaction of the constitutional imperative. Firstly, the correctness of the timing of the implementation of the land redistribution programme. Secondly, the readiness of all the stakeholders and role players involved in this programme.

5.1.3 THE TIMING

It is my submission that the timing could not be more appropriate. It should be remembered that by anybody’s standard the land issue has been for some time a ticking political bomb. Any further delay could lead to an outburst. It is my belief that such an outburst would be the last thing that an incoming post apartheid government would wish for, not because it would be difficult for it to handle but also it would go a long way to discredit it. This would open that government to its critics and opponents who had for sometime made the land issue their political campaigning tool. What also favours the argument for a correct timing is a parallel rational as almost every newly liberated country, particularly those neighbouring Southern African states, had initiated and implemented land reforms as their political priority and a restorative measure. That in itself posed a pressure to the South African government to show political intent and the promise to deliver.
5.1.4 READINESS

However, having said that, one has to look at the country’s readiness to engage in such a step. Sending a message on political intent is one thing and how to practicalise that is another. If the gaps and some other weaknesses that have been discovered by the study and the admissions by Ms Lulu Xingwana, the then Minister of Agriculture, that there are redistributed farms that lay idle and non-productive and need to be confiscated are anything to go by, there is a case to argue that the government and the beneficiaries in those failed projects have hastily acted before determining their state of readiness. Here the distinction between the want to get the land, the reason for that want and then readiness to get it comes into play. This is the anomaly that is referred to by scholars and critics of our land reform as the misfit between the land policy and rural development that is most evident when land reform is being pursued by a government primarily as a quasi-constitutional right or as a means of redressing past injustices, rather than as a basis for sustainable rural livelihoods. Hence the conclusion by them that redressing gross racial imbalances in land ownership and access is one thing, whilst recreating sustainable livelihoods on the land is something else and infinitely more difficult to attain.

5.1.5 LAND REDISTRIBUTION FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (LRAD)

This intervention should be viewed in the context of what Michael Aliber (2003) sees as a response to the realisation of the Department of Land Affairs that a high proportion of its redistribution projects were experiencing serious problems. One of the main causes of this problem was the amount of the Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) and its applications.

In the context of the above, the introduction of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in 2001, four years after the introduction of the Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) as viewed as a corrective measure by the government should be welcome. Though it cannot be said to be a panacea for the ills of the previous SLAG programme it shows a propensity of improving on the foundation laid by SLAG. Whilst not abandoning its character and disposition to assist the potential farmers, it is a pointer to what can be viewed as a better direction as it lays an emphasis on interest and need, unlike SLAG that seemed to base its applications on randomness and assumptions. As
observed by Aliber, it proposes a significant change in the size of the grant as the grant now can be awarded to adult individuals rather than to households. The principle benefit here is that in practice multiple adult members of the same household can apply for this grant with the intention of pooling those grants. Its strength also lies in that it provides a higher grant, it is individually based and that in itself enforces a greater sense of responsibility on the applicant, and it supplements what the applicant already has. If all things being equal this is a sort of assistance that could be considered for the group of four people at Karkotskraal that has demonstrated that given the chances they can prosper.

However it has some weaknesses. The threat of fragmentation between the Departments of Agriculture and Land Affairs that was seen as compromising their efficacy is again observed in this LRAD. Whilst the Department of Land Affairs is taking responsibility in providing the grant, the responsibility of overseeing the projects from start to finish will be a shared one between the Departments of Agriculture and Land Affairs. Under the circumstances one would wish to see a single point of responsibility and correspondingly so, accountability, more so when this initiative is seen as a corrective measure to the woes of the previous programme.

5.1.6. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE?

It is my view that much has happened in terms of other measures and interventions that had been affected to remedy what has gone wrong in the past within the land redistribution. Seeing that the status quo remains the same in some areas, including the one in which this study has been conducted, the department will do well to consider what is contained in this study.

The department should take it upon itself to clearly identify the purpose for the use of the farm. It should be feasibly determined whether the farm’s sustainability strategy is to be fully commercialised and make it intensively productive for markets, or whether it is for poverty alleviation and subsistence. This will assist in terms of determining what resources to spend on what and what expectations to satisfy. This will ensure a balance between the levels of expectations on one hand and the levels of delivery on the other. However from my point of view it will be a waste of resources and illogical to use it for poverty alleviation as the majority of the active beneficiaries do have other source of income and such initiatives are
not sustainable, so one has to look at initiatives that are going to generate a revenue base to keep them viable.

At a national government level the department should carefully and progressively develop policies that do not just resonate well with itself, but also with those that positively influence those who are currently affected and are still going to be affected in future by socio-economic land issues. This will ensure that there is no gap between what is envisaged and articulated in documents on one hand and the implementation on the other. One example of this disjuncture is what is contained in the document entitled ‘Department of Land Affairs As A Rural Development Role Player’ where they call for the planning for land reform at a district level. According to this approach, before individual enquiries and projects could be handled effectively, each district needed to develop an overall district plan for land reform within which to regulate appropriate development. On conducting this study this plan was missing as there was no evidence of this being put in place. This omission is conspicuous because the district and local government are the nearest to the communities and are therefore strategically placed to take ultimate responsibility for service delivery as noted in the Rural Development Framework (1997).

The Department of Land Affairs as a custodian of this programme needs to go back to the farm to take stock of what is there now. This would include assessing the condition of the infrastructure and the facilities that have been previously used for the interventionist ventures. This could be done with the soliciting of assistance from the available experts both within the Department of Land Affairs and Agriculture. The Department of Land Affairs would then convene a strategic session with the remaining beneficiaries to ascertain the interest to continue with the farming project. All those that have declared interest to continue should be bound by a contract of some sort of commitment. These beneficiaries should be divided along their farming sectoral interests. Over and above mentorship, training relevant to their area of involvement should be given to the beneficiaries through whatever method as long as it is done by a credible service provider. Each participant should be trained according to his or her area of farming interest and involvement. Emphasis should be laid on training to empower the beneficiaries on how to run an organisation democratically and how to participate in decision making. This is critical in making sure that there is a genuine buy-in to avoid problems where beneficiaries feel that they are not part of the scheme and can therefore steal from the projects and care less about the well being of the project. Given my
understanding and scepticism that the Department of Land Affairs is badly under resourced in terms of personnel and capacity, this issue of monitoring and training should advisably be the responsibility of the Department of Agriculture as they have the knowledge and expertise to assist in the management of farms.

One area that needs a critical intervention is funding. The state should qualify its intentions by assessing the financial needs of the project before injecting any monies into the projects. What has been going on in those farms justifies both the adequacy and the relevance of availing necessary funds to keep the farms operational. This is an essential step as long as mechanisms are put in place to make sure that resources are not thrown down the bottomless pit. It is a precedent all over the world that the state would pursue such interventions where and when they are necessary. We can learn lessons from the experiences of other countries.

The pomegranate orchard opportunity that has been referred to earlier has arisen and should be exploited and capitalised on. Pilot tests on suitability of the soil for the pomegranate orcharding have been done around the Blue Crane Route Municipal area. Prinsloo has passed that test. The climate, the soil, the water supply and the transportation convenience all count in Prinsloo farm’s favour. Feasibility studies have already been conducted. Chances are that if that venture is well taken care of it is destined for success. The Department of Land Affairs and whoever the powers that be in taking the decisions on Prinsloo should consider rolling in some beneficiaries in that venture in a form of a workers trust as advised by the business plan. Beneficiary selection should be executed taking lessons that were learnt from the previous experience. From the plan that has been presented by those who developed the studies on the venture it shows employment absorption opportunities of up to ninety individuals (Business plan 2007). This implies that the venture will go beyond absorbing beneficiaries and offer employment to other people too and thereby going a long way in reducing unemployment and alleviating poverty much to the credit of the government. And in my view that is just one success story that will send a positive statement rather than long term promises. It should be remembered that we are running short of excuses and the excuses that we have offered in the past are fast losing taste. This happens at the time when the people on the ground are more and more demonstrating that their patience is not without limits.

Though mentorship is acceptable, a healthier scenario that would be more desirable would be to contract an interested partner with a wealth of experience in a certain field who would
inject a financial share. Here the benefit would be to tap on his or her expertise and that person wouldn’t allow his or share to depreciate. This arrangement would be a workable one because it is a partnership. This partnership will have to be strengthened by the Department of Agriculture’s constant monitoring and evaluation of the progress. These monitoring and evaluation systems should be built within the policy to avoid gaps that would lead to dissonance. Once that happens, respect and trust set in and that will be a foundation of cooperation for progress.

The role of the Department of Water Affairs in this development cannot be overstated. Water provision is and will remain an integral part in farming activities. The water rights system as practised now is not assisting those who would make a good start in farming. Once the beneficiaries experience non affordability of water fees it immediately pronounces a cul de sac to any further farming operation. The same argument should be advanced with regard to power supply. Farming operations are today heavily mechanised. This mechanisation talks to electricity power supply needs. In the case of the Blue Crane Route area the municipality is the supplier of electricity. The Blue Crane Route Municipality is therefore expected to satisfy its development mandate by creating an environment that will encourage progress by providing affordable electricity to the initiatives in these farms.

What has also transpired is that there are three individuals who own large herds of cattle and one who tills the land at Karkotskraal. These individuals show signs of working together very well and have progressed quite well. A prudent thing to do under the circumstances is not to disrupt that relationship. To affirm their efforts the Department of Land Affairs could through the provisions of the LRAD assist them with land. These farmers were not the intended beneficiaries of the programme but their success justifies their presence and lends credence to and validates the criticism of the unworkability of large number of beneficiaries rather that a small number that would register success. Whilst these successful farmers will provide employment to others, the other remaining beneficiaries could be accommodated in the Pomegranate orchard at Prinsloo and other schemes that may be thought of.

What has also been observed is that ever since the purchase, Prinsloo and Karkotskraal have been an island in the sea of surrounding farms. Whatever the attitudes that led to that unfortunate situation, that state of affairs should be discouraged as it is denying the beneficiaries assistance from the established neighbouring commercial farmers. The
assistance and experience of the farmers will bring the necessary farming and farming management skills, the understanding of market dynamics and how to phase the potential emerging farmers into established markets so that they become an integral part of the mainstream economy. Whatever the circumstances, those seasoned farmers together with the other host of retired farmers remain an invaluable resource to the amateur emerging farmers. The saddest tragedy was that even the previous owners of the farms were never involved in assisting the beneficiaries despite them renting the homesteads. Being the previous owners of those farms and having been brought up in those farms places them in a position of being the best resource in assisting as they are expected to know every nook and cranny of the farms.

There is also the question of ownership. The Department of Land Affairs should satisfy itself that it has done everything within its power to prepare the beneficiaries to be the owners of the land within given time frames. Should that preparation be ensured, beneficiaries should be given the right to ownership. This will go a long way in boosting the morale of the beneficiaries. Who the beneficiaries this time will be has to be sorted out by the department. Whoever those beneficiaries will be, a special concerted effort should be done and a mechanism put in place to ensure that the recruitment of women is a priority. The department may acknowledge the right to ownership of the existing beneficiaries or recruit new ones. This is however a grey area to be traversed by the department. Its greyness arises from the technicality that the total amount of the purchase price on the farms is what was contributed by the collective grants of the beneficiaries. However their right to ownership was not qualified as the legal owner of the farms remain the Department of Land Affairs. However, much as the department has a legal claim to the right of ownership to the farms, it can be argued that the beneficiaries have a right to have their expectations met. Moreover, any move to replace the present beneficiaries may have a potential of kindling an unnecessary conflict. Whatever is to be done it must ensure that in the short, medium and long term is not sowing the seeds of a social conflict that would disrupt any means to restore order and progress on those farms. There is also the issue of the Zamukuphila Trust. Its role should be clarified. Decisions have to be made not only on whether its existence is desirable or justifiable but also what role should it play given the present circumstances and how the changes will affect it if there are any to be effected on the farms. That should first be settled before any resources are pumped in to start ventures.
5.2. SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The nature of the subject under study suggests continuity. Land redistribution is an ongoing socio-economic phenomenon. As it is premised on the urge to satisfy the dynamic needs of the previously disadvantaged, it must take into consideration that those needs are not immune to changes, implying that as time unfolds so will the needs change. As land can have economic value it is expected to be affected by the changes frequently experienced in an economic environment. It has also been observed that even the countries that were liberated before South Africa that have implemented land reform as a socio-economic and political programme have not done so without challenges, and cannot claim success and perfection. The implication of that for South Africa is that there is no ‘panacea precedent’ to base their programme on. However the positive that flows from that is that South Africans can tap on their own expertise and experience whilst blending it with some of the best elements of what has been practised in other countries to produce the hybrid programme that they may use to their best advantage. What then this suggests is that as the programme unfolds over time it offers us with the opportunity of further research on the adequacy of ongoing programmes such as LRAD that come to the fore.

5.3 CONCLUSION

Flowing from the indisputable fact that land is not only a political factor but an economic one, it remains valid that land redistribution as an act of land reform remains a correct programme to introduce and implement. Having said that however there is much evidence that its implementation resembles a programme that lacks a well thought-out operational plan, with incoherence between what is envisaged and actual implementation, and inconsistency in application. It seems to lack consolidation and tempts one to conclude that it is a hasty overhaul that had the correct motive but with operative integral parts that are at a complete disjuncture. This is evident from the fact that the majority of the beneficiaries did not enjoy any dividends or benefits to talk of. And if this is a standard to use to measure any degree of success of the programme in that area, then we are far from achieving it.
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BENEFICIARY INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

PROJECT: ____________________________________

INTERVIEWEE : ________________________________ AGE ____________ GENDER_________

INTERVIEWER: ________________________________ DATE: _________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>ANSWERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In what year were you recruited to this programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you have interest in farming?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What positive impact has the land redistribution programme had on your life?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Why has the project been struggling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What role has Department of Land Affairs played?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What role has Department of Agriculture played?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What assistance do you think you need to succeed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>What can the government do differently to help the project succeed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>What have you done to make a difference to the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What do you think motivates you to do your best for the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What do you think about the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. redistribution programme in general OR What contribution can land redistribution make in our society?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>What influence will the availability of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. man-made improvements, like infrastructure and other inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. irrigation, roads, machinery, tractors, transport, pesticides and fertilizers) have on the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>