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ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the role of land reforms in the alleviation of rural poverty. A three-pronged approach is adopted in the background study process. This includes a review of the South African land reform programme, a review of international experiences in land reforms, and finally, a focused study of the Uitkyk community of the North West Province.

Chapter 1 lays the framework for the study and ends up with the fundamentals of the South African land reform programme. Chapter 2 examines experiences in land reforms in three other countries namely, Brazil, China and Zimbabwe. Based on the comparability of these countries to South Africa in various respects, lessons are drawn from their experiences for South Africa. Chapter 3 traces the origin and evolution of the land question among the Uitkyk community and their subsequent quest for restitution. Chapter four presents empirical evidence from a field survey, with subsequent analysis thereof. Finally, Chapter 5 summarises the lessons drawn from the Uitkyk and South African experience and the international experience. It also offers some tentative recommendations for the South African land reform programme.

Two fundamental approaches to land reforms are recognised in this dissertation. These include the government-assisted approach and the market based approach. It is difficult to find any pure form of either approaches anywhere on a national scale. However, at different time periods, countries may tend to prefer one approach over the other. After the 2005 National Land Summit, there is growing
momentum for South Africa to switch from a predominantly market-based approach to a more government-assisted programme. For a land reform programme to be effective, it must go beyond changes in access to resources to actual economic development. Such development is indicated by changes in income, employment, nutrition and education. The evidence from this dissertation suggests that within the Uitkyk community, land reforms may so far have resulted in change in access to land, but not so much in economic development.

To advance the goals of land reform, South Africa will have to carefully consider the tradeoffs between two seemingly conflicting goals of land reform, namely, efficiency and equity. Both community and individual beneficiaries of land grants must also take greater responsibility in translating the change in land access to more wealth and better living conditions.
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

1.1 Introduction

One of the major challenges that faced the newly elected Government of South Africa from its very inception in 1994 was the question of land reform. This challenge called for urgent action primarily because of the critical role that land ownership plays in the economic and social lives of individual communities. In a speech on land redistribution in South Africa, Didiza (2005) hints that the structure of land ownership in South Africa was heavily skewed against the black population, with 87 percent of land belonging to white and 13 percent to black South Africans. Didiza (2005) blames this inequality in land ownership on protracted periods of systematic dispossession of the land of black South Africans in favour of the white population, during decades of colonial and apartheid regimes.

In an effort to correct the identified imbalance, the South African government instituted a land reform program, which effectively took off in 1995. This land reform program is made up of three major components, namely, land restitution, land tenure reform and land redistribution (Gwanya 2003:2). Land restitution deals with historical rights in land ownership and relates primarily to communal ownerships. Land tenure reform focuses on the different forms of land holding. Land redistribution aims at transforming the racial pattern of land ownership.

1.2 The problem statement

The land reform program was one of the first socio-economic policy instruments that were adopted by the new democratic government of South Africa after 1994. The restitution of land rights Act 22 of 1994, provides the fundamental legislative framework for the South African land reform programme. Within a year after this act kicked in, the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR) was established as well as the Land Claims Court (LCC) as vehicles to drive the reform process.

Today, twelve years down the land reform road, there is little evidence of success, or otherwise, of the reform programme. Where efforts have been made to show such evidence,
it remains unclear what the real success indicators are. One approach would be to consider the extent to which historically deprived land rights have been restored. The alternative approach is to determine the extent to which the reform programme has achieved its stated mission of delivering on increased income, job opportunities, productive land use and well planned human settlements (DLA 2003:1). This dissertation seeks to address this quandary from the perspective of the effect of land reform on the improvement of the above-mentioned set of economic indicators.

**Figure 1.1 The prosperity paradigm.**

![Diagram of the prosperity paradigm](image)

Source: Dekker (2003:111)

Dekker (2003:111) developed a tool for assessing the effectiveness of land reform projects, namely, the prosperity model which is outlined in Figure 1.1 above. The prosperity model seeks to describe the relationship between land reform and economic development. This
model will be used as a dip stick to assess the success of the South African land reform program.

1.3 Aims and objectives of the research

The overarching aim of this dissertation is to determine the extent to which land reform has succeeded in alleviating poverty among a rural South African community, namely, the Uitkyk community of the Ventersdoorn district of the North West Province.

In seeking to achieve this aim, the study pursues five specific objectives. Firstly, to review the South African land reform program with a view to examine its historical background, objectives, and the approach and success indicators. Secondly, to review international experiences with regard to the alleviation of rural poverty through land reforms, with a view to seeking lessons that South Africa can draw from them. Thirdly, to conduct a focused assessment of the effects of land reforms on the economic well being of a specific beneficiary community, namely, the Uitkyk community. The fourth objective is to relate the experience of the Uitkyk community to the experiences of the broader land reform beneficiary community of South Africa. Finally, to provide recommendations for the better use of land reform as a vehicle for rural economic development in South Africa.

1.4 The research questions

This research seeks to address a number of questions. Firstly, it examines international evidence around the relationship between land reforms and rural poverty. It further explores the objectives of the South African land reform programme, with particular regards to the alleviation of rural poverty. Focusing on the Uitkyk community as a case in point, the study investigates the root causes of inequality in land ownership, the process of restitution, and finally, the beneficiaries' perceptions of the success of the land reform programme. The answers to the above questions will highlight the current state of effectiveness of the South African land reform programme and provide pointers to the future.
1.5 **Significance of the study**

This study deals with an issue that is both topical and immediately relevant to South Africa's economic and social development. It relates to the macroeconomic issues of equity and stability. The land reform process is as old as the new political order in South Africa. Thirteen years on, it is imperative to examine how far down the road the process is, and to what extent the overarching objective of poverty reduction has been achieved. The outcomes will liven up the debate towards the future of property rights in South Africa and the economic transformation of a population, which is still largely rural and poor.

1.6 **Limitations of the study**

Generally, any study which seeks to explore issues of national economic relevance should have a national spread in its coverage. However, financial and time constraints have a bearing on the design and implementation of this research. This will in turn influence the generalisations that can be made from the research outcomes. For instance, an availability sample is used for the purpose of data collection. This limitation is, however, mitigated by structured interviews with targeted agents of the land reform process, which seek to compare the experiences of the focus community to other communities in the country.

The time perspective also presents another limitation. It is a popular view that such large socio-economic reform programmes as the land reform programme require a long lifespan before their impact can be reasonably assessed. While this study is important to keep the eye on the ball, it may be too soon to make a conclusive rating of the success of the South African land reform programme.

1.7 **Review of the South African land reform process**

1.7.1 **Introduction**

Land reform refers to the redistribution of property or rights in land for the benefit of the landless, tenants or farm labourers (Adams n.d.:1). In South Africa, the land reform programme was contemplated even before the historic 1994 elections. The interim constitution Act 200 of 1993 made provision for the development of specific legislative and institutional instruments to drive the much needed land reform programme.
The restitution of land rights Act 22 of 1994 defined the three pillars of the land reform programme, namely, land redistribution, restitution and tenure reforms. Land redistribution aims to provide access to land to the historically disadvantaged. It targets both the urban and rural poor. The focus is to moderate the 87:13 percent land ownership ratio between white and black South Africans as was the case until 1994 (Gwanya 2003:2). Land restitution focuses on the restoration of land rights to people or communities that were disposed of such rights after 19th June 1913 (DLA 2003: 1). The third leg of land reform is land tenure reform, which focuses on present land policy with a view to improve tenure security for all South Africans.

This research focuses on the land restitution component of the land reform programme, which is arguably the biggest of the three pillars in terms of its reach to the targeted beneficiaries of land reforms. Other themes explored in this section include food security and rural poverty.

1.7.2 The restitution of land rights in South Africa

The Department of Land Affairs estimates that over 3,5 million people were victims of racially based dispossessions of land rights during the years of colonialism and apartheid (DLA 2003:1). This institutionalised process of dispossession was enforced through various instruments and processes including the infamous Black Land Act 27 of 1913, the Development Trust and Land Act 18 of 1936, the Group Areas Act 41 of 1950, and the Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act 52 of 1951. These acts were enforced by various means, amongst them the removals from mission stations and the so-called black spot removals to which the community under study, the Uitkyk community fell victim.

The major role players in the restitution process include the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (CRLR), the Department of Land Affairs (DLA), and the Land Claims Court (LCC). Other stakeholders include the beneficiaries who may be individuals or groups and several Nongovernmental Organisations (NGOs), which play a variety of intermediary and advocacy roles. The CRLR remains the principal agency responsible for the implementation of the restitution process. The national commission is supported by seven regional commissions, some of which combine two provinces in their coverage.
The Restitution of Land Rights Act provides for several forms of restitution including the restoration of land from which the claimants were originally dispossessed, the provision of alternative land, the payment of compensation, priority access to state resources, such as housing and development programmes, or any combination of the above (DLA 2003:4). The restoration of dispossessed land is often the preferred solution as it is deemed to ensure more stability and sustainability in terms of both the intended economic and social outcomes of restitution.

The restitution process is composed of six phases, namely, lodgment and registration of claims, screening and categorisation, determination of qualification in terms of Section 2 of the Restitution Act, negotiations, settlement and finally the implementation of the settlement. This involves the effective transfer of land, grants or financial compensation and post award support (DLA 2004:1). The exact nature and extent of the post award support is not clearly defined.

The focus of restitution has been more on claims in rural areas. According to the DLA the rationale for this is two pronged. Firstly, poverty is more concentrated in rural areas and the poverty alleviation effects of restitution are therefore more likely to be better realised in these areas. Secondly, most rural claims are community based, therefore serving more people than urban claims which are mostly individual claims. The statistics indicate that by 2003, 80 percent of all claims processed were to the benefit of 300 000 urban beneficiaries, while 20 percent of claims which were for rural claimants benefited 3,6 million people (DLA 2003:7).

The approach to the restitution process has shifted over the years from a more judicial to an administrative one. The idea was to expedite the restitution process, given the often protracted and laborious processes through the land claims courts (DLA 2003:6). Hence, more authority was handed to a decentralised land claims commission to finalise claims and to the Minister of Land Affairs to make recommended awards. On the recommendations of the 2005 land summit, there is a growing momentum for a further shift to a more interventionist approach by the government to further fast track land restitution (RSA 2005:1-2). The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) identifies legally secure land ownership as the key to sustainable rural development (IFAD 2001:1). IFAD contends that without secure property rights, farmers lack the incentive to invest in land management.
1.7.3 Rural poverty

According to May (1998:3), poverty refers to the inability of individuals, households or communities to afford a socially acceptable standard of living. Poor South Africans themselves characterise the elements of poverty to include alienation from the community, food insecurity, unemployment, and fragmented families (May 1998:3). Rural poverty is a daily reality for millions of rural dwellers around the world that live with intense unfulfilled needs for the basic necessities of life, including food, clothing and shelter. Intense rural poverty is believed to have exacerbated social crises during the apartheid era (Microsoft 2002).

According to Gittinger (1982:413), income distribution and poverty issues must be the primary focus when planning development programs aimed at benefiting rural people. Poverty generally erodes self-esteem and can be a major cause of social instability. Income inequality inhibits economic development and makes the alleviation of rural poverty more difficult. Dagdeviren and van der Hoeven (2001:2) reject the hypothesis that a redistribution strategy need necessarily undermine poverty reduction in the long-run by reducing per capita growth. The emerging consensus is that an initial condition of greater asset and income equity enhances growth rates.

The Gini coefficient can be used to measure income inequality from a range of 0 for perfect equality to 1 for perfect inequality. May (1998:4) asserts that in 1998 South Africa had a Gini coefficient of 0.58, one of the highest in the world and second only to Brazil. Her analysis further indicated that in South Africa, the poorest 40 percent of households, equivalent to 50 percent of the population, received only 11 percent of the national income. On the contrary, the wealthiest 10 percent of households, or 7 percent of the population, earned over 40 percent of the national income. A considerable disparity between rural/urban African households was also reported, with a Gini coefficient of 0.54, very close to the national value. The indication in the current economic dispensation in South Africa appears to be that income inequality is no longer so much along racial lines as it is between rural and urban dwellers.
1.7.4 Food security

Section 27 of the constitution of South Africa affirms the right of every citizen to food security (RSA 1996). In a landmark publication of the Department of Agriculture (DoA) entitled Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS) for South Africa, food security is defined as the attainment of physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food by all persons at all times to meet their dietary and food preferences for an active and healthy life (DoA 2002:15). The global goal of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) is to eradicate hunger, malnutrition and food insecurity by 2015 (DoA 2002:13). In principle, the government of South Africa fully subscribes to this position.

One of the cardinal features of the land reform in South Africa is the food-safety-net project, a component of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development. This aims at assisting participants who wish to access land for crop and/or livestock production in order to improve household food security (DoA 2001:2). In terms of national aggregates, South Africa is food secure (Statssa, 2002:17). It appears though that the real challenge is the distribution of food. According to the Department of Agriculture, food security challenges in urban areas are fundamentally different from the challenges in the rural areas (DoA 2001:4). In urban areas, the challenge is to enhance the economic capacity of poor households to access to food. In the rural areas, the challenge is based around access to agricultural land and resources to sustain meaningful production.

The Department of Agriculture recognises five principal costs of food insecurity (DoA 2002:17). These include disproportionately high health and medical costs, low labour productivity and high funeral expenses. Other recognised costs include social costs including policing, criminal and justice expenses, and finally, low investment confidence. It is therefore in the national interest of real and sustainable economic development that food security becomes a reality for every household.

1.8 Research methodology

This section provides the layout of the research design, sampling method, method of data collection and data analysis.
1.8.1 Research design

A combined qualitative and empirical approach was adopted for the purpose of this research. From the qualitative perspective, several secondary data sources were explored to review international experiences around land reform and poverty alleviation. The focus is placed on four countries, namely, Brazil, China, Zimbabwe and South Africa. The other three countries were selected mainly on the basis of perceived similarities in terms of level or stage of economic development. In the case of Zimbabwe, the major attraction was the many areas of historical and cultural comparability.

The empirical perspective was implemented mainly through a case study, focused on the Uitkyk community, a land reform beneficiary community in the North West Province of South Africa. Primary data was collected and analysed as described in the sections that follow.

1.8.2 Sampling method

An effective sampling method is required to explore a small number of items or parts of a larger population as a basis to make conclusions about a larger population (Zikmund 2003:369).

In choosing an appropriate sampling method, a balance was sought between maintaining the integrity and validity of the outcomes and the constraints faced by the researcher. Two significant constraints influenced the choice of sampling method. Firstly, the population under survey, namely, the Uitkyk community is very widely dispersed. Hence, it would be too costly to reach out to respondents that would have been earmarked using a systematic sampling technique for example. Secondly, the lack of access to telecommunication facilities meant that even telephonic interviews would have little chances of success.

Accordingly, the availability sampling technique was adopted in this study. Opportunities provided by monthly meetings of the Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA) were used to contact the respondents for the purpose of data collection.
1.8.3 Data collection

Four main sources of data were exploited for the purpose of this study. These included questionnaires, structured interviews, published literature and unpublished material.

The questionnaire was designed as the major instrument for collecting primary data. It was structured to take the respondents through their expectations as applicants for land grants, their perceptions of reality as beneficiaries and reflections of the past and future of land reforms. The questionnaire tests respondents’ perceptions of the main drivers of the land reform process and indicators of success thereof.

For the purpose of collecting input from land reform agents and administrators, a structured interview schedule was developed, mostly parallel to the questionnaire administered to the beneficiaries. The objective was to seek alternative views, vis-à-vis the views of the primary respondents, namely, the land reform beneficiaries.

Secondary data was also obtained from a wide range of both published and unpublished materials. Unpublished sources included minutes of meetings, reports and communiqués issued by the various stakeholders such as the UCPA, and the Department of Land Affairs.

1.8.4 Data analysis

The capturing and preliminary analysis of data was completed through the Statistics Consultancy Services (Statcon) of the University of Johannesburg. Simple measures such as percentages, mean and standard deviation are used to derive empirical meaning from the data. The resulting findings are then interpreted to espouse the link between the data and the specific question(s) under examination. The findings are further presented graphically to enhance clarity.

1.8.5 Deployment of study

This dissertation is made up of five chapters, arranged in a logical sequence that allows the reader to trace an initial road map, through the complexities and intricacies of the issues at
stake, to the crystallisation of the notable outcomes and recommendations. Below is a synopsis of the five chapters.

Chapter 1 provides a general introduction and orientation to the study. It defines the problem statement, states the aim and objectives of the research and raises the questions which the study seeks to answer. The chapter further affirms the significance of the study, the observed limitations of the study and an outline of the research methodology employed. A brief review of the South African land reform programme is also presented as a prelude to the themes that are addressed in the study.

Chapter 2 undertakes a comprehensive review of international experiences in land reforms and poverty alleviation. The chapter adopts a comparative approach to examine experiences in four countries, namely, Brazil, China, South Africa and Zimbabwe. A consistent approach is adopted throughout each country review. First, a historical perspective of the land question and the factors that led to inequalities in land ownership and rights are reviewed. Then, the approaches to dealing with the problem are examined and finally the outcomes, as indicated by factors such as changes in household income, employment, nutrition and food security and social stability are analysed.

Chapter 3 offers a case study focusing on the historical perspective of the land question in the Uitkyk community. This chapter opens with the origins of the Uitkyk community. Then, the landmark 1927 land dispute between the Wesleyan Methodist church and the Bakwena tribe, being the dominant component of the native Uitkyk community is chronicled. Next, this chapter examines events around the 1967 forced removals of the Uitkyk people which dealt the final blow to any rights to land ownership of the Uitkyk people. Finally, the community’s struggle for restitution of land rights after 1994 is examined.

Chapter 4 presents the findings, analysis and discussions arising from the various empirical and qualitative data sources employed. There is a generous use of tables and graphs to ensure improved readability and comprehension of the contents. The analysis is structured to flow according to the issues raised in the questionnaire, being the primary tool of data collection.
Chapter 5 summarises the major findings of the previous chapters, especially chapters 2, 3 and 4. It also presents the findings of the study as a whole. On the basis of these findings, certain conclusions are drawn and recommendations proffered towards enhancing the capacity of land reform in South Africa as a means of alleviating rural poverty.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL EXPERIENCES IN LAND REFORMS AND POVERTY ALLEVIATION

2.1 Introduction

South Africa and Brazil are ranked first and second respectively in terms of inequality in land ownership (Bryant 1998:2). Bryant (1998:1) asserts that land reform is a major part of asset redistribution, which must be at the origin of efforts to address rural poverty, which is in turn, at the root of urban poverty.

This chapter reviews existing literature on land reforms in various countries. Two broad approaches to land reforms are prevalent, namely, market-based land reforms and government-assisted land reforms. Accordingly, experiences on either sides of the debate have been considered. These include Brazil as an example of a mainly market-based reform and China and Zimbabwe as examples of mainly government-assisted land reform programmes. In the review, attention is also given to two, often conflicting paradigms to land reforms, namely, the neo-classical paradigm which advocates efficiency and productivity as principal objectives versus the structuralist paradigm which advocates equity and social justice (Bryant 1998:2).

For each country under review, the origin of the need for land reform has been traced. This is followed by the goals and objectives set out to be achieved through land reforms. Next, the peculiar policy approach adopted by the country in the implementation of land reform and the indicators of success or failure are examined. Constraints in relation to poverty alleviation are also reviewed. Finally, lessons that may benefit South Africa are drawn from the experiences of the countries reviewed.
2.2 Brazil

2.2.1 Historical background to the land question in Brazil.

Groppo (1996:1-6) provides a comprehensive chronology of events which resulted in the initial settlement and land use patterns in modern day Brazil, the emergence of the land question and efforts of successive governments at redressing the land question. In this writing, Groppo indicates that early settlers in Brazil originated mainly from Europe and Asia, with the most intense phase being between 1887 and 1934. The early settlement patterns and land use closely followed development patterns of specific produce export booms. For instance, the large influx of European immigrants during 1822-1930 was designed to meet manpower needs of coffee plantations and to create small farm properties through settlements (Groppo 1996:1). Groppo concludes that the result of this early process of land occupation was the emergence of feudalistic land patterns, with powerful land owners who actively opposed the development of any family farming patterns. The period 1930 to 1954 was marked by the institutionalisation of the Brazilian settlement process. Following two previous institutions, the National Immigration and Settlement Institute (INIC) was created in 1954 as a technical agency under the Ministry of Agriculture, to execute settlement activities. However, by 1960 the pressure for agrarian reform became unbearable and in 1962 the INIC was replaced by an Agrarian Policy Authority (SUPRA) (Groppo 1996:2). Other major groups that emerged with agrarian reform as a core agenda included the peasant leagues and the National Confederation of Agricultural Workers of Brazil (CONTAG), created in 1963. Tensions between the pressure groups for agrarian reforms and the non-compromising land owners was sited as a major reason for the intervention of the military when they seized power in October 1964 (Groppo 1996:2).

In Brazil, land has traditionally not only been a factor of production, but a reward for service and proximity to power (Pereira 2003:2). Pereira further argues that this power includes the ability of large land owners to direct the legal and coercive apparatus of the state and control over peasant populations. In Brazil, an increase in land redistribution represents a major economic and political reform. Institutional regulation of land ownership dates back to 1850 when Brazil's land law was promulgated (Viotti 2000:3). Viotti contends that this law brought
an end to previous rights to land through occupancy. According to the 1850 land law, land is primarily a public property and can only be acquired through purchase (Viotti 2000:3).

According to Pereira (2003:3), the government of President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1995-2002) marked a significant era of change in Brazil’s land reforms history. Pereira (2003:3) argues here that before the Cardoso regime, land policies of previous governments only promoted the emergence of large, highly capitalised commercial farms. In an earlier publication, Pereira (1997:8) attributed this trend, which he described as conservative modernisation, to government policies of subsidised credit for large producers, tax breaks, price supports and several other incentives. Leite (1999:173) estimates that in the 1970s alone, about 31.8 million hectares of previously public land was transferred to private ownership by purchase or government grants. Both Pereira (1997) and Leite (1999) agree that this growing trend of land concentration only led to rural-urban migration, as sharecroppers, tenants and small farmers lost access to land and jobs. A potential for social unrest was recognised and the military regime’s response was to roll out rural social assistance programs, such as pension and health grants. According to Margolis (2002:6), a protest march by 3000 squatters on April 17th 1996 in Para, eastern Amazonia resulted in the shooting and killing by the police of 19 peasants. This marked an important milestone in the struggle for land reforms in Brazil and is seen as the centerpiece of Cardoso’s new rural democracy. Margolis further contends that similar protests to date by groups such as the Landless Workers Movement (MST) continue to create social tensions which keep land reform as a topical issue on Government agenda in Brazil.

2.2.2 Goals and approaches to land reform in Brazil.

The overarching goal of land reform in Brazil has been to transform the peasants and landless into modern family farmers and full socioeconomic citizens (Groppo 1996:3; Margolis 2002:7). This goal remains consistent with the objectives set in the first National Plan of Agrarian Reform (NPAR) which run between 1985 and 1989 and is deemed to mark the origin of modern land reform in Brazil (Groppo 1996:4). Smith (2002) corroborates this view in stating that the main aim of land reform is to change the structure of rural property rights in order to improve the living standards of the agrarian poor, who still constitute a substantial part of the population in Brazil. Smith (2002) further contends that complementary objectives
in this regard include arresting environmental degradation, slowing rural-urban migration and creating an agrarian political base for the incumbent authorities. The broad goal is to reassert the public and social character of land ownership, against the absolute dominion given to private property ownership by the 1850 land law (Pereira 2003:3). However, Groppo (1996:5) cautions that land reform objectives must not disrupt an efficient national agro-industry based on large scale commercial farming. Under President Cardoso, the state’s priority was to stimulate and maintain a modern agricultural sector, while using land reform, mainly as a welfare programme to provide some relief to a strife-torn countryside (Pereira 2003:5).

In pursuit of the above-mentioned goals, various approaches have been adopted and specific objectives set at different stages of land reform processes in Brazil. One of the earliest government interventions in addressing land reform in Brazil was the National Plan of Agrarian Reform, which was inaugurated in 1985. Borras (n.d.) notes that the target of this plan was to settle or resettle 1.4 million families across Brazil between 1985 and 1989. The outcomes of this initiative are reviewed in section 2.2.3 below. More recently, a major vehicle for land reform adopted by the government of Brazil is the World Bank-supported Brazil Land Reform and Poverty Alleviation Pilot Project (Roumani and Coirolo 2005:1). This is a community-led, market-based approach to land reform in which associations of landless or labourers with insufficient land for subsistence obtain financing to secure land from willing sellers. This project was first piloted in 1996 and 1997 and later rolled out in five states of Northeast Brazil between 1998 and 2001. From 2001 to date, the project has been expanded across 14 states under the Land-Based Poverty Alleviation Project I (Credito Fundario). Overall, the project targeted to benefit 50 000 families by 2006. The main objective of this program since inception has been poverty reduction with two specific objectives. The first objective is to increase the incomes of 15000 poor rural families through improved access to land and participation in complementary, demand-driven community sub-projects. The second objective is to raise the agricultural output of lands included in the project and to pilot a community-based approach to reform (Roumani and Coirolo 2005:7). The outcomes of these initiatives are also reviewed in section 2.2.3.

In November 2003 the government of President Lula da Silva set the goal of redistributing land to 400 000 families during its 4 year term between 2003 and 2006 (Osava 2005). In May 2004 the same government undertook to step up the expropriation of what it termed
unproductive land. The legitimacy of expropriation, according to Osava (2005) is based on the 1975 constitution, which allows for the expropriation of rural property that fails to live up to the social function of producing a minimum level of goods and jobs. Borras (n.d.) estimates that such unproductive land constitutes about 44 percent of Brazil's arable land.

2.2.3 Outcomes of land reform in Brazil

The National Plan of Agrarian Reform, which was implemented by the National Institute for Rural Settlement and Agrarian Reform (INCRA), only achieved 6 percent of its own targets in terms of settled families (Borras n.d.). By the third year of implementation, the government of President Lula da Silva had managed to provide land to only 24,000 families (Osava 2005). Again, this represents a mere 6 percent success rate on the targeted 400,000 families planned for settlement. However, government sources claim greater success in land reform programmes. For instance, Pereira (2003:7) notes that according to government sources, the President Cardoso's government settled 585,683 families in 7 years. Pereira (2003:7) insists that this figure does not only exceed Cardoso's own 1994 electoral promises, but also surpasses the combined number of settled families during the last three presidential regimes in Brazil.

Just like the objectives, the Credito Fundario project had more measured outcomes. Roumani and Coirolo (2005) report that after a three-year grace period, agricultural productivity and cash flows from the project were good enough to allow loan repayment. Other positive outcomes included general increase in household income of beneficiaries of about 180 percent, greater employment creation as an average of 3.9 family members were directly employed on the farm, and an overall improvement in living conditions of beneficiary families. Veiga (2003) asserts that no other public investment of a comparable magnitude resulted in so many new opportunities for income generation and redistribution of assets.

However, not all authors accept that land reforms under President Cardoso were very successful. Margolis (2002:2) posits that for most Brazilian peasants, securing a plot of land was at best, only a mixed blessing. It is recorded that at least one in every four beneficiaries quit their plots within two years and in some areas, as much as half the settlers quit (Margolis 2002:2). The reasons for such widespread failures according to Margolis (2002:3) are mainly
due to a lack of infrastructure in the Brazilian countryside, such as poor transportation, no running water and widespread diseases without access to medical care. Margolis (2002) argues that where settlers were organised into cooperatives, greater success was achieved.

Land reform continues to be at the centre of the political, social and economic debate in Brazil. Protests by land reform activists against the current government abound (Lopez & Valdes 2000:2; Osava 2003:1). International agencies continue to intervene to either provide corrections for the weaknesses of previous reform initiatives or augment them. For example, in September 2005 the World Bank granted the Brazilian state of Minas Gerais a US$35 million loan to fund the Minas Gerais Rural Poverty Reduction Project (World Bank 2006:1).

2.3 China

2.3.1 Historical background of land reform in China

The history of land reform in China dates back to 1949 and is recognised as one of the earliest in modern times (Beehner 2005). The period 1955 to 1980 was marked mainly by agricultural collectivisation through the people's communes. This saw a sharp decline in agricultural productivity compared to the period from 1949 to 1955, when the land belonged to the peasants (Mei 1988). Kroeber (2004:1) identifies two main phases in China's contemporary land reforms, namely, from 1979 to 1989 and from 1990 to about 2002. Constitutional amendments in 2004 were widely expected to entrench the sacred nature of private property ownership, and therefore, lead China into a third phase of its land reforms (Kroeber 2004:2). The first phase of reform was mainly characterised by the breaking up of Maoist collective farms and the granting of 15-year rights to farmers on individual plots of land. A main feature of this era was the family farm system (Mei 1988). Although ultimate land ownership here still belonged to the collective, the proceeds of farming were shared among the state, the community and the immediate peasant family. The second phase according to Kroeber (2004:2) was politically motivated in favour of urban elites to support manufacturing and exports. Mei (1998:3) blames this regression in agricultural development on the government's drive at the time. This was to ensure the continued supply of cheap food in support of growing industrialisation and urbanisation. Although the 15-year terms were replaced by longer 30-year ones in the 1990s, the fact that village leaders could adjust land
rights resulted in greater tenure insecurity with the attendant consequence of a low motivation for long-term investment in the land (Kroeber 2004:2).

However, Cheng, Wang and Davis (1999:4) portray a different chronology of phases in China’s land reform which dates back to 1949. The first phase was a revolutionary approach in the early 1950s, which expropriated land from landlords for redistribution to landless peasants. The second wave was characterised by collectivisation of individual farms resulting in the formation of communes with centrally controlled property rights, in the mid-1950s. The third phase, which emerged in the 1970s, was marked by the family-based contract system or the household responsibility system.

Since the mid-1980s, there have been on-going debates about new approaches to land reform in China. The result of such debates is four distinctive models of land reforms which have been piloted in different counties across China. This is outlined by Cheng, Wang and Davis (1999) to include, firstly, the two-land system which was originated in Pingdu city in 1984, secondly, the fixed responsibility farmland within a contract term which was initiated in Meitan County in 1987. The third model is represented by the collective farms which were very successful in the Shunyi County around the mid-1990s. Finally, the farm shareholding cooperative system, also a collective model, was piloted in the Pearl River Delta area of Guangdong Province in 1992.

With the turn of the millennium, the new challenge to land reform in China is how to continue to secure the land use rights for rural farmers in the face of ever increasing demand for land for industrialisation and urbanisation (MacNamara 2005:4; Clouse 2006:2; Chan 1999:1). A booming property market founded on a land use rights system, modeled after the Hong Kong leasehold system, is luring local officials and business developers to appropriate land without adequate compensation (Clouse 2006:1; MacNamara 2005:4). This, in conjunction with the widening rural-urban income gap is blamed for widespread protests in China, especially since 2005 (Clouse 2006:2). Therefore, the land question in China remains an on-going political, social and economic debate.
2.3.2 Goals and approaches to land reform in China

According to Beehner (2005:3), land reform in China has often taken a populist approach. That is, large land holdings that resulted mainly from the infamous collectivisations in the 1950s are broken down and redistributed to landless peasants (Beehner 2005:3). China's land reform has focused mainly on land use rights (Chen, Wang & Davis 1999:6). This is the legacy of the Communist party, which rewrote the constitution soon after it came to power in 1949, vesting all property rights in public ownership (Chan 1999:4; Kynge 2002:5). To date, ownership of virtually all rural land rests with village collectives who may contract the land use rights to individual households for up to 30 years (Keliang and Prosterman 2006:1).

A major weakness of the land use rights system as opposed to outright private property ownership was the resulting insecurity as households could not protect their leaseholds from unscrupulous property developers and corrupt local officials (Liu and Ansfield 2006:2). The 2002 Rural Land Contracting Law was designed to enhance security of rural leaseholds by putting an end to the reallocation and readjusting of land boundaries with changes in rural household demographics. Further, the law allows leaseholders to take legal action to protect their leases. Liu and Ansfield (2006:2) indicate that although an increasing number of leaseholders are able to transfer land use rights through private sales contracts, many of such deals can still be reversed by corrupt officials.

The various phases of land reforms in China and land reform projects adopted in various counties across China had specific goals as elaborated by Chen, Wang and Davis (1999:4). The radical reforms of the 1950s had the goal of giving the land to those who tilled it. The second wave of land reform in the mid-1950s sought to create the people's communes through collectivisation, a move which hindsight now indicates only resulted in poor performance. The third wave, widely known as the household responsibility system, used a family-based contract system. It is deemed to be the most widely implemented and successful land reform initiative in China ever (see also Mei 1988:3).

The following is a synopsis of the approaches and goals of the four experimental approaches to contemporary land reform in China, as presented by Chen, Sang and Davis (1999:5). In the Meitan project, farmers were granted inheritance rights on the land, the right to exchange land
with one another, to sub-rent, to pool land and to use land as a mortgage for credit. The local authorities encouraged surplus family labour to find work outside agriculture. In the Pingdu (two-land system) reform, the total arable land in the village was divided into two parts, namely, food land meant for family consumption and contract land for commercial farming. The purpose of food land is for subsistence and the land was distributed equitably according to household size. The basis for allocation of contract land was efficiency. Farmers bid for the land although even the bid prices were regulated to prevent excessive competition and a limit of between 0.33 and 1 hectare per labour unit was imposed to encourage larger scale operation and prevent over fragmentation. The contract period was five years. During the fixed-term contract period, if a household grew in numbers, the village reduced its contract land area and increased its food land area, so that family subsistence did not suffer.

The Shunyi project sought to reconsolidate farm land through collective farms. The most important local factor which made this an attractive option was the high level of rural industrialisation. This provided good opportunities for distribution and profitable sale of produce. Being an enterprise of the village, the collective farm could benefit from profits from non-agricultural enterprises in the village. The Nanhai shareholding cooperative system is a more innovative approach, precipitated mainly by the need to revive declining agricultural production in the face of growing rural industrialisation (Chen, Sang and Davis 1999:5). Under this system, households gave up their land use rights and in return were awarded shares, represented through paper entitlements. Through the village, the land use rights were ultimately ceded to an expert agricultural company which worked the land and paid dividends to the peasants.

2.3.3 Outcomes of land reform in China

Although China's decollectivisation process initially resulted in increased productivity, continued land fragmentation ultimately resulted in such plot sizes that are too small to sustain any economies of scale and only exacerbate land degradation (Beehner 2005:3; Kynge 2002:2).

Despite the existence of the 1998 Land Management Law (LML) and other legal instruments that seek to regulate land use rights, the reality in China is that the policy of the Chinese
Communist Party (CCP) and the associated political patronage still reigns over the rule of law (Bledsoe and Prosterman 2000:6). Hence, the beneficiaries of fixed term land use rights often have no recourse when faced with unwarranted readjustments or even dispossession (Bledsoe and Prosterman 2000:7).

The three waves of land reforms in China as highlighted by Chen, Wang and Davis (1999:4) all had varied results. The first and revolutionary reform, which redistributed land from affluent landlords to landless peasants, created a layer of private small holders. These beneficiaries, for the first time, realised their dreams of owning their own land. The second wave of collectivisation more than anything else only curbed the individual farmer’s operational freedom and enthusiasm for production. The third wave is evidently the most successful. During this phase, the national production of grain, China’s most important farm product category reached an all time high of 407 million tones. Output of cotton and oil-bearing crops all rose by at least 100 percent (Chen, Wang and Davis 1999:6). However, the benefits of the family responsibility system were gradually eroded in the mid-1990s. This is attributed to the fact that family plots became repeatedly fragmented to accommodate changing family demographics (Cheng, Wang & Davis 1999:6). By 1993, average individual plot size was as little as 0.08ha, described by Beehner (2005:4) as “noodle-strip” farms. Such over-fragmentation and continuous adjustment of existing land use rights resulted in several inefficiencies including the lack of incentives to invest in conservation and agricultural infrastructure, the overexploitation of the soil in pursuit of short-term results, and increasing cost of the redistribution process itself (Cheng, Wang and Davis 1999:6).

In terms of the four experimental approaches to land reforms implemented across different areas of China, different outcomes were achieved. The fixed responsibility farmland approach adopted at Meitan had some notable outcomes (Cheng, Wang & Davis 1999:4-7). Firstly, it was widely accepted by most local farmers. Secondly, farmers were better motivated to invest in the land and to conserve it. Thirdly, land fragmentation was brought under control. The two-land system saw greater land consolidation, more household specialisation in the gender distribution of farming activities and increased grain yield per unit of land. In the Shunyi collective farm initiative, grain output per worker reportedly grew eightfold during the same period and employees of collective farms earned higher incomes than part-time workers who took up non-agricultural employment. In the Nanhai collective farm model, the following
benefits were observed, namely, villagers earned dividends from their land shares, while also earning off-farm income. Moreover, large scale farming became possible as small land parcels could be merged into bigger and more expertly managed units. Accordingly, cultivated area per labour unit rose about tenfold. In conclusion, Chen, Wang and Davis (1999:7) concede that while each of the experimental approaches has their benefits, they are yet to be tested nationally, to see their suitability on that scale. A distinctive factor that emerges from the above discussions is that while the collective forms of land use rights tend to provide greater land use efficiencies, the more individual household forms of land use rights tend to enhance individual drive to invest in and conserve the land.

2.4 Zimbabwe

2.4.1 Historical background to land reform in Zimbabwe.

Land reform generally denotes efforts to correct historical imbalances in land use or land ownership, and Zimbabwe is no exception to this premise. Lebert (n.d.:40-56) provides a comprehensive chronology of events that resulted in a small minority of the white settler population owning and controlling the majority of prime arable land in Zimbabwe. The focus here is, however, on efforts towards undoing this historical wrong.

Land reform initiatives in Zimbabwe date back to pre-independence days. Land reform in post independence Zimbabwe constituted a major component of deliberations leading to the Lancaster House Agreement of 1979. This created the framework for an independent, democratic Zimbabwe (Lebert n.d.:44). In this original conception, Zimbabwe’s land reform was to be modeled after the Kenyan experience in which the government constituted a fund through which land would be bought from present owners for redistribution. Under this agreement, the United Kingdom would underwrite half of the cost of resettlement, while the post independence Zimbabwean government would foot the other half (Lebert n.d.:45). This was based on a willing-buyer/willing-seller mechanism. The only variation was that the state could expropriate land for public and resettlement purposes. In this case, compensation must be paid in foreign currency (Lebert n.d.:45). In response to its obligations for funding as laid down in the Lancaster agreement, Britain showed greater bias in favour of land in areas less...
favourable to rain-fed agriculture as such land was more available for sale and at cheaper prices (Potts and Mtuambirwa 1997:3).

Two main phases of land reform in post-independence Zimbabwe are widely recognised (Lebert n.d.:45; Robilliard, Sukume, Yanoma and Löfgren 2001:1). These are the state-centered market-based land reform between 1980 and 1996, and the compulsory state-led land acquisition, which begun in 1996 and is still in force. The year 1990 marked an important turning point in that the Lancaster house conditions expired. Hence, the government of Zimbabwe seized the opportunity to review the land reform program (Potts and Mtuambirwa 1997:3). A major feature of the second phase, is the fast track mechanism adopted from 2000, which more than anything raised significant political clouds around Zimbabwean land reform debates (ICG 2004:75). A discussion of the goals, approach and outcomes of the various initiatives follows in the next section.

2.4.2 Goals and approaches to land reform in Zimbabwe

According to Kinsey (1999:1), the objectives of land reform in Zimbabwe were largely political and placed great emphasis on welfare and poverty alleviation. In its original formulation, the land reform began in 1980 and had six specific objectives (Kinsey 1999:3). Firstly, to alleviate population pressures in the communal areas, secondly, to extend and improve the base for productive agriculture in the peasant farming sector, thirdly, to improve the level of living of the largest and poorest sector of the population. The fourth objective was to provide opportunities for the landless and unemployed, fifthly, to bring under-utilised land into full production, and finally, to improve and expand the infrastructure for economic development, to achieve national stability and progress.

The state-centered market-based land reform was implemented through one of four models (Lebert n.d.:46; Kinsey 1999:2). The first, which was code-named model A was characterised by intensive settlements on individual family basis. The second, model B was made up of village settlements with cooperative farming. The third, model C composed of state farms with out-growers and the fourth or model D was characterised by commercial grazing for communal areas. Model A was the predominant approach to land reform and was used to facilitate over 80 percent of (re)settlement (Lebert n.d.:47). In this model, each beneficiary-
family received between 10 and 65 hectares of cropping land and up to 65 hectares of grazing land. Beneficiaries' rights to the land were limited to renewable yearly leases and they were not allowed to sell the land (Potts and Mutambirwa 1997:3). According to Potts and Mutambirwa (1997:2), model A schemes were very regulated in terms of land use in favour of commercial production as against subsistence farming. For example, these regulations in terms of choice and scale of land use were perceived by beneficiaries and community observers as interference by the government (Potts and Mutambirwa 1997:8).

Model B was implemented via cooperative schemes which took over existing large commercial farms. The cooperatives were responsible for sourcing credit and income was allocated to individual families or for farm development. Model C sought to resettle beneficiaries around a core estate managed by a professional farm manager. Beneficiaries received individual parcels from the estate for crop production and were given access to communal grazing land. Model D was geared mainly towards livestock farming and sought to give communal livestock farmers access to commercial ranches to fatten their animals. This, it was thought, would reduce the need for grazing on communal land. As indicated above, only model A was widely implemented on a sustained basis.

According to Richardson (2006:3), there was common agreement among various interested parties including the Zimbabwean government, the British government, the United Nations, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) by the late 1990s, that land reforms were required in Zimbabwe. The stated goals were to increase agricultural productivity and to increase the wealth of the black majority. The big question was how to achieve land and income redistribution without compromising the efficiency of commercial agriculture, Zimbabwe's major foreign exchange earner (Richardson 2006:9). Much against the expectations of the IMF that Zimbabwe's land reforms would proceed fairly and legally (Richardson 2006:3), from about 1996, the government started taking a more radical stance towards compulsory land acquisition (Lebert n.d.:42; Robilliard et. al. 2001:2). Both sources attribute this new reaction to government's perception that purely market-based willing-buyer/willing-seller mechanisms did not do enough to give the majority of Zimbabweans adequate and appropriate access to land. In its original design, full-market compensation would still be paid even when the land was compulsorily acquired (ICG 2004). Between 1993 and 1997 a growing number of farms
were redistributed through this mechanism. Some farms earmarked for redistribution were delisted following legal appeals (Lebert n.d.:49).

Land reform in Zimbabwe took a dramatic turn following a largely politically motivated constitutional amendment in April 2000. This allows the government to expropriate land while passing on the responsibility for compensation to Zimbabwe’s former colonial master, the United Kingdom (ICG 2004:76). This ushered in yet another approach in Zimbabwean land reform, namely, the fast track (ICG 2004:77). Some writers (Johwa 2004:3; ICG 2004:77) believe that the fast track programme was motivated more by political self preservation rather than sound economic or social imperatives. Richardson (2006:2) attributes Zimbabwe’s current economic collapse to the damage done to property rights as a consequence of the fast track land reform programme. This dissertation rather focuses on the modus operandi of fast track and the outcomes thereof. According to the International Crisis Group report (ICG 2004:9), the government of Zimbabwe adopted two models for distributing confiscated land, namely, model A1 for small scale farmers from communal areas and model A2 for indigenous commercial farmers. Average farm sizes were earmarked at 25 hectares and 100 hectares for model A1 and A2 schemes respectively. Neither the criteria for selection of beneficiaries nor plans for post-settlements support were put in place (ICG 2004:11). The outcomes of the above mechanisms are reviewed in paragraph 2.4.3 below.

2.4.3 Outcomes of land reforms in Zimbabwe

This section provides a review of the outcomes of the three major waves of land reform in Zimbabwe, namely, the state-centered market-based land reform of 1980 to 1996, the compulsory state-led land acquisition, which begun in 1996 and later metamorphosed into the now well known fast track mechanism.

Potts and Mutambirwa (1997:1) and Kinsey (1999:2) assert that contrary to the widespread myth in political circles that beneficiaries of land reform in Zimbabwe were undeserving and unproductive farmers, concrete evidence suggests that the first wave of land reform in Zimbabwe produced some very good results. For example, Kinsey (1999:3) further notes that an internal value-for-money study conducted by the Zimbabwean government in 1993 showed that Model A and Model C schemes significantly improved the lives of beneficiary
families. Kinsey (1999:6) notes that 90 percent of beneficiary household owned on average ten cattle each, and had improved access to facilities including potable water, dip-tanks, clinics, schools, improved toilets, housing loans, roads and marketing ports. In comparison to the average communal area households, Kinsey (1999:13) concludes that after a lag, Zimbabwe's resettlement programme yielded both higher incomes and more equally distributed incomes up to 1996. A major weakness of the resettlement programmes according to Kinsey (1999:14) was that despite the observed improvements in incomes and income distribution, child nutrition in resettled homes remained poor.

With respect to the number of families to be resettled, the initial targets set in 1980 were very modest and easily met. Subsequent targets, however, proved more difficult to attain as a number of constraints crept into the reform programmes. The chief constraints according to Kinsey (1999:5) included the lack of funds to pay for land acquisition, the prime importance of agriculture to the Zimbabwean economy, pressure from multilateral organisations to protect commercial farming and government corruption.

The outcomes of the post-1996 land reform in Zimbabwe are in stark contrast to the above. An International Crisis Group report (ICG 2004:13) noted that the recipients of the A1 scheme could barely grow enough food for their own subsistence, never mind contribute to surpluses. This, according to the report is largely due to the lack of investments on the farms, as the state failed to assure inputs such as credit, implements and marketing support. Richardson (2006:7-9) blames the failure of the fast track mechanism on three major reasons. Firstly, the lack of secure tenures as beneficiaries had to lease their land from the government on a yearly basis. Secondly, most beneficiaries were government officials and not poor peasant who were the originally intended beneficiaries. Thirdly, most beneficiaries had little knowledge of farming. The effect on commercial farming was even more dramatic. In the first year of fast track alone, maize production fell by 50 percent (ICG 2004:86). Lebert (n.d.:49), however, justifies the shift towards the more radical compulsory land acquisition mechanism as a response to the failure and weaknesses of the market mechanism.
Summary of major findings and lessons for South Africa

On the evidence of the foregoing review, a number of salient points emerge. Across all three countries reviewed, the question of land reform is at least as old as the nation state itself and yet there is clearly no definite solution in sight. The underlying historical factors which created the imbalance in land use and ownership were distinctly different for the four countries reviewed. In Brazil, the biggest factor was the divergent economic classes between the affluent commercial farmers and the peasants. In China, it was more the question of private versus communal land ownership. Both Zimbabwe and South Africa shared a similar causal factor, namely, racial segregation. Two broad objectives of land reform have been identified, namely, efficiency and productivity which form the basis of the neo-classical approach or equity and social justice. The countries reviewed have shown different preferences in their pursuit of the above objectives. For example, Brazil and China showed bias in favour of the efficiency and productivity, while South Africa and Zimbabwe tended to emphasise equity and social justice.

Different approaches have been adopted at different time periods and across different localities to deal with this endemic question. Various degrees of successes and/or failures have also been reported. The approaches adopted have varied according to the political economy of the country in question. A key distinguishing factor in this regard is the prevailing system of property rights and ownership. In all three countries under review, there is consistent confirmation that wherever more secure land tenure systems exist, more positive outcomes have been recorded. This is true whether tenure security is ensured through reasonably long land use rights or better still, through outright ownership. This positive relationship between tenure security and improved welfare of beneficiaries has been attributed to the incentive to invest in the land and conserve it for more sustainable benefits. Within each country reviewed, different approaches have also resulted in different outcomes depending on the prevailing social and economic peculiarities of the local community in question. Across all three countries reviewed, an inextricable relationship is observed between land reforms and politics. Where the political will has been strong and in favour of addressing the needs of the rural poor, greater success has been achieved in this regard.
In Brazil, the credito fundario, a community-led and market-based approach implemented under the government of President Cardoso was spread across 14 states and is widely believed to have had a positive impact on bettering the lives of the rural poor. Improvements were noted in the areas of productivity, better cash flows, increased household incomes and employment. The project was even more successful where beneficiaries formed cooperatives. However, it is recorded that as many as 50 percent of initial beneficiaries quit the land reform programme prematurely. This is blamed on the lack of infrastructure required to sustain development such as sanitation, healthcare and transportation facilities.

In China, land tenure is limited to land use rights and not ownership. The policies of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the influence of local authorities and more recently, influential property developers, tend to eclipse any legal infrastructure supporting land reforms. Generally, where more land use rights have been given to individual peasant households, there has been greater success than when they belonged to the communes. On a national scale, the household responsibility system has thus far been the most successful. This family-based contract system provided incentives for the family to grow the cake and by so doing, their share of it. However, the household responsibility system later imploded, due to over-fragmentation of the plots to accommodate changing family demographics. Tenure security was badly affected by influential local authorities who adjusted land boundaries willy-nilly thanks to their political patronage. The Shunyi project, a collective farm and one of the contemporary land reform experiments was successful, mainly due to the existence of a viable produce market and thanks to rural industrialisation. The Meitan project, also an experimental approach, encouraged excess labour to be freed up for non-farming employment, thus supplementing income from the farm. This could have been the solution to the problem of over fragmentation with the otherwise highly successful household responsibility system. In general, while the co-operative and collective farms tended to offer greater land use efficiencies where they were well managed, the household units offered more drive to invest in and conserve the land.

Zimbabwe provides both evidence of a wave of land reform that succeeded in addressing the needs of the rural poor and a more recent one that is widely blamed not only for the demise of a viable agricultural industry, but of a national economy as a whole. Model A and model C schemes of the first wave of land reforms between 1980 and 1996 were found to be
successful in improving the lives of the beneficiaries. Zimbabwe land reform started facing severe implementation problems when the government ran out of the funds to pay for the land. Changing political imperatives are believed to have led the government of Zimbabwe to rush onto the fast track programme, which has been cited as the underlying cause of Zimbabwe's economic woes.

From the foregoing review and summary, a number of positive lessons and some warning flags emerge for South Africa. Firstly, for land reform to be successful, it must be backed by both the political will and the relevant economic resources. Political will goes beyond the need to create an agrarian political base as in Brazil or using the agrarian poor as a tool for self-preservation in office as in Zimbabwe. Economic resources include, but are not limited to substantial funding on a sustained basis in order to tilt what is often a very steep economic divide. The World Bank Projects in North Eastern Brazil typified the positive effects that such a commitment could have.

A second lesson is that worldwide, inequality in land ownership results in social unrest. Indeed, it is clear that the struggle for more balance in land ownership cannot simply be wished away. Thirdly, governments have used land reform to influence either political or macroeconomic objectives. For instance in China, the government exploited the more vulnerable poor to support its quest for more industrialisation. In Zimbabwe and Brazil, the landless have often been abused as political puns. The Zimbabwe fast track programme is a good example of the failure of an ill-conceived, politically motivated programme. In South Africa, the focus of land reform appears to be on achieving income redistribution. Fourthly, wherever tenure security is low, there has been little incentive to invest in and conserve the land. This has also exposed the poor to exploitation by unscrupulous industrialists and politicians. China and Zimbabwe typified this scenario, where the policies of the China Communist Party (CCP) and the Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) respectively overrode the law and politicians did as they pleased.

A fifth and positive lesson comes out of China. That is, project-based land reform, tailored to local conditions and needs can be very successful. The Meitan, Pingdu, Shunyi and Nanhai projects were all divergent in their approaches, but just as successful in addressing set
objectives. Hence in South Africa, care must be taken to avoid offering blanket solutions to different land reform needs of different communities.
CHAPTER 3

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF THE LAND QUESTION IN THE UITKYK COMMUNITY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the major historical developments in the course of the long quest for land access and ownership by the Uitkyk community. Owing to the dearth of published information on this important yet little known struggle, there has been heavy reliance on three main sources. These include interviews with elderly Uitkyk community members, the records of a 1927 supreme court of South Africa case and the seminal work of Samantha Hargreaves under the auspices of The Rural Action Committee (TRAC).

In constructing the narrative, attention is first given to the creation of the Uitkyk community, which is mainly the outcome of the convergence of different tribes as their paths crossed in their search for survival. Secondly, focus is shifted to the 1927 land dispute between the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society and the Bakwena tribe, being one of the major constituent tribes of the Uitkyk community. This case represents a major milestone in the history of the Uitkyk community. Next, light is shed on events leading up to the 1967 forced removal of the Uitkyk community, a final stroke which could have easily led to the demise of a people. Thirdly, an account is given of the struggle of the Uitkyk community to reclaim their land rights following the rebirth of South Africa in 1994.

3.2 The origin of Uitkyk – a multatribal community

The exact number of tribes that constitute the Uitkyk community of the Venterdorp district in the North West province of South Africa is unknown. According to records of the Supreme Court of South Africa (SCSA), the Bakwena stands out as the leading component tribe with regard to the drive for land ownership and leadership of the traditional Uitkyk community (SCSA 1927:15-16). The other tribes, according to different testimonies in the topical 1927 SCSA case include the Bafokeng, the Malakouto, the Maefuti, the Moghele, the Bechuna, the Bakatle, the Mamatoe, the Bapoede, the Baralong and the Cape coloured people (SCSA 1927:7,17,29,45).
The Bakwenas are believed to have migrated from Taba ‘Nchu about 1877 (Hargreaves 1998:35; SCSA 1927:7). They travelled over the Vaal River to settle briefly at Devon Kraal in the Klerksdorp district before proceeding to Potchefstroom. This was a community of about 300 people under the leadership of Chief Petrus Malefo. Having previously suffered expulsion from their homeland in the hands of the Matabele, the Bakwenas upon arrival in Potchefstroom were determined to buy and own land of their own at the earliest opportunity (SCSA 1927:8). Thus, soon after arriving in Potchefstroom, Chief Petrus Malefo approached the local leadership of the Wesleyan Methodist church for assistance in acquiring land of their own. In the 1870s the natives could not own land in their own rights (SCSA 1927:15,101). Land allocated for use by natives was registered in the name of the superintendent of Native Affairs in trust for the natives. In order to purchase land that was not designated by the colonial administrators for the natives, it had to be acquired and registered in the name of the more privileged, mainly European settlers. This is how the Bakwena ended up buying farm Uitkyk in 1878 from Mrs. Johanna Wolhuter nee Elliot, in the name of Timothy Creswell, a Pastor of the Wesleyan Methodist Church (SCSA 1927:15,100).

The Malakoutos are believed to have lived in the Uitkyk farm area before the arrival of the Bakwenas who joined forces with the former to purchase the farm (Hargreaves 1998:36). All the other tribes as mentioned above contributed to the purchase of farm Uitkyk and submitted to the leadership of the Bakwena Chief Petrus Malefo (SCSA 1927: 17). From 1878 to the early 1920s the Uitkyk community lived on the farm Uitkyk as a self-sustaining traditional society, though with strong allegiance to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society. On the evidence of the 1927 case, each community member was tasked with a contribution of £6,00 towards the purchase of the farm and an annual levy of £1,00 towards registration of the deed of purchase and for farm improvements. Improvements reportedly included 3 dams, a school with teacher’s house the church building and several permanent and semi-permanent houses (SCSA 1927:31). The Chief had authority over the entire community, but reported to the church authorities especially on issues regarding community development.
3.3 The 1927 land dispute

In 1927, a case was brought before the Transvaal Provincial division of the supreme court of South Africa. The plaintiff in this matter was the Bakwena tribe and the defendant, the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society (WMMS). The question before the court was the ownership rights of Uitkyk farm. This case represents the struggle by a native community for recognition of their land ownership rights in an era and environment where all forces, including the government, the church and the court appeared to collude against them (Hargreaves 1998:36-37).

The leading witness for the plaintiff was Chief Malea Malefo, who succeeded his late father Petrus Malefo as Chief of the Bakwenas and leader of the Uitkyk community upon his death in 1886 (SCSA 1927:12). Other witnesses for the plaintiff included Johannes Nakedi, Moses Nakedi, Josiah Malosi, Andrew David Elliot (son of the last owner and seller of Uitkyk farm, Johanna Elliot). Leading witnesses for the defendant included Martinus Wessels (who had worked in the Pretoria deeds office since 1910) and the Reverend John W. Allcock, the then incumbent President of the WMCS for Transvaal and Swaziland.

The Uitkyk farm, the ownership of which was being contested, was registered in the name of Timothy Creswell, who was then Minister in the WMCS. On the evidence of the witnesses for the plaintiff and supported by Hargreaves (1998:36), the natives were not allowed to own land outside areas designated as native reserves. Under pressure for land to survive, communities such as Uitkyk resorted to buying land through a white proxy, in this case, the Reverend Creswell. Even the Reverend John Allcock in his evidence stated that the Uitkyk community could only have been the people who paid for the purchase of the farm as Mr. Creswell was not in the financial position to do so (SCSA 1927:106). Another interesting witness for the plaintiff was Mr. Andrew David Elliot, son of Mrs Johanna Elliot, the alleged seller of farm Uitkyk. In his evidence, he testified that as far as he understood it, the farm was bought by the Bakwena natives in the name of Timothy Creswell. Further, he believed that his mother could have colluded with Reverend Creswell to enter the purchase price in the deed of sale as £1450 when in deed it was £800 (SCSA 1927:87). In line with the prevailing circumstances, the Uitkyk community moved to buy another farm, namely Montrose in 1906 to accommodate
an expanding community. It was to be registered in the name of yet another white male proxy, Mr. Marthinus Goertz (SCSA 1927:24). It is not clear whether this was achieved.

The church on finding this out, were not happy that Reverend Creswell had connived to buy land on behalf of the natives. This, it is believed, led to his transfer from Uitkyk (SCSA 1927:19). The Uitkyk community, however, felt betrayed that Reverend Creswell refused to leave behind both the deed of sale and the title deed on this departure from Uitkyk (SCSA 1927:19). Until the Anglo-Boer war broke up around the turn of the 19th century, the Uitkyk community lived in relative peace, under the leadership of Chief Malea Malefo and in communion with the Wesleyan church (Hargreaves 1998:37). During these years, the community built three dams, a school with a teacher’s house, the church building, and several other homes (SCSA 1927:31). They also paid the teachers’ salaries (SCSA 1927:25). After the war, Reverend Bottrill, demanded that the natives would each require a pass to live on the farm (see annexure F2 in SCSA 1927). This was objected to by the community, although some natives resorted to taking the passes (SCSA 1927:47). Major trouble started when the Reverend Amos Burnet arrived at the farm Uitkyk and raised the annual rent from £1,00 to £2,00. The natives perceived this as unnecessary control over their rights as owners of the farm and refused to comply with the demand. In 1917 the Reverend Burnet unsuccessfully attempted to depose the Chief, Malea Malefo for not complying with his demands (Hargreaves 1998:39; SCSA 1927:36). The Wesleyan church leaders continued to systematically exploit the ignorance and naivety of the Uitkyk native community. See for example, a 1926 letter of demand from Reverend J.W. Allcock to Chief Malea Malefo in annexure “B” of SCSA (1927:235). In this letter, Reverend Allcock issues a veil threat that the Uitkyk community stood to lose the farm to an unnamed Johannesburg-based company if the natives did not pay their “rents” on time.

The decision to take the matter to court is believed to have been precipitated by the discovery of diamonds on the farm. According to Chief Malefo, the community was approached to sell the farm for mineral exploration (SCSA 1927:31). Reluctant to sell their land, they demanded five farms in exchange for farm Uitkyk. However, the Wesleyan Church was pressing to sell exploration rights to some mining company and the community decided to approach the court pleading that they be declared the rightful owners of the land. The court ruled against the Uitkyk community (Hargreaves 1998:37). This outcome marked yet another major turning
point in the history of Uitkyk. According to Phiri (2007), following the loss of the court case, Chief Malefo, accompanied by a part of the population departed Uitkyk in search for a new home. The once again displaced people of Uitkyk settled temporarily in Watershoek before moving on to Tse-tse (also known as Doornkop) in the Ventersdorp district. Phiri (2007) attests that it is here that Chief Malea died. However, the remains of the chief were returned and buried at Uitkyk.

The rest of the Uitkyk community that stayed on the farm after the verdict of the 1927 land dispute did so under the complete control and command of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. Their fate is outlined in the paragraphs that follow hereunder.

3.4 The 1967 forced removals

In the words of the chairperson of the Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA), Mr. Abraham Phiri, the segment of the Uitkyk community that remained on the farm after the 1927 case did so "under the cloak of the Methodist church". Thus, the church "rewarded" those who abided by its rules and punished those who did not. Anyone who dared question the ownership rights of the church over farm Uitkyk was immediately removed from the farm (Phiri 2007). Surrendering to the will of the state and the church, the Uitkyk community lived a relatively normal life until the mid-1950s, when it started becoming apparent that the uneasy relationship between the Uitkyk community and the Methodist church would last.

Hargreaves (1998:38) records that in 1955 the community was warned that they would be moved to Mooiordorpie in 1967. In 1959, the Boitchoko secondary school was closed down without warning (Van Wyk and Phiri 2007). This was followed by the closure of the primary school in 1966. According to both men, this marked the dousing of the only flame of hope for the future of the Uitkyk community. Mr Abram Phiri, who is currently the chairperson of the Uitkyk Community Property Association, was among the last batch of learners in the high school and an eye witness to the closure of the school.

Referring to the fateful day the school was shut down, Phiri recounts..."Everybody cried but no one would listen to our wailing. We wrote our names and placed the sheet of paper in a bottle and sealed it. It was buried in the soil, but I can't trace the exact spot now. I always
believed that we would one day return to this place and it is a wonderful feeling that I have seen that dream come true.”

The final blow was struck on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of January 1967. In military evacuation style, the Uitkyk community was forcefully removed from Uitkyk. According to Phiri (2007), it was about 9 pm and the community was preparing to go to sleep when military trucks rolled into Uitkyk. Speaking through loudspeakers, they were given about 30 minutes to pack their belongings and move out of their dwellings. In no particular order, people, furniture, kitchen utensils were flung into the back of the trucks amidst wailing from women and children. As a result, the Uitkyk community was forcefully removed and scattered to various directions as shown in Figure 2.1 below.

\textbf{Figure 2.1} \textit{The dispersal of the Uitkyk community after the 1967 forced removals}
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It appears that even after this forced removal, a small portion of the Uitkyk community remained on the farm after 1967. The apartheid government in the meantime, continued to fine-tune its act. In 1978, using the Group Areas Act as the legal instrument, the last vestiges of the Uitkyk community was forcefully removed to Ramatlabama (Hargreaves 1998:39). Ramatlabama is also called New Tse-tse.

It is believed that the church colluded with the state to ensure, or at least did nothing to prevent, the forced removal of the Uitkyk people from the farm Uitkyk (Hargreaves 1998:39). In fact, the church benefited immediately from the expulsion of the natives. The Methodist church split and auctioned off portions of the land, and kept the rest for itself (Hargreaves 1998:39). According to Hargreaves (1998:39), it is unclear whether either the church or the state compensated the natives for the loss of their land and property. It is difficult to even contemplate compensation here, when it was clear that the people would not give up their land for anything, having suffered so much deprivation in the past regarding land ownership.

The marginalisation and eventual forced removal of the community was by no means unique to the Uitkyk community or limited to rural communities. For example, Mears (2007: 7, 8) chronicles the demise of Sophiatown, a well established African suburb of Johannesburg in 1955. In this case, 60000 people were forcibly removed from a fully matured community to shacks and shanties in the western periphery of Johannesburg.

3.5 The struggle for restitution

The quest for the restitution of the Uitkyk farm to the Uitkyk community began on the heels of the 1994 elections that ushered in the new political era in South Africa. The Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA) remains the major driving force behind this struggle. Accordingly, the account recorded herein is based on records and minutes of the UCPA meetings and interviews with executive committee members and other elders of the UCPA.

Efforts to constitute a forum to serve as the vehicle for the reconstruction of the Uitkyk community began in 1995. This was encouraged by the promulgation of the Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994, one of the first pieces of legislation developed by the newfound democratic government. In 1995 the Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA) was
formed thanks to guidance and workshops offered by The Rural Action Committee (TRAC). This was in anticipation of the Community Property Associations Act 28 of 1996, which was then already set up for public debate (Van Wyk 2007). Under the auspices of the 350 member UCPA, the first land claim was lodged in 1995. In August 1995 the claim was accepted as a legitimate claim and published in the government gazette. Besides the government through the Departments of Land Affairs and Agriculture, and the claimant community, the University of Potchefstroom played a facilitating role in the process and assisted in evaluation of the land for the purpose of compensation. The first land grant to the Uitkyk community was awarded on December 13th 2003, marking the start of a new beginning. This comprised of 2 out of a total of 18 portions being claimed for restitution (Van Wyk 2007).

Over the years, several claims have been lodged and acknowledged for processing by the Land Claims Commission (LCC) for a total of 18 portions, totaling about 5500 acres. According to the minutes of the UCPA 2006 annual general assemble, to date, only about 761 acres has been handed over, at a cost of R2,7 million to the state (UCPA 2006:5). Claims over several other land portions are being processed and the Uitkyk community remains hopeful that all their land will one day be returned to them. With the current drive to expedite land redistribution through expropriation following the recommendations of the 2005 land summit, this dream may be realised sooner than later.

In the meantime, the Uitkyk community is currently geographically dispersed. They continue to grapple with the means of translating the land they have acquired into a better communal and individual life. The Uitkyk community currently meets at the farm once every month to discuss community issues. According to the UCPA president Abraham Phiri (2007), these meetings are essential to keep the momentum for restitution and restoration alive. However, some members of the community find this burdensome, especially because they have to travel over 200 kilometers to attend the meetings. Some speakers at the February 2007 meeting expressed their frustration at spending much money and time to attend meetings even though no real progress was being made. The task of translating the reclaimed land and the yet to be reclaimed land into better lives for the community is significant. Chapter four shows that this process is fraught with many challenges.
3.6 Summary of findings and conclusions

The story of the Uitkyk community, to date, stretches over 130 years of a continuous quest for the right to land ownership. This includes at least four forced migrations, 761 acres of reclaimed land and a community of about 350 people scattered across South Africa seeking to restore their heritage. Theirs was a stable community under an established traditional authority, reduced to a loose association of members who only share vague memories of lost glories and a common dream for restoration.

Having previously been driven out of their previous homes at Taba ‘Nchu, the Uitkyk people arrived at Potchefstroom, hopeful that with the help of the Wesleyan church, they would finally own a place of their own. As it emerges, the church initially assisted the community in obtaining land, much against the provisions of the colonial administration. The role of the church in securing an opportunity for the Uitkyk community to lead a normal life during an otherwise abnormal social and political life in South Africa is commendable. However, the church itself fell to the trappings for making wealth out of the land with the discovery of diamonds on the farm. The church subsequently engaged the community in a 1927 Supreme Court case, to claim ownership of the farm Uitkyk. The court ruled in favour of the church. This was despite the fact that evidence before it as recorded in the official court proceedings suggested that the ruling could have been in favour of the Uitkyk community. This was a time when the church served as a vehicle for the state to oppress a helpless native community. Following the court case, the church partitioned and auctioned off some portions of the land that it did not require and held the rest for itself. The church, which is normally expected to be the voice of the voiceless, could have done more for the people but did not.

Following the 1994 elections, the Uitkyk people found opportunities to begin the quest for restitution of their lost land and restoration of their native community. The Uitkyk Community Property Association was founded in 1995 and has been the driving force behind their struggle for restitution. However, 4 years since the first two portions of land were returned to the community, not much has happened to bring back the people to their much sought land.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSIONS ON THE ROLE OF LAND REFORMS IN THE ALLEVIATION OF POVERTY AMONG THE UITKYK COMMUNITY

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings derived from the analysis of data obtained from the questionnaires. An integrated analysis of the findings is conducted. It also discusses the emerging outcomes within the context of the Uitkyk community and evidence from other experiences both locally and internationally to support the arguments. The chapter unfolds along the lines of the questions that were posed to respondents through the questionnaires and or interviews that were used as instruments of collecting primary data.

Section 4.2 examines the characteristics of the Uitkyk population, namely age, gender, marital status, occupational and family unit size distribution. The influences of demographic characteristics on the approach to development are also explored.

Section 4.3 analyses the expectations of the Uitkyk community as at the time when they entered the struggle for land restitution. An appreciation of these expectations is important in understanding the respondents' perceptions of the subsequent impact of the restitution process.

Section 4.4 focuses on the community's perceptions of the realisations of their dreams for land restitution as a means to a better quality of life. This section seeks to ascertain the extent to which the Uitkyk community members believe their expectations from land ownership and use have been fulfilled.

Section 4.5 examines the community's perception of the role of the government in solving their land ownership and the consequent development question. No distinction is made among the different tiers of government or agents thereof.
Section 4.6 assesses the Uitkyk community's understanding of the role of credit availability and usage in transforming land ownership into economic wellbeing. Particular emphasis is given to perceived drivers of improved access to credit.

Next, Section 4.7 evaluates the big question, namely, the respondents overall perception of the extent to which access to land has improved their economic wellbeing. A broad definition of poverty alleviation is implied as no specific measures of economic wellbeing are indicated.

Section 4.8 tests the future worth that the Uitkyk community attaches to the ownership of their restored land. This section seeks to assess the perceived social benefit of land ownership to the community under study.

Section 4.9 condenses the perceptions and views of other individuals, mainly outside the Uitkyk community, and who either as agents of government or non-governmental organisations are involved in the land reform process in South Africa. The primary objective is to compare or contrast these views with those of the primary respondents, namely, members of the Uitkyk community.

A five-point scale based on the Likert scale (Zikmund 2003:312) was used in collecting data for most of the questions posed in this survey. In the analysis which follows, the responses have been grouped into three categories, namely, the top two, the middle one and the bottom two. The middle responses usually indicate apathy or lack of knowledge of the question being posed (Markinor 2007). A comparison between the top two and the bottom two frequencies generally give an indication of the bias of the respondents.

4.2 Demography of the Uitkyk community

The demography of any population refers to structural characteristics of that population such as size, gender, age and religious distribution. For the purpose of this study, four demographic characteristics were examined for the Uitkyk community namely age, gender, marital status and household size. The observed results are presented below:
4.2.1 Age distribution

Out of a total of 41, 35 respondents indicated the age category to which they belong, representing a valid response rate of 85.4 percent. Three age categories were used namely 20 to 35; 36 to 55 and over 55. Table 4.1 below summarises the findings regarding the age distribution of the population sample.

Table 4.1. Age distribution of the population sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.1</th>
<th>In which age category are you?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>20 to 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 to 55</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Nearly 70 percent of the sample is over 55 years old. While this may not necessarily represent the entire Uitkyk community, it certainly represents the segment of the community which is actively involved in driving the community’s initiatives towards achieving true restitution. Such a mature population may be very useful in maintaining a historical knowledge base, which is necessary to pursue the correction of what is mainly a historical anomaly. However, it may not augur well when rapid change is required to launch a community on the path of economic development. After 55, people are more likely to be set in their ways. On the converse, the active involvement of the more youthful segment of the population is more likely to bring in more energy and fresh perspectives to bear on the restitution and ultimately, economic restoration process.
4.2.2 Gender distribution

Table 4.2. Gender distribution among the Uitkyk community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.2</th>
<th>What gender are you?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Table 4.2 shows an even distribution between males and females in the population sample. This may initially indicate that there is no basis to discriminate on the basis of gender in contemplating development initiatives for the Uitkyk community. However, the effective participation of women, or the lack thereof within the decision-making structures of the Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA), point to a different reality. For example, during an assembly of the UCPA which I was privileged to attend, it was noted that there were only five women, in a fifteen-member executive committee. Given such skewed representation in the executive committee, it is unlikely that adequate sensitivity will be accorded to female-gender related initiatives. The likelihood of lack of gender sensitivity in the management of the UCPA affairs was confirmed in subsequent telephonic interviews with some members of the community (Mokhethi 2007). Non participation of youths in the UCPA was also evident. Follow-up telephonic interviews revealed two main reasons for this. The first is the absence of any programmes or activities that would entice youth participation and secondly, the absence of any encouragement from the parents or older members for youth involvement (Gugulethu 2007). The above-mentioned primary evidence suggests that increased participation of women and youth in the affairs of the UCPA is imperative for balanced development. This is in line with the recognition of the fact that the economic well-being of the entire household in general and the women and children in particular can better be achieved by giving women greater access to economic development (Dolan 2007:2).
4.2.3 Marital status

The economy as a whole and especially, the rural economy revolve around the family unit. Accordingly, the structure of the family is often a pivot around which rural development programmes are planned. Table 4.3 shows the distribution of the population sample in terms of marital status.

Table 4.3. Distribution of Uitkyk community according to marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.3</th>
<th>What is your marital Status?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43,9</td>
<td>46,2</td>
<td>46,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>53,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,1</td>
<td>17,9</td>
<td>71,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26,8</td>
<td>28,2</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95,1</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

A response rate of 95 percent was obtained for this question. The majority, constituting about 46 percent of the sample were married. About 18 percent of the sample is widowed. This can easily be related to the age distribution of the sample as indicated in section 4.2.1 above, with nearly 70 percent of the sample being over 55 years old. A salient feature of the sample with regard to marital status though, is that there is a strong tendency towards the traditional family units. This may be an important consideration when planning development initiatives for the Uitkyk or similar communities.

4.2.4 Size of household

The household is generally considered as the functional unit of the economy (Mohr, Fourie and associates 2004:48). The following table shows the distribution in terms of size of the household for the sample under survey.
Table 4.4. Distribution of Uitkyk community by size of household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.6</th>
<th>Number of people (excluding yourself) living with you in your household</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14,6</td>
<td>21,4</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td>28,6</td>
<td>57,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>10,7</td>
<td>67,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>14,3</td>
<td>82,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>89,3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>96,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68,3</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

A relatively lower response rate of 68 percent was observed for this question. A further analysis of the above results provides the following statistics:

Table 4.5. Descriptive statistics of distribution of Uitkyk community by household size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.6 How many people (excluding yourself) live with you in your household?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4,75</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Table 4.5 shows that the size of the average household in the Uitkyk community, including the respondent, is nearly 6 persons.
4.3 Expectations of claimants

Table 4.6. Intended land uses and occupational status of beneficiaries prior to receiving the land grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3.2.6... Which of the following did you intend doing with the land when you applied for a land grant/claim..?</th>
<th>Not Marked</th>
<th>Marked</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Crop Farming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Livestock Farming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Build a home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Question 3.2.7... Before you received your own land, what was your occupation..? |
|---------------------------------------------|------------|--------|-------|
| 1 - Farming as a tenant                    | 32         | 9      | 41    |
| 2 - Farming as farm labourer               | 37         | 4      | 41    |
| 3 - Farming as a sharecropper              | 35         | 6      | 41    |
| 4 - Other                                   | 15         | 26     | 41    |

Source: Survey data, March 2007

In order to ascertain the occupational status of the beneficiaries prior to being granted land through the land reform programme and their initial land use plans once the land was received, two questions were put to the respondents. The questions and the corresponding results are shown in Table 4.6.

As indicated in Table 4.6, both questions had a 100 percent response rate, indicating that all respondents were fully aware of their situations regarding the questions posed. Table 4.6 shows that about 83 percent of the population sample wanted the land for the purpose of building their own homes. Moreover, 83 percent needed the land for crop farming. An even greater proportion, namely 85 percent wanted the land to be engaged in livestock farming. However, no distinction was made between subsistence and commercial farming in both regards.
With respect to occupational distribution, Table 4.6 shows that 22 percent of the sample worked as farm tenants, 9.8 percent as paid farm labourers and 14.6 percent worked the land as sharecroppers. This statistics indicate the extent of an agricultural knowledge base within the Uitkyk community. This will be important in establishing a baseline for agricultural training needs assessment, as a tool for advancing the lot of the community.

About 63 percent of the respondents indicated that they had other occupations. However, only 4 of them, representing 15 percent in this category specified what other occupation they were involved in. This suggests that the majority of the sample were either unemployed or hopped between piece jobs. Either way, the data indicate that unemployment was rife among the community. This probably explains why the respondents looked up to the land reform programme to provide opportunities for housing and occupations in agriculture. The above information is illustrated in Figure 4.1 below.

**Figure 4.1. Occupational distribution of Uitkyk community before 2003**

![Figure 4.1](image)

Source: Table 4.6

### 4.4 Realisations of beneficiaries

The respondents' perceptions of the extent to which their expectations of the land reform programme have been realised are examined in this section. The same set of parameters
tested in terms of their initial expectations is used. This includes building a home, crop and/or livestock farming. This question was also extended to include leasing the land and non-agricultural land use options. The response rate for this question category varied widely, ranging from 44 percent (for building a home) to 83 percent (for crop farming). The findings are shown below in Table 4.7 and illustrated graphically in Figure 4.2.

Table 4.7. Indications of success according to land use within the Uitkyk community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.1... How successful have you been in using the land that you received in the following ways..?</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Neither successful nor unsuccessful</th>
<th>Fairly unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Crop farming</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Livestock farming</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Built a home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Leasing out the land</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Other Use</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007.

Figure 4.2 Perceptions of success according to land use

Source: Table 4.7
Two land use options easily stand out as successful, namely, crop farming and leasing out the land. Accordingly, about 62 percent of the respondents believed that the community has been successful in terms of crop farming and about 59 percent believe that leasing out the land has brought real benefits to the community. The evidence on the ground confirms these results as the community was growing maize on a section of the land and another section was being farmed by a tenant farmer for an annual fee. Except for a few free range chickens that were seen roaming the grounds of the old Uitkyk School, there was no evidence of livestock farming or new physical infrastructure on the Uitkyk farm. The following photographs were taken during a visit to the Uitkyk farm in February 2007.

The majority of the respondents were either negative or did not respond with regards to livestock farming or building a home. This suggests that there has been little success in these regards, if any.

**Figure 4.3.** Executive members of the Uitkyk Community Property Association (UCPA) confer during a General Assembly in February 2007.

Source: Photograph by Peter Ayuk, February 2007.
The perceived impact of the use of reclaimed land on their economic wellbeing was also tested. Five indicators of economic and or social wellbeing were used in this regard, namely, income growth, employment creation, food security, access to credit and a sense of belonging and pride. The results are shown in Table 4.8 below.

A relatively low response rate was obtained for this question category, ranging from 49 percent for access to credit, to 78 percent for sense of pride. This may indicate some degree of apathy towards the question or a lack of clear appreciation of the effect under consideration. However, for those that responded, between 63 percent believe that the land reform programme has not resulted in increased income from farming. In the same vein, 86 percent believe that the land reform programme has not resulted in increased employment opportunities.
Table 4.8  Indicators of economic and social success of land ownership and use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.2... To what extent has the land that you received helped you in the following ways.?</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Vary large extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Increased your income from farm activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 43,3%</td>
<td>% 20,0%</td>
<td>% 13,3%</td>
<td>% 13,3%</td>
<td>% 10,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Increased your income from non-farm activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 64,0%</td>
<td>% 4,0%</td>
<td>% 20,0%</td>
<td>% 8,0%</td>
<td>% 4,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Created jobs for members of your household</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 63,6%</td>
<td>% 22,7%</td>
<td>% 9,1%</td>
<td>% 4,5%</td>
<td>% 22,7%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Been able to provide food for the people in your household</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 68,2%</td>
<td>% 13,6%</td>
<td>% 4,5%</td>
<td>% 9,1%</td>
<td>% 4,5%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Helped you get access to credit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 75,0%</td>
<td>% 10,0%</td>
<td>% 10,0%</td>
<td>% 5,0%</td>
<td>% 10,0%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Made you feel proud as a member of your community</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 40,6%</td>
<td>% 12,5%</td>
<td>% 12,5%</td>
<td>% 3,1%</td>
<td>% 31,3%</td>
<td>100,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007.

In terms of the sense of pride and belonging to the community, a relatively higher 34 percent believe that the land reform programme has been successful. Although in absolute terms 54 percent of the sample believes that even the objective of restoration of a sense of pride and belonging has not been achieved, this still stands out as the most successful factor in comparison to the other factors tested. This sense of pride is more an affective, rather than material benefit and is deemed to be of no immediate value in improving the economic welfare of the beneficiaries. The results are further illustrated in Figure 4.5 below.
Figure 4.5. Indicators of economic and social success of land ownership and use.

Since you received the land, to what extent has it helped you in the following ways?

Q 4.2.1 Increased your income from farm activities

Q 4.2.2 Increased your income from non-farm activities

Q 4.2.3 Created jobs for members of your household

Q 4.2.4 Been able to provide food for the people in your household

Q 4.2.5 Helped you get access to credit

Q 4.2.6 Made you feel proud as a member of your community

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Source: Table 4.8

Figure 4.5 shows that for all except one of the indicators of economic and social success, the response was either negative or no response at all. This indicates that very limited financial or economic success has been achieved by the community through the restitution programme.

To examine factors that drive the economic success of land-use by the beneficiaries, a set of 9 questions were put to the respondents. The factors being tested included soil quality, availability of irrigation facilities, distance to farm and access to credit. Other factors examined included access to agricultural extension services, availability of farming implements, access to produce markets, size of the farm and the beneficiaries’ farming skills.

Table 4.9 shows that an overwhelming 94 percent of the respondents are satisfied with the soil quality of the land they received. This indicates a large potential for agricultural production. However, 5 other factors appeared to negate this potential. These included the long distances between homes and the farm, no access to credit, lack of farm inputs, limited access to produce markets and limited farming skills of beneficiaries.

Source: Table 4.8
Table 4.9. Factors influencing the economic success of land use among the Uitkyk community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.3... How do the following factors affect the benefits you get from your land...?</th>
<th>Very positively</th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>Neither positively nor negatively</th>
<th>Negatively</th>
<th>Very negatively</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - The soil quality of the land allocated to you</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>77,4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16,1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Irrigation facilities available to you</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Distance between the land you received and the place where you live</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Your access to credit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,2%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Your access to extension services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29,6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25,9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Your access to inputs (tractors, implements, seeds etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Your access to crop/livestock market</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15,0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - The size of the land you received</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10,5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - Your farming skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12,0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32,0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

The members of the Uitkyk community still live in diverse locations, some as far as 500 kilometers away from the farm. According to the executive committee of the UCPA, relocation of members onto the farm is imperative to accelerate development on it. The committee, however, believes that the continued presence of non-Uitkyk community members currently settled on the land was a major obstacle in this regard. Dealing with this so-called settler community presents a contentious challenge within to the UCPA. It is a challenge which has the potential to result in a social strife and requires the attention of the government and other interested stakeholders. The simple point is that, the UCPA blames the presence of the settler community for their inability to take occupancy of the farm (UCPA 2007). Hence the community members have to cover long distances to get to the farm. As a consequence, the community currently farms a portion of the land, but this is tended by hired labour and not by...
themselves. The results are graphically illustrated in Figure 4.6 below. It shows that the only two factors which the respondents feel have a positive effect on their land-use are the soil quality and the access to extension services. For all other factors, the negative or no response tends to dominate. This indicates that the other factors such as the size of land received and access to credit do not currently favour the Uitkyk community. It may also mean that the community is simply not aware of the real potential of these factors towards translating their access to land into better economic rewards.

Figure 4.6. Factors influencing the economic success of land-use among the Uitkyk community.

How have the following factors affected the benefits that you get from the land?

- Q 4.3.5 The size of the land you received
- Q 4.3.3 Distance between the land you received and the place where you live
- Q 4.3.7 Your access to extension services
- Q 4.3.1 The soil quality of the land allocated to you
- Q 4.3.6 Your access to inputs (tractors, implements, seeds etc.)
- Q 4.3.2 Irrigation facilities available to you
- Q 4.3.10 Your farming skills
- Q 4.3.4 Your access to credit

Source: Table 4.10

Table 4.9 and figure 4.6 show that the lack of farm inputs such as machinery, implements and seeds as well as the limited access to credit are issues that can be resolved through improved access to financial resources. The question of access to credit is further investigated below. Fair and competitive access to produce markets is also required to translate sellable output into the money that is required for further growth. This certainly is a constraint that will also require further attention. Finally, an improvement of the farming skills of the beneficiaries is deemed to be necessary to improve the benefits they can achieve from the land. Figure 4.10 shows that although 56 percent of the respondents feel that the
agricultural extension services available to them have a positive effect on the benefits they can reap from the land, 48 percent also feel that improvements in their farming skills are required for them to really benefit from the land.

4.5 The role of government in the restoration of the Uitkyk community

Redistribution of assets is often used by governments to seek equity in national economic development. This is very true of land in South Africa, which has been the object of so much inequity in the nation’s colonial and apartheid past. A question was put to the sample of the Uitkyk community to assess their perceptions of government support towards achieving their aims as beneficiaries of land grants. The results are shown in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10. Uitkyk community’s perceptions of government support towards achieving their aims as land reform beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.4 How supportive has the Government been towards you in achieving your aims as a beneficiary?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very supportive</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>11,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>46,3</td>
<td>52,8</td>
<td>63,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17,1</td>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>83,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsupportive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>13,9</td>
<td>97,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unsupportive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87,8</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007.

Table 4.10 shows that 64 percent of the respondents believe that the government was supportive of their quest for a better life through land reforms. This largely positive response appears to contradict the findings shown in Table 4.8. In that table, the respondents indicated that land restitution has not resulted in increased production, employment or income. The only alternative explanation is that government support is simply not enough to translate into improved economic welfare for the beneficiaries. Further informal discussions with members of the Uitkyk community explain their positive perception of government support (Van Wyk
and Phiri 2007). Firstly, they believe that by handing the land back to them, the government had done their part and that it was up to the community to take the process forward. A second reason is that they believe that it is internal bungling within the UCPA that is impeding the full utilisation of various forms of government assistance that is available to the community. For example, about six months after a financial grant had been approved for the renovation of buildings on the farm, the community property association was still caught up in arguments amongst themselves as to the allocation of the contract. Hence the effective management of social conflict is critical to unleashing the full benefits that are or can be available to the Uitkyk community. A further question to examine the perceptions on the potential of different forms of government intervention in improving the economic wellbeing of the beneficiaries yielded the following results.

Table 4.11. The influence of various government interventions on the success of land reforms in the Uitkyk community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.5...</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent will the following forms of government support assist you to improve your farm...?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Provide training in agriculture</td>
<td>4 11,1%</td>
<td>1 2,8%</td>
<td>5 13,9%</td>
<td>11 30,6%</td>
<td>15 41,7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Provide farming machines</td>
<td>5 17,2%</td>
<td>1 3,4%</td>
<td>4 13,8%</td>
<td>5 17,2%</td>
<td>14 48,3%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - Provide irrigation facilities</td>
<td>5 16,1%</td>
<td>1 3,4%</td>
<td>4 12,9%</td>
<td>12 38,4%</td>
<td>10 32,3%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Help me/us to get credit</td>
<td>9 29,0%</td>
<td>5 16,1%</td>
<td>8 25,8%</td>
<td>9 29,0%</td>
<td>31 100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - Build school(s)</td>
<td>9 24,3%</td>
<td>2 5,4%</td>
<td>7 18,9%</td>
<td>19 51,4%</td>
<td>37 100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - Build hospitals(s)</td>
<td>9 25,7%</td>
<td>1 2,9%</td>
<td>5 14,3%</td>
<td>20 57,1%</td>
<td>35 100,0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Help us sell our produce</td>
<td>7 24,1%</td>
<td>1 3,4%</td>
<td>2 6,9%</td>
<td>7 24,1%</td>
<td>12 41,4%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - Give the beneficiaries more chance to take part in making decisions</td>
<td>2 6,1%</td>
<td>2 6,1%</td>
<td>6 18,2%</td>
<td>7 21,2%</td>
<td>16 48,5%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007.

Table 4.12 shows that while the Uitkyk community could do with all of the interventions being examined, five of them were more prominent. This is based on the higher response rates they received that is, 76 percent or more. These factors also received comparatively more affirmative feedback by the respondents. These preferred forms of interventions include
providing agricultural training, building of schools and hospitals, improving access to credit, provision of irrigation facilities and enhancing community participation in making decisions that affect them. The results are graphically represented in Figure 4.7 below.

**Figure 4.7. The influence of various government interventions on the success of land reforms in the Utiky community**

![Bar chart showing the influence of various government interventions on the success of land reforms.](chart.png)

Source: Table 4.11

Table 4.11 and figure 4.7 indicate that 70.3 percent of the respondents believe that the availability of schools would have a positive impact on the effectiveness of the reform process. Also, 72.3 percent feel that the provision of training in agriculture would contribute in the same vane. Tight (2002:29) corroborates this view by affirming that education and formal training are essential ingredients for development. In terms of provision of healthcare, 71.4 percent of the sample believe that the availability of hospitals will accelerate the effectiveness of land reform. Further, 70 percent of the respondents indicate that more community involvement in decision making is necessary for better performance of the reform process. In terms of agricultural infrastructure, 71 percent believe that the provision of irrigation facilities was also necessary to speed up the delivery of the promise by land reform. This need may be based on the vulnerability of rain-fed agriculture. A relatively lower 55 percent of the sample indicates that better access to credit would enhance the effectiveness of land reform. Further
probing of the community members on the use of credit to leverage the development of their farm revealed that they were apprehensive of ending up in a worse situation if they were unable to keep up with loan repayments (Van Wyk and Phiri 2007). Hence the actual need for credit may be stronger than indicated.

4.6 The influence of credit availability

The availability and effective use of credit can be a catalyst for growth. Table 4.9 shows that nearly 64 percent of the respondents believe that a lack of access to credit negatively affected the potential benefits that they derived from the land. However, as indicated in Table 4.11, only 55 percent of the respondents believe that government assistance in securing credit would help improve the value derived from the land. It is not clear whether the outcome would have been different if the source of credit was any other institution besides the government. This further strengthens the perceived inertia of the community towards using debt to finance their own development. Table 4.12 shows the results of further investigations into factors that would enhance the community’s propensity to use credit.

Table 4.12 Factors influencing the propensity to use credit for farm development by the Uitkyk community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4.6...</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent will the following factors encourage you to borrow more money to improve your farm...?</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - If the banks charge lower interest rates</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33,3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - If the banks allow a longer period before start of repayment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22,2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - If the government supports our applications for loans</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20,7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Table 4.12 shows that the average response rate for this question category was 71 percent, indicating that almost 30 percent of the sample would not consider using debt to finance their development.
development no matter the conditions. It also shows that 59 percent of the respondents would use credit if the risk was borne by the government. Only 53 percent would use credit if interest rates were lowered. The apparent lack of interest in considering credit options could be related to two factors. Firstly, a lack of education on the potential benefits from prudent use of debt in funding development. A second possible factor is that the Uitkyk community has fought and lost the battle for land ownership rights so often that they would rather be more cautious in any transactions involving land as a mortgage item.

Figure 4.8. Factors influencing the propensity to use credit for farm development by the Uitkyk community

Source: Table 4.12

Figure 4.8 confirms that more of the respondents would use credit to finance the development of their farm if the risk was carried by the government and not by themselves. Globally, the provision of agricultural credit often requires specialised attention due to the potential impact it can have on national economic questions such as food security, employment and income distribution. This is a matter that requires further attention as South Africa seeks to use land reforms as a tool for national development.
The overarching question of this research is to examine the role of land reforms in the alleviation of rural poverty. It was therefore deemed imperative to put a direct question to the respondents regarding their perception of the influence of the land reform programme in alleviating poverty in their households. The following results were obtained.

Table 4.13. The influence of land reform in the reduction of household poverty among the Uitkyk community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39,0</td>
<td>48,5</td>
<td>48,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a small extent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26,8</td>
<td>33,3</td>
<td>81,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a moderate extent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>93,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a large extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>97,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a very large extent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>3,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80,5</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Table 4.13 shows that an overwhelming feeling that the land reform programme has not done enough to reduce poverty among households in the Uitkyk community. Nearly 82 percent of the respondents believe that the land reform programme has not led to the reduction of household poverty. The significance of this result is that while the Uitkyk community has a positive affective feeling about being beneficiaries of the restitution programme and while the community is fairly satisfied with government support for their plight, very few of these have yet translated into a better quality of life for the people.
4.8 The future of land ownership rights

It was deemed imperative to ascertain whether retaining their recently acquired land ownership status was important irrespective of the benefits attained thus far from the land reform programme. The results of this question are shown in table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14. The inclination of the Uitkyk community towards retaining their land ownership rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5.2. Would you consider selling/giving up ownership of your land within the next 5 years?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely no</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey data, March 2007

Table 4.14 shows that this question received a high response rate of nearly 93 percent. The respondents were clear on the fact that they were not willing to let go of the ownership of their land within the next five years. Accordingly, 86.7 percent were in favour of retaining ownership of their land. This is so, despite the fact as indicated in table 4.14 above, that 82 percent of the respondents believed that land reform has to date, not resulted in the reduction of household poverty. This indicates that land ownership means more than just present economic benefits for the Uitkyk community. This feeling is also confirmed in Table 4.8, where the sense of pride and belonging emerged as the strongest benefit of the land reform programme to the Uitkyk people thus far. These observations are important in designing and planning development initiatives for the community, as they demonstrate the will to go a long way in time if only to achieve their objectives.
4.9 Perspectives of other parties on the land reform question

A second set of structured interview schedule was used to obtain the views of various agents and administrators involved in the land reform programme (see Annexure 2). The small sample size of completed questionnaires from this category of respondents did not warrant extensive analysis. However, it still provided alternative views from outside the beneficiary community, which may be important in highlighting the latter’s own blind spot. The spectrum of respondents in this category was relatively broad including Nongovernmental Organisations (NGO) such as Business Unity South Africa (BUSA) and Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA) as well as the Department of Land Affairs. The following findings emerge from these responses.

The respondents had been in their current positions or worked in the land reform programme for an average of 6 years. Therefore their responses, especially to subjective questions could be relied upon. While the respondents’ views varied widely on several questions, there was clear agreement on two questions. That is, that lack of access to credit and the long distances between beneficiaries’ current dwellings and the allocated land negatively affected the benefits they could have derived from the farms. In general, 67 percent of the respondents indicated that nationally, land reform in South Africa has not resulted in increased income, employment or food security for beneficiary households (Responses from Questionnaire 2, see also annexure 2).

On the question of what needed to be done to ensure that the land reform programmes delivered or continued to deliver the desired benefits, the following suggestions were put forward. Firstly, increase the capacity of state and other agents to service the land reform programme. Secondly, educate beneficiary communities on how to handle group dynamics. Thirdly, government must take decisive action regarding current occupants of the land, were they are not bona-fide beneficiaries. The last question, regarding the presence of so-called farm dwellers on the farm is indeed a common and contentious one across several beneficiary communities. This question requires more careful investigation and urgent attention.
4.10 Summary of the main findings and conclusions

This chapter presented the findings and analysis regarding the demographic characteristics of the Uitkyk community and the expectations of the Uitkyk community prior to receiving land grants. It then proceeded to examine their actual experiences over the last four years as beneficiaries of land grants. Thereafter, the indicators of economic success of the land reform process and the factors that influence such success or lack thereof were examined. The role of government as facilitator of the land reform process was also investigated as well as the influence of credit availability and the factors influencing credit use in financing the development of acquired land. The significance of land ownership to the community was also explored. Finally, the chapter condensed the views of agents of land reforms, both from the private and public sectors. The following section highlights the major findings that emerge from the foregoing analysis.

The Uitkyk community has a 1:1 gender ratio, with nearly 50 percent of them living in the same households as married couples, with an average household size of about 6. The majority of the members of the community, at least those actively involved in the restitution process, are over 55 and this can have implications for measures of interventions towards developing the community. The lack of active participation of the community’s youth is blamed on two factors, namely, the lack of motivation by the older members, and secondly, the absence of any initiatives that warrant the active involvement of the youth. The youth do not merely want to continue attending meeting after meeting without necessary action to follow through on the decisions of such meetings. However, the unanswered question is, why do the youth not take the initiative themselves? After all, it is more their future that is at stake, not that of their parents. Another important demographic characteristic of the Uitkyk community is the gender distribution. Although the sample indicated a 1:1 male to female ratio, only 5 out of 15 executive members are female. This raises concern about the balance in considering gender sensitive issues within the community.

The Uitkyk community has since 2003 progressively received parcels of land through the land-restitution programme under the umbrella of the Uitkyk Community Property Association. The objectives of the community were to use the land for habitation as well as crop and livestock farming. Prior to receiving the land, 63 percent of the members of the community were either
unemployed or were employed in non-agricultural organisations. Conversely, only about 27 percent of the population was involved in farming either as farm labourers, tenants or in sharecropping agreements. This indicates a low reserve of knowledge and skill in farming and related agricultural activities.

The majority of the community believes that the land reform programme has not been successful in achieving the stated outcomes. Nearly 82 percent of the respondents feel that the land they have received is yet to be translated into better conditions of living. That is, land reform has not resulted in the alleviation of poverty. There is, however, a strong expression of emotional satisfaction associated with the mere ownership of land. About 32 percent of the respondents believe that through the receipt of land, their sense of belonging and pride has been improved. This was the strongest positive factor in terms of actual benefits which the Uitkyk community has derived from restitution thus far.

The main factor in favour of achieving economic success from the use of their acquired land for the Uitkyk community is the good soil quality. On the contrary, five factors have been identified as major challenges to efficient land use. These include the limited access to credit, inputs and implements, low per capita farm size and inadequate farming skills. Other factors include the distances between the Uitkyk farm and the current dwellings of the members.

The Uitkyk community appreciates government’s efforts towards ensuring restitution of land rights and the improvement of living conditions of the poor. About 53 percent of the respondents indicate that the government has been supportive in this regard. However, they believe that the government can do more in several areas to enable them to achieve the desired economic benefits from their acquired land. Other recognised constraints to the translation of land rights into better living conditions for the community include, internal conflict and the lack of capacity within the Uitkyk Community Property Association. The findings highlight specific areas for public provision to include general education and specialised training in agriculture, healthcare as well as improved access to credit and access to produce markets. Despite the prevailing sense of the failure of land reforms in alleviating poverty among the Uitkyk community, most members would rather retain ownership of the land, than give it up. This demonstrates the community’s faith that even though the land
reform programme may not have delivered any economic benefits presently, their hopes for future prosperity lay in the preservation of their land ownership rights.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY OF THE MAIN FINDINGS, LESSONS LEARNT, AND TENTATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS PROFERRED.

5.1 Summary of international experiences in land reforms and lessons for South Africa

For the purposes of establishing the relevant frame of reference and reviewing current knowledge on the question of land reforms internationally, four countries have been reviewed in this dissertation, namely, Brazil, China, Zimbabwe and South Africa. From this review process, a number of noteworthy similarities and contrasts emerge in the reasons behind the need, the conduct and outcomes of land reforms across the four countries. From these experiences, several important lessons are drawn for land reforms in general, and for South Africa in particular.

With regard to the causal factors that resulted in the inequity in land access and ownership, three main categories were identified. These include a history of colonialism and racial discrimination as in the case of South Africa and Zimbabwe, the dominant property ownership regime in the case of China and institutionalised economic segregation in the case of Brazil. In both Zimbabwe and South Africa, the colonial masters and later racist national governments, used state apparatus to tilt land access and ownership in favour of a white minority. In China, both the laws and the policies of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) favoured communal land ownership forms over private ownership. The challenge therefore was how to stimulate efficiency from a property ownership regime that provided little incentive for initiative and investment. In Brazil, the state sought to maintain a bipolar agricultural sector. That is, provide vast areas of prime agricultural land to the commercial sector, while leaving the majority of the population to survive on marginal land or even leave them completely landless.

In terms of the conduct of land reforms internationally, two broad categories of approaches are recognised, namely, market-based land reforms and government-assisted reforms. While the cardinal objective of market-based reforms is economic efficiency, government-assisted
reforms seek mainly social equity and redistribution. In all four countries reviewed, different degrees of both market-based and government-assisted reforms have been adopted. The choice of approach has also varied across different regions of the respective countries or over different time periods.

In Brazil, a mainly government-assisted approach has been adopted. Thanks to the World Bank, pockets of market-based land reform projects have also been carried out across the country. In China, several community-based government-assisted programmes have been embarked upon, prominent among them, the Meitan, Pindu, Shunyi and Nanhai projects. The struggle has been to find a balance between the broader communal ownership structure and more revolutionary approaches that give individual household units greater autonomy in land ownership and use. In Zimbabwe, a mainly market-based land reform programme was brokered under the 1979 Lancaster House Agreement. In terms of this agreement, the United Kingdom was to carry half the cost of a willing buyer/willing seller land reform programme. From 2000, the government of Zimbabwe turned its back on this agreement and embarked on the government-driven fast track programme. The reasons for this shift in approach are widely believed to be more political than economic. South Africa adopted a more market-based government-assisted approach to land reform as from 1995. Following a review of the process during the 2005 national land summit, strong calls were made for greater government intervention to accelerate the rate of reforms. A major feature of the revised approach is that should negotiations in the willing buyer/willing seller process fail, because the seller declines what government believes to be fair value for a tract of land, the government will proceed with expropriation.

With regard to the outcomes, the various national or regional land reform initiatives produced different results. In Brazil, the National Plan of Agrarian Reform, which was implemented by the National Institute for Rural Settlement and Agrarian Reform (INCRA), achieved only 6 percent of its own targets in terms of settled families. The credito fundario, a community-led market-based approach implemented across 14 states is widely believed to have had the most positive impact on bettering the lives of the rural poor. Improvements were noted in the areas of productivity, better cash flows, increased household incomes and employment. The project was even more successful where beneficiaries formed co-operatives. However, about 50 percent of initial beneficiaries quit the land reform programme prematurely. This is blamed
on the lack of infrastructure required to sustain development such as sanitation, healthcare and transportation facilities.

In China, the decollectivisation of land use implemented in the 1950s resulted in increased agricultural productivity. This improvement was, however, soon overshadowed by two systemic weaknesses. The weaknesses included the over-fragmentation of land parcels and the influence of undue political patronage, which rendered poor families vulnerable to losing their land access rights. The household responsibility system adopted in the 1970s is believed to be the most successful national land reform programme in China ever. This family-based contract system provided incentive for the family to grow the cake and by so doing, their share of it. Like the decollectivisation era, the household responsibility system also later imploded, due to over-fragmentation of the plots to accommodate changing family demographics. Tenure security was badly affected by influential local authorities who adjusted land boundaries willy-nilly thanks to their political patronage. The Shunyi project, a collective farm and one of the contemporary land reform experiments was successful, mainly due to the existence of a viable produce market as a result of rural industrialisation. The Meitan project, also an experimental approach, encouraged excess labour to be freed up for non-farming employment, thus supplementing income from the farm. The Nanhai shareholding cooperative system delivered two major benefits to the farmers. First, total household income increased as they could combine their returns from the farm with income from non-farming employment. Secondly, more efficient and larger scale farming became possible due to consolidation of land through the cooperative scheme. In general, while the co-operative and collective farms tended to offer greater land use efficiencies where they were well managed, the household units offered more drive to invest in and to conserve the land.

In Zimbabwe, model A and model C schemes of the first wave of land reforms between 1980 and 1996 were found to be very successful in improving the lives of the beneficiaries. Generous portions of land ranging from 10 to 65 hectares were allocated per family and the government actively supported commercial production. However, this otherwise successful era of land reforms in Zimbabwe had two main weaknesses. First, there was no tenure security. Farmers were only allowed one year renewable leases and had no selling rights to the property. Second, despite the much lauded successes of this scheme, child nutrition remained poor. The Lancaster house agreement expired in 1990 and as from 1996, the
government of Zimbabwe embarked on compulsory state-led land acquisition. This was later accelerated to the fast track mechanism adopted from 2000. Both programmes were mainly politically motivated and have not only undone any achievements of previous reform initiatives, but have left Zimbabwean rural poor in arguably the worst state ever.

Several lessons emerge from the above review. Firstly, for land reform to be successful, it must be backed by both the political will and the relevant economic resources. Political will goes beyond the need to create an agrarian political base as in Brazil, or using the agrarian poor as a tool for self preservation in office as in Zimbabwe. Economic resources include, but are not limited to substantial funding on a sustained basis in order to tilt what is often a very steep economic divide. The World Bank Projects in North Eastern Brazil typified the positive effects that such a commitment could have.

A second lesson is that worldwide, inequality in land ownership results in social unrest. Thirdly, governments have used land reform to influence either political or macroeconomic objectives. For instance in China, the government exploited the more vulnerable poor to support its quest for more industrialisation. In Zimbabwe and Brazil, the landless have often been abused as political puns. The Zimbabwe fast track programme is a good example of the failure of an ill-conceived, politically motivated programme. In South Africa, the focus of land reform appears to be on achieving income redistribution. Fourthly, wherever tenure security is low, there has been little incentive to invest in and conserve the land. This has also exposed the poor to exploitation by unscrupulous industrialists and politicians. China and Zimbabwe typified this scenario, where the policies of the China Communist Party (CCP) and the Zimbabwe African National Union Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) respectively overrode the law and politicians did as they pleased.

A fifth and positive lesson comes out of China. That is, project-based land reform, tailored to local conditions and needs can be very successful. The Meitan, Pingdu, Shunyi and Nanhai projects were all divergent in their approaches, but just as successful in addressing set objectives. Hence, care must be taken to avoid offering blanket solutions to different land reform needs of different communities in South Africa.
5.2 Summary of the Uitkyk experience in land reform

The Uitkyk community has gone through over 130 years of struggle for the right to equitable land access and ownership. During this period, the community suffered at least four forced migrations. Between the 1920s and 1970s, the Uitkyk community suffered systematic deprivation during which the state, the courts and even the church all contributed to rendering them landless. The consequences of this go beyond the loss of land rights. They also include the scattering and unsettling of an otherwise settled community. Today, the Uitkyk community is dispersed across a large area of South Africa and only represented by a 350 member community property association.

Legislative reforms following the 1994 elections presented the Uitkyk community fresh opportunities to resume the struggle for the restitution of their land rights. The Uitkyk Community Property Association was founded in 1995 and has been the driving force behind this struggle. Following the acceptance of their claims by the National Land Claims Commission, the first two of eighteen portions were returned to the community in 2003. To date, the Uitkyk community has received 761.5 hectares out of a total of 3340 hectares being claimed. Besides receiving at least a part of their claim, the bigger challenge facing the community is translating the newfound land rights into better living conditions.

On the merits of empirical evidence collected from a sample population of the Uitkyk community, a number of salient findings emerge. There is limited participation by women and youth in the affairs of the Uitkyk Community Property Association. It is believed that lack of participation by women and youth inhibits innovation and growth from within the community itself.

Before receiving land grants through the restitution programme, the majority of the Uitkyk people were either unemployed or employed in non-agricultural sectors. Thus, only about 27 percent of the population was involved in farming either as farm labourers, tenants or in sharecropping agreements. This indicates a low reserve of knowledge and skill in farming and related agricultural activities.
The majority of the community believes that the land reform programme has not been successful in achieving the expected or stated outcomes. Nearly 82 percent of the respondents feel that the land they have received is yet to be translated into better living conditions. That is, land reform has not resulted in the alleviation of poverty. There is, however, a strong expression of emotional satisfaction associated with the mere ownership of land. About 32 percent of the respondents believe that through the receipt of land, their sense of belonging and pride has been improved. This was the strongest positive factor in terms of actual benefits which the Uitkyk community has derived from restitution thus far.

The main factor in favour of achieving economic success from the use of their acquired land for the Uitkyk community is the good soil quality. On the contrary, five factors have been identified as major challenges to efficient land use. These include the limited access to credit, inputs and implements, low per capita farm size and inadequate farming skills. Other factors include the distances between the Uitkyk farm and the current dwellings of the members. The lack of access to farming inputs such as tractors, implements and seeds is perceived to be the biggest obstacle to the effective use the claimed land.

The Uitkyk community appreciates government’s efforts towards ensuring restitution of land rights and the improvement of living conditions of the poor. About 53 percent of the respondents indicate that the government has been supportive in this regard. However, they believe that the government can do more in several areas to enable them to achieve the desired economic benefits from their acquired land. Other recognised constraints to the translation of land rights into better living conditions for the community include internal conflict and the lack of capacity within the Uitkyk Community Property Association. The findings highlight specific areas for public provision to include general education and specialised training in agriculture. Other areas of need include healthcare and better access to credit and access to produce markets. Despite the prevailing sense of the failure of land reforms in alleviating poverty among the Uitkyk community, most members would rather retain ownership of the land, than give it up. This demonstrates the community’s faith that even though the land reform programme may not have delivered any economic benefits presently, their hopes for future prosperity lie in the preservation of their land ownership rights.
In comparison with the prosperity paradigm (Dekker 2003:111), the land reform programme, with particular regard to the Uitkyk community has only achieved the first four stages. The challenge going forward is how to ensure the attainment of the last four stages of the model. A barometer of the level of achievement of restitution based on the prosperity paradigm is shown in figure 5.1 above. The shaded blocks indicate the achieved stages. To advance the development process, the community must take more responsibility for its own destiny. While seeking more assistance from the government, the community must be prepared to take more risks, for example, by seeking loans to invest in the land. Such a demonstration of commitment can only increase the prospects of sustainability in the eyes of any potential external aid agency. Hence, more proactive involvement by the community itself is critical for generating positive spin-offs for the future of the community.
5.3 Recommendations towards more effective land reform in South Africa

Based on the findings in respect of international experiences in land reforms in general and the Uitkyk community experience in particular, the following tentative recommendations are proffered.

Firstly, the Department of Land Affairs and other principal agents of the land reform programme must review the criteria for successful reforms. The current criteria place too much emphasis on redistribution of land or restitution of land rights, with little emphasis on the economic consequences on the lives of the beneficiaries. Such definitive economic indicators must include changes in the level of household income, employment, housing and sanitary conditions, food security and nutritional status. However, the community must demonstrate their vested interest in the success of the restitution process by taking on more responsibility and risks.

Secondly, there must be a stronger and more sustained political will towards successful land reforms. This is necessary in order to commit the human and financial resources needed to lift what are mostly destitute communities above the poverty line. The relevant government departments and organisations need to grow their own capacity to deal with this problem, which cannot just be wished away. Effective partnerships with institutions such as Universities and selected NGOs as well as more experienced farmers and farmers associations can be used to bridge such capacity gaps.

Thirdly, land reform programmes must be planned along initiatives that are tailored according to specific local conditions. As seen in the four experimental projects in China and the World Bank projects in North Eastern Brazil, the needs of different communities vary and so should the solutions to address those needs. The Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA), the African Development Bank (ADB) and the World Bank can assist with setting the groundwork for such local initiatives, but the government must take the responsibility to assure their sustainability.

Fourthly, there is a need to assist the beneficiary communities to develop into effective teams. Social tensions within the community property associations, if not well managed, have the
potential to severely undermine any possible benefits that could have been derived from reform programmes. Experts in effective team building and other relevant fields have to be involved to make the projects successful, until the necessary capacity building has been achieved.

With particular respect to the Uitkyk community, the following interventions are recommended in order to shake up the current state of inertia and to accelerate the translation of land access rights into better conditions of living. Firstly, there is a strong need for more general education as well as training in certain fields. This is particularly needed in agriculture, finance, marketing and project management. The skills and knowledge acquired from such programmes will enhance the community's ability and confidence to engage in more developmental initiatives. Secondly, there is a need for the government to provide the infrastructure needed to accelerate agricultural development. Such infrastructure should include hospitals, irrigation facilities, produce storage and processing equipment. Above all this a clear commitment from the Uitkyk community and demonstration of self reliance is required for any sustainable results to be achieved.
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## ANNEXURE A

### STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LAND REFORMS BENEFICIARIES

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the South African land reforms programmes as part of an academic research project. Your devotion of time and honest responses to the questions posed is very much appreciated.

Kindly direct any queries to the researcher –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names:</th>
<th>Peter Ayuk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Telephone:</td>
<td>(011) 796 2000 (W) / 084 507 7565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aytabot@yahoo.com">aytabot@yahoo.com</a>/petera@damelin.co.za</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And/or to the study leader –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names:</th>
<th>Prof. R. Mears</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact Details:</td>
<td>(011) 489 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Economics, University of Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mears-r@rau.ac.za">Mears-r@rau.ac.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

2.1 In which age category are you?
- Below 20 0
- 20 to 35 0
- 36 to 55 0
- Over 55 0

2.2 Gender: Male 0 Female 0

2.3 Marital Status: Married 0 Divorced 0 Widowed 0 Single 0

2.6 Number of people (excluding yourself) living with you in your household: _____

### 3. BEFORE THE GRANT

Please tick in box that is applicable: ☑️

3.1.1 Did you receive your land as an individual or part of a group?
- Individual 0 Group ☑️

3.1.2 If you benefited as part of a group, how many members were in the group? ________

3.2 Under which program did you receive your land?

3.2.1 **Restitution** (land claims for historical reasons) 0

3.2.2 **LRAD** (land grants through redistribution program) 0

3.2.3 **Tenure reform** which granted ownership rights to previous workers 0

81
3.2.4 In which year did you first apply for the grant/claim? 

3.2.5 In which year did you receive the land? 

3.2.6 Which of the following did you intend doing with the land when you applied for a land grant/claim? 

*Please tick all that apply.*

- Crop Farming  
- Livestock farming  
- Build a home  
- Other reason (please specify)  

3.2.7 Before you received your own land, what was your occupation? 

- Farming as a tenant (you rent the land for farming)  
- Farming as a farm worker (you are paid to work on the farm)  
- Farming as a sharecropper (you share the harvest with the land owner)  
- Other (please write here)  

### 4 AS A BENEFICIARY

4.1 How successful have you been in using the land that you received in the following ways? *Please tick the applicable box per activity.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Fairly successful</th>
<th>Neither Successful nor Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Fairly unsuccessful</th>
<th>Very unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock farming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built a home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease out the land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Use (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Since you received the land, to what extent has it helped you in the following ways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased your income from farm activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased your income from non-farm activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created jobs for members of your household?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to provide food for the people in your household?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped you to get access to credit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made you feel proud as a member of your community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 How have the following factors affected the benefits that you get from your land?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very positively</th>
<th>Positively</th>
<th>Neither Positively nor negatively</th>
<th>Negatively</th>
<th>Very negatively</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The soil quality of the land allocated to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation facilities available to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between the land you received and the place where you live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your access to credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your access to extension services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your access to inputs (tractors, implements, seeds etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your access to crop/livestock market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of the land you received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your farming skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 How supportive has the Government been towards you in achieving your aims as a beneficiary?
4.5 To what extent will the following forms of government support assist you to improve your farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Form</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide training in agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide farming machines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide irrigation facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help me/us to get credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build school(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build hospital(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help us to sell our produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the beneficiaries more chance to take part in making decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 To what extent will the following factors encourage you to borrow more money to improve your farm?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encourage Factor</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>Moderate extent</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the banks charge lower interest rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the banks allow a longer period before start of repayment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the government supports our applications for loans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1 To what extent has land reform helped in reducing poverty in your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5.2 Would you consider selling/giving up ownership of your land within the next 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ownership Decision</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
<th>May be</th>
<th>Definitely no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you very much.
ANNEXURE B
STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LAND REFORMS
ADMINISTRATORS/AGENTS

1 INTRODUCTION
The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data on the South African land reforms programmes as part of an academic research project. Your devotion of time and honest responses to the questions posed is very much appreciated.

Kindly direct any queries to the researcher –

| Names: | Peter Ayuk |
| Contact Telephone: | (011) 796 2000 (W) / 084 507 7565 |
| E-Mail: | aytabot@yahoo.com/petera@damelin.co.za |

And/or to the study leader –

| Names: | Prof. R. Mears |
| Contact Details: | (011) 489 2017 |
| | Department of Economics, University of Johannesburg |
| | Mears-r@rau.ac.za |

2 BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

2.1 Names ________

2.2 Contact Telephone ______________________ E-mail ______________________

2.3 Current Employer/Organisation ______________________

2.4 Location/delivery site ______________________

3 BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3.1 How many years in total have you been involved with land reforms in South Africa? ________ years

3.2 Have many years have you been involved in land reform in South African in each of the following roles? Please enter 0 if you have NOT BEEN INVOLVED in a specific role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Period in years. (Please enter 0 if none)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government agent/administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/Charity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 ENGAGEMENTS IN LAND REFORM PROGRAMMES

4.1 In which of the following models of land reform have you been involved?  
*Please tick all that apply.*

4.1.1 Restitution?

☐

4.1.2 Tenure reforms?

☐

4.1.3 Redistribution (LRAD)?

☐

4.1.4 Other (please specify)?

☐

4.2 To what extent do you believe that land reform in South Africa has resulted in each of the following benefits to recipients of land grants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased beneficiaries’ income from farm activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased beneficiary’s income from non-farm activities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created more jobs for beneficiary households?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been able to provide food for the beneficiaries’ households?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped beneficiaries to get access to credit?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 How will you describe the effect of the following on the gains that beneficiaries get from their land grants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very positive effect</th>
<th>Positive effect</th>
<th>No effect</th>
<th>Negative effect</th>
<th>Very negative effect</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The soil quality of the land allocated to beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation facilities available to beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between the allocated land and where the beneficiaries live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries access to credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries access to extension services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries access to inputs (implements, seeds etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 How supportive has the Government been towards the recipients of land grants in improving their well being?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very supportive</th>
<th>Supportive</th>
<th>Neither supportive nor unsupportive</th>
<th>Unsupportive</th>
<th>Very Unsupportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 SEEKING GREATER EFFICIENCY

5.1 To what extent do you believe that land grants made to groups are more effective in alleviating rural poverty than when the grants are made to individual beneficiaries?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To no extent</th>
<th>To a small extent</th>
<th>To a moderate extent</th>
<th>To a large extent</th>
<th>To a very large extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 What reasons do you believe are responsible for your observation in 5.1 above?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

5.3 Suggest measures that are required to ensure that land reforms can (or continues to) improve the lot of the rural poor.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________