

Locating Policies in the Everyday Practices of Land Reform Beneficiaries: A case of Mighty and Wales Farms

Malebogo Phetlhu

MSc. Thesis August 2008

Supervisor:

Dr Paul Hebinck, Rural Development Sociology Group



WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY
WAGENINGEN UR

**Social science group
Wageningen University**

Malebogo Phetlhu

**Locating Policies in the Everyday Practices of Land Reform Beneficiaries:
A case of Mighty and Wales Farms**

August 2008

Registration number, 790919652080

Master thesis Social Sciences submitted in partial fulfilment of the degree of Master of Science in Rural development and Sociology at Wageningen University, the Netherlands

Supervisor:

Dr. Paul Hebinck

Department of Social Sciences
Rural Development
Sociology
Wageningen

Acknowledgements

Glory and honour be to God almighty for making all my endeavours possible.

I would like to thank Wageningen University for opening its doors for me, and equipping me with what I call “world experience” in studying. I did not only acquire the formal education, I learnt to function in a multicultural setting. I sincerely thank my sponsors, CAPRI, for financing my studies. My sincere gratitude goes to my supervisor Dr. Paul Hebinck for his tireless efforts of, constructive criticism and guidance from the conception until the completion of my research. I am pleased to let you know that, I have finally learnt to **“PUT MY ASS DOWN AND READ”** and you indeed deserve the credit for what I have learnt.

Special and heartfelt thanks to Mrs Carla Haenen for all the genuine support that she offered during my time of bereavement. Your support makes Wageningen more than just a University, but a home where the well being of every student counts. Another special thank you goes to Mrs Martha Bloemberg and Mrs Marleen Nooij my MAKS study advisors for their advices and support during my stay in Wageningen.

My appreciation goes to the staff of the department of Agriculture in kuruman. I thank you all for the warm welcome. Special word of gratitude to Mr. Boikanyo Gae, for personally making sure that my research and internship became a success, thank you for volunteering to be my mentor and guiding me through the internship. I have learnt a lot from you. I appreciate the time and cooperation that I got from the villagers who helped me to acquire the information that I needed for my study as well.

To the MAKS 21 people, spending time with you was great. Special thanks to Judit for always being there; to Sara for listening. Thank you to Francois and Modise, for being my big brothers, and to Tessa and Carlo for caring. Thanks to Doortje my former corridor leader for all her support during my time of bereavement. To my mother for her indescribable support, you made a world of difference Ma. To my beautiful daughter Naledi, thanks for being a good girl while I was away. To all my cousins and brothers

thank you for your support. To all my aunties, thank you for the moral support. To my beloved and ever caring ouma and mother Tsiwe, you hold a special place in my heart, and every achievement that I attain is associated to your strength and dedication in raising me. Ke a leboga ouma!! I would also like to say thank you to my special dear brother and friend Francis Nkoka for his brotherly advices and for always agreeing to read and comment on my work. To all those that I did not include, your support did not go unnoticed, you all made an impact in my life. Last but not least a big thank you to my best friend ever and late fiancé Mdu for believing in me to make it through Wageningen University, and for being a good daddy to our daughter when I was away. Your memory will forever stay.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

DLA	Department of Land Affairs
LRAD	Land redistribution for agricultural development
NGO	Non Governmental organisation
R	Rand (South African Currency)
SLAG	Settlement and Land Acquisition Grant
CAPRI	Cape provinces in Rural Innovation
RDP	Reconstruction development programme
ANC	African National Congress

Abstract

This report is an account of “what is happening on land reform farms?” The report begins by providing a short background to the land question in South Africa as this explains why land reform came into being. The two case studies (Wales and Mighty land reform projects) that are selected for the research aim to provide a detailed account of the daily encounters at land reform projects. These farms (or projects) have been selected at random. The angle for exploring what is happening on the land reform projects is deliberately first of all prescriptive as there are not many descriptive accounts of everyday life at land reform projects.

In land reform programmes which are seen as the processes through which the goals of the new land policies can be met, have been seen to be a point of a series of interfaces where different actors struggle to gain control over the recently acquired resources and develop strategies and social relationships to achieve that. The cases description also show in some detail what the nature is of the social relationships between land reform beneficiaries as well as develop strategies for managing the project. The analysis will show that much of what is happening in land reform projects is not anticipated by the policies.

1. Introduction Land reform in South Africa

Describe shortly at the beginning of each chapter what the chapter is about!!

1.1 Land Reform in general

The Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines Land Reform as "measures designed to effect a more equitable distribution of agricultural land especially by governmental actions". Land reform according to Horowitz (1993) is an ongoing attempt since World War II in a range of countries to redistribute land or make access to land by landless people more easier. All this is in the name of the fight against poverty and a more efficient agriculture. "Access to land and the ability to make productive use of such land is critical to poor people worldwide" (World Bank, 2003).

For many countries land ownership has its origin in the history of skewed ownership of land (such as the latifundia in Latin America, or Tsarist Russia, Ethiopia during the Emperor's regime) and also in discriminatory land ownership policies (such as South Africa, colonial Kenya and Rhodesia but also the United States and Australia). It is on the basis of these policies that land reform was made justifiable. The World Bank argues that there are mixed experiences with land reform policies. In countries like Japan, Korea Taiwan it has been reported that the land reform policies did well, though they are known to have had very repressive reforms, while in countries like South Africa and Latin America it has been reported that land reform has not been doing well, (World Bank policy, 2003).

The critical issue regarding land, however, is that according to a range of studies (see for instance Shipton and Goheen, 1992) that it is not only used for production purposes and survival, but also plays a role gaining control over the others (Anderson, 1999), and in defining social and personal identities (Berry, 1989). Land thus needs to be understood as having multiple and potential contrasting meanings: political, cultural, social, religious and economic. Ownership over land is in this way embedded in complex relations of power as well associated with wealth, status and meaning. This means that land reform is not an easy, linear process but rather a conflictual as Moyo and Hall (2007) recently have posed. The entry point for this thesis is that land reform needs to be seen as a process rather than as the straightforward implementation of policies.

1.1.2. Policies and Land Ownership in South Africa

Land ownership in South Africa has been a sensitive issue for a very long time. During the apartheid era the largest part of arable land (87%) was owned by white South Africans and only 13% was allocated to the black South Africans to reside in. The skewed land distribution was the outcome of the 1913 Land Act and which was sharpened during Apartheid from 1948 (CDE Research, 2005). After the introduction of segregation laws, black people were forcibly moved from their lands and made to stay in homelands (White Paper, 1997).

A radical change in the land ownership came with the dawning of 1994 when the first South African democratic government was established. During this time a policy of reconstruction and development programme (RDP) was introduced, and one of its objectives was to promote equity among the citizens of South Africa through uniform distribution of wealth, (i.e. agricultural land) (White Paper, 1994). It was through the guiding principles of the RDP policy that the land and agricultural policies were drawn (White paper, 2005). The policy dealt with the injustices of the apartheid land distribution, thus, through the land policy the land reform programme was introduced (Lahiff, 2000).

The land reform programme has three aspects to it which are: land redistribution, land restitution and land tenure. The objective of land redistribution which this study focuses on was to redistribute a third of white owned land to the black farmers within a period of 5 years. It was expected that through this programme land reform could achieve political and equity goals, through which strong economic growth in the agricultural sector would be met. The aim of land tenure was to transfer state owned land in the former homelands to the residents of South Africa, while land restitution was aimed at returning land to its legitimate owners who were forcefully removed during the apartheid era, (Adey, 2007).

Through these programmes land would be much more equally allocated to those who live in South Africa. Land redistribution for agricultural development programme (LRAD), as

Bernstein calls it (LRAD) was designed with the aim of correcting the previous skewed land redistribution among the people of South Africa, (Bernstein, 2005) and Wagerif, (2004). Land reforms were thus used as a tool for the poor people to secure titles to residential land, access to land for livelihood purposes by engaging in agricultural practices (Hall 2004).

This study aims to examine and understand the land reform policy interventions in detail. It will do so based on a case study of two different land reform projects in the Northern Cape. The critical theoretical and methodological issue is; how to understand and unpack land reform. Do we understand it as a linearly progressing policy development and implementation process; or as one that is embedded in the multiple realities of everyday social life. The latter perspective and entry point we will be able to explore whether and how land reform becomes subject to redesigning by both implementers and land reform beneficiaries. This aim will be achieved by studying the relationships among the land reform beneficiaries and how they shape, or are shaped by the land reform policies.

1.1.3 Thesis organisation

After the above introduction to land reform policies and its historical background in chapter one, I will briefly outline the structure of this thesis. Chapter 2 deals with the conceptual frame work, research question and the methodology that is used in this study. This chapter further aims at giving a clear picture as to how this study was carried out and how the used concepts are understood. Chapter three presents an overview of the eras and history of the land reform programme. Furthermore, the fourth chapter will present the cases of Wales and Mighty land reform projects consecutively. The cases that will be presented will further be analysed and discussed in this chapter. The last chapter (chapter five) will summarise and draw a conclusion about the whole study and the research questions that were posed at the beginning of the research.

1.2 Concepts and Methodology

This study is designed to provide an answer to the question what is happening on the land reform farms in South Africa. By answering this question I aim to bring about an understanding of what happens when different actors (land reform beneficiaries) come into contact in order to work towards a “common goal” of improving their livelihoods and contributing towards the economic development (Bradstock, 2005), and how they re-define and re-shape the land reform policy through their interaction and involvement in the land reform projects. The remaining of this chapter elaborates the methodology of the study. We will focus on how to understand land reform and its policies, and on how to understand and unpack them. We will begin with a short overview of how in the literature land reform has been interpreted by South African scholars.

2.1. Different views of land reform

Comment [h1]: See my email and article I send. Needs a better organisation and positioning!!

Since its inception, the land reform program has been greatly commented upon, criticized and analyzed by the different commentators. Irrespective of ideology and perspective, the common denominator seems to be that land reform has failed. Among the critics of the land reform are writers like Philip DuToit (2004) who stated that land reform is a failure and a scandal. Kariuki and Van der Walt (2000) stated that “the failure of the land reform programme seems inevitable”. Wagerif (2004) in his study of land reform in Limpopo pointed out that the land reform programme failed in meeting its objective of creating job opportunities. Other commented that land reform will not reach its set target of redistributing 30% of the land by 2014. The final dates for land claims for the land restitution part of the land reform programme has been shifted and shifted and there is an enormous backlog in the final approval of the cases. These statements and facts make land reform look like a totally hopeless and unhelpful programme which does not have any good in it.

Though there are critics to the land reform programme, there are also those that have advocated that the land reform programme should be looked at in a different way which moves away from the linear interpretation of policies and look deeper into this programme which some have seen as just a failure. Commentators such as Deininger

(2003) have looked not only at the negative side of the land reform programme, by stating that land reform has managed to reach the targeted poor. James (2007) also advocates that the land reform programme should not be analysed in a linear way where it is located on the political and economic spheres only, but should be understood in a way that integrates the every day practises of the beneficiaries thereof. Cousins (2005) has also pointed out that there has been a stereotypic understanding of small scale agriculture which has been seen as not good enough, and Cousins is arguing that small scale agriculture should be looked at differently.

2.2. Research methodology

The previous section has identified the different ways by which academics have unpacked land reform. I also pointed out my disagreements with their point of views. My critique boils down to two issues. One is that both political economist as well as neo-liberal approaches to land reform have been preoccupied by a linear, rather prescriptive perspective on social change. Second, the matter of the issue is that what is considered ‘failing’; whose point of view is taken into account and which accounts are ignored. Does land reform fail when agricultural production is not increasing or stagnating. What about other forms of land use like land for housing, or smaller vegetable gardens? My preliminary analysis of my data hints at different, more diverse dynamics occurring in the context of land reform projects. Similar to Hebinck (2008) my argument is that land reform poses a set of questions that cannot be answered with reference to political economy or neo-liberal frameworks of analysis.

Base don the literature readings on policy, planning and implementation I decided to centre my analytical framework and methodology around a number of principles or perspectives.

1. Land reform projects are made up of different people (beneficiaries) who are expected by the “policies” to work towards a common goal of improving their livelihoods and ultimately reducing poverty and levels of unemployment. Land reform is thus best understood as an organised or planned intervention; an intervention that aims to reach goals set by government and society. In South Africa this amounts to a mixture of poverty alleviation, human rights and a fair distribution

of land (and other assets) to undo the injustices of the past. This is laid down in the so-called RDP programme accepted by the first democratically elected government in 1994.

2. Second. Policies are not linearly interpreted and implemented. Outcomes of policies are rather diverse, complex, multi-dimensional and some times even conflictive and contradictory.
3. Third: Land reform may thus have intended but also unintended consequences. This implies that land reform may create social space for change in many different ways and forms.
4. I have adopted an actor oriented approach to understanding land reform as this enables me to examine how social actors who are local and external to specific arenas encounter one another and develop strategies to cope with changing circumstances. The social actors I encountered, the so-called land reform beneficiaries, are interlocked in struggles over “resources, meanings and institutional legitimacy and control” (Long 2004). The advantage of such an approach is that its concepts are “grounded in the everyday life experiences and understanding” of actors, despite their social standing.

Long (2001) contends that an interface analysis is useful for studying the processes by which planned interventions enter the life worlds and it is also useful in analysing state-peasant relations. Interface analysis will therefore be useful in helping to mainly understand the responses of local groups to planned intervention. According to Long (2004) interface analysis is useful in studying: interventions, encounters between different actors of different life-worlds, strategies of negotiation between actors. Interface analysis is also useful when studying; how goals, perceptions, interests and relationships are reshaped by interactions and conflicting interests among the different actors. Interface analysis will further be used in this study to explain what happens when the different actors (land reform beneficiaries and policy makers) interact through the program land reform at the level of implementation (beneficiaries).

Such a focus allows us to zoom in on the day to day encounters on land reform farms between a range of social actors. This will help in understanding the roles that they play in land reform and also the kind of struggles that these actors get into.

For the purpose of this research, actor oriented approach and interface analysis have been seen as useful in giving a detailed analysis of what is happening on the land reform farms. It is therefore based on the above mentioned methods, that the following concepts (policy, actors, knowledge, interface, spaces and agency) which are related to interface and actor oriented analysis are useful in shedding some light into the policy process and its implementation through the land reform projects.

Policy: Understanding and unpacking policies

Policies have been popularly known and understood in a linear way in which; a problem is identified, information collected about the particular problem, a solution found about how to deal with the identified problem and a policy drawn and passed on to bureaucrats to implement it (Mc Gee, 2004). It has however been found that policies are much more complex than they have been understood to be. Trojman (2005) defines a policy as carefully planned decisions that are aimed at focusing on certain identified public concerns, and are developed with an objective to them. Mc Gee (2004) however gives a deeper explanation of policy process, wherein she states that policies are developed with a lot of influence from different actors who have different interests and who in most cases do not have experiential knowledge about the subjects on which they are drawing the policies about e.g. poverty. As a result policies are drawn based on the knowledge that policy makers have, and the knowledge of the poor for whom the policy is being drawn for are excluded.

Mc Gee (2004) suggests in her writing that, though policies are developed by actors who do not have an experiential knowledge about matters like poverty, they are later passed down to implementers who have to further take them to the beneficiaries who are subject to poverty and have an experiential knowledge of poverty. And these (policies) are used as tools for developing the poor. It is at the point of implementation that the policy is interpreted by both the implementers and the beneficiaries. Bolding (2004) points out that

the beneficiaries and policy implementers get involved in transforming or reshaping policies at the level of implementation.

Literature suggests that policy processes are complex and involve different actors who hold different interests and opinions and have “agency” as Long (2004) suggests. Policy process for this study is defined as the time where policies are formulated to the point where they are implemented and put into practice by the “beneficiaries”. From the formulation stage of the development policies until the implementation and practice level, McGee states that there are different actors involved. Among these are donors and creditors from Northern countries who have a great influence in the decisions that are taken considering the policy, because of the partnerships that they have with the poor countries. This suggests that the policy decision for the poor people in Southern countries, are to a certain extent based on the Southern donors and creditor’s influence. This was further confirmed by (Levin and Weiner, 1997) by stating that “In South Africa land and agrarian reform policy is presently being developed as a top down exercise increasingly informed by neo-liberal macroeconomic policy orientation”. Ntsebeza (2004) further confirmed what McGee said that external actors have an influence in policy making by stating in his writing that; the transferring of the 30% of land within the first 5 years of operation was a proposal by the World Bank for the RDP programme.

Actors

The defining of the term actors is necessary in clarifying who the actors are and what their different roles are. Mc Gee (2004) defined actors in her study as; all the people that play a role in the policy processes, either by being at the formulation or at the implementation stage of the policy. McGee further states that in policy formulation there are external actors who prescribe what should be done and what should not be done concerning development. The explanation by McGee suggests that actors can be at different levels and even in “different world”. McGee’s definition of actor will be adapted for use in this study. The actors that will be referred to however in the study are; the land reform beneficiaries, extension officers and the policy makers. The land reform beneficiaries who are the actors that were studied will be extensively talked about in the study because they are the one who the policy goals have to be realised through, but the

policy makers and the extension officers will only be talked about in a brief way as only their influence on the projects is sought to be understood.

Agency

According to Long (2001) agency, is the ability to devise means and ways of coping with life even the most extreme coercion. Long further went on to say that no matter how restricted people are they always find some way of creating and deploying their own objectives.

Knowledge

Knowledge has been said to be one of the tools in understanding policy process (McGee, 2004). Webster dictionary defines knowledge as “the fact or condition of knowing something with familiarity gained through experience or association”. Einstein in Midgley (1989) stated that there are two forms of knowledge that exist, the one in the book he described as “lifeless” and the one in the consciousness of people that he described as “alive” McGee states that, there are different levels of knowledge, and they are “experiential, presentational, propositional and practical” knowledge. And further went on to explain that experiential knowledge is the kind of knowledge that is experienced.

Spaces

Spaces are multiple points in time or space in a policy process and as well as sometimes signifying transformative potential, and they are also the points at which policy actors and discourses come into contact (McGee, 2004).

Comment [h2]: Wauh: but where do you analyses this in your thesis. As far as I can remember you do not use this ‘space’ to order your material.

Comment [h3]: I suggest to simply delete!!

2.3 Linkage of concepts

The above mentioned concepts are useful in explaining what is happening on the land reform farms and how policies are linked to what is happening. The main aim of this study is to locate the policy in the everyday practices of the land reform beneficiaries.

This will be done by “unpacking” the policy process and comparing the practices of the beneficiaries to the policy objectives.

McGee further states that there are also the local government officials and the “representatives” of the poor at the formulation level who are also seen as playing an active role in the policy formulation. Though they are usually represented at higher levels, poor people are the ones who are instrument in the final stages, which is the “practice” level. It is at this point that beneficiaries act out their agency and where the policy process is broken down into “observable, influence able elements”.

McGee states that in settings where actors come into contact to interact there is an exchange of knowledge, and it is through this exchange of knowledge that they get into a struggle to win other actors into their projects and get them to accept their frame of meaning. These interactions are termed “knowledge encounters”. Long, (2002) states that, societies are heterogeneous and are differentiated by their values, interests and understanding.

This implies that even in situation where people have come together in an attempt to work towards a common goal there still exists what Long terms “battlefield of knowledge”. Battlefield of knowledge was explained as the way in which people’s ideas are pitched against each other and how they bring their “ideas, interests, understanding and values into what they get engaged in. He further states that it is where ideas, interests and values are contested by the different actors. McGee says that, during the policy process all these different actors who are said to be having different interests, understanding, ideas and opinions and agency, it is those who have the unified voice who win legitimacy over the others.

This then brings the deliberation to the concept of agency. Long defines agency as the ability to devise means and ways of coping with life even the most extreme coercion. The concept of agency applies at all the levels of the policy process, but it is at the interface level where it is greatly evident. Interface according to Long is the point where two

different and conflicting life worlds come into contact. In the case of this study the two different and conflicting life worlds are the policies which are coming from the government and the people who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of these policies. At this point the agency of the beneficiaries greatly showed as they start to create and deploy their own objectives in contrast to those that are prescribed by the policy.

According to Long (1989) it is at this point that the different actor at the receiving end of the policy (beneficiaries) will start to create meanings, and start to pitch their values, interests and understanding towards each other. And it is at this point also where the actors who McGee refers to as having a stronger voice will win legitimacy over the others in getting them to accept their frame of meaning and accept their “Projects”. As a result of this pitching of ideas, values, interests and understanding against each other new meanings are brought into the policy in an informal way. Meaning that, these meanings are brought in not through the legitimate negotiation among all the actors involved in the policy process but only through the beneficiaries.

According to McGee (...) policy processes take place in different spaces (land reform projects, offices where policies are made, offices where implementers receive the policy for implementation) which are multiple points in time in a policy process. Spaces are the points at which policy actors and discourses come into contact. At the points where the actors or discourses meet there is usually some form of struggle either between the actors or the discourses. These struggles are caused by the fact that spaces carry with them the history of how they began, thus ending up with “assumptions and meanings” to them.

Comment [h4]: Is this still needed I do not think so:

2.4 Methodology

Methodologically my approach hinges on identifying who the key actors are that play in role in the land reform projects and examine how and where they interact in order to make land reform work. The analysis of the dynamics of land reform are situated in everyday life of the social actors involved.

The logical consequence of this approach is twofold. One is that a case study approach is required and that the focus would be on collecting social actors views and accounts of their experiences with land reform. I did my research in the area around Kuruman which

is one of the towns of the Northern Cape Province. The farms I selected for further study were rather ad random selected but in the end appeared to be among the few land reform farms in Kuruman, hence my selection of the two projects Mighty and Wales.

2.4.1 Questions

The original question. ‘ What is happening on the land reform projects in Kuruman’ remains an important one but can now be rephrased into questions like: what categories of social actors are relevant for the understating of land reform dynamics at Mighty and Wales? How are land reform beneficiaries interacting and where.

2.4.2 Sub Questions

Why do beneficiaries join land reform projects?

What causes some beneficiaries to be inactive?

What causes the other beneficiaries to quit?

Why do other beneficiaries stay in projects?

As a result, purposive sampling was used to select the informants, because there was a need to know from the different categories of beneficiaries why they are doing what they do and to also find out from the extension officers about the background of these projects. During the interviews unstructured and semi-structured interviews were used to collect data. Questions were posed to any beneficiary who was found on the farm. The aim behind this was to get information on what different beneficiaries’ experiences were on the farm. Interviews were only done only with individuals and not in a group as it allowed convenience in terms of following up on stories. The inactive members and those who had quit the project were followed up on, in their homes. Further more snow ball sampling (Russel, 1995) was used, for the members that had quit the project or were inactive. According to Russel (1995) this method is useful when trying to find out “who people know” especially in small populations, which is in this case the beneficiaries of Mighty farm. This sampling method was therefore used in locating the other members that I could not find on my own.

Observation was used as another method of collecting data. This method involved attending meetings with the beneficiaries, spending time on the farms with beneficiaries while at work, and to also generally observe what was going on in the farms. Observation was useful in confirming the information that was gathered through interviews with the beneficiaries. The land reform policy and the available project's constitution were consulted to get more information on the goals and objectives of the land reform policy and those of the beneficiaries of land reform.

Chapter 3 : Land reform in South Africa and the Northern Cape

3.1 Land reform Eras and its progress

Since the new democratic government came into being there has been reports about the achievements and failures met, and the still remaining challenge that the government programs have to go through. When the democratic South African government came into being in 1994 it inherited the legacies of the previous government. Bradstock (2005) states that, when the new government which was led by the (ANC) African national congress took over from the old regime, it “inherited the slow growing economy, wide spread poverty and high and rising unemployment”. This implies that however new the democratic government was, it already had some inherited problems and challenges from the old government which it had to address.

As a way of dealing with the inherited poverty, slow growing economy and high unemployment, (Jacobs, et al, 2003) points out that the democratic government adopted a land reform programme to address these issues. Walker (2003) states that the goals of the land reform program when it was initially introduced were to promote “social justice with the principle of market led land reform”. And Hall (2004) said that this market assisted program was aiming at transferring 30% of arable land within the first five years of its operation to 60,000 black people.

According to (Bradstock, 2005; Deininger and May 2000) the land reform programme came as a result of the RDP (reconstruction and development programme) which was a program used by the government in economy restructuring. Bradstock points out that this program had some very ambitious goals for the land reform program, as it was targeting to “supply both residential and productive land for the poorest section of the rural population, it would help to raise incomes and productivity through the provision of support services to build the economy by generating broad-based employment and increases in rural incomes”.

The land reform programme which was introduced through RDP policy was not only meant to deal with poverty, unemployment and slow economic growth. Hall and Lahiff (2004) state that the land reform programme was a means of redressing the previous skewed land ownership pattern, by giving land to those who had been forcefully removed from their lands in the past. According to (Jacobs et al, 2003; Wegerif 2004) the land reform programme had three legs to it which are:

- Land restitution
- Land redistribution
- And, tenure reform

According to Kariuki (2003) the land tenure reform was aimed at securing and giving the rights of land tenure in its different forms to the previously disadvantaged people of South Africa. Deininger and May (2000) defined land restitution as aiming to compensate the victims of the 1913 forced removals during the apartheid regime. Bradstock (2005) points out that only those that can prove that they were forcefully removed from their lands after the 19th of June 1913 are catered for by the land restitution programme. While on the other hand land redistribution was according to (DLA, 1997) aimed at providing the previously disadvantaged and the poor with access to land for productive and residential purposes.

Deininger and May (2000) further state that the land redistribution program was “seen as having the potential to significantly improve the livelihood of the rural poor and to contribute towards economic development”. Bradstock (2005) and Lahiff (2003) further stated that the guiding principle for the land redistribution program was that the households which had an income of less than (rand) R1, 500.00 could apply for the Settlement land acquisition grant (SLAG) to the value of R1600.00 in order to purchase land. This was going to be achieved through the use of the willing seller willing buyer approach, in which the government was going to provide grants to beneficiaries who had identified land which was on sale and were interested in buying that land.

This approach to acquiring land meant that the beneficiaries had to identify the land themselves without getting any help from the government. Thus making the program a demand led one (Hall, 2004). Deininger (1999) highlighted the fact that the amount from SLAG was not sufficient to start a self sufficient agricultural operation, and this led to beneficiaries forming groups of which some were mostly dysfunctional in order to raise enough funds to purchase land. Walker, (2003) states that; in addition to land tenure, land restitution and land redistribution the land reform program was targeting to address the issues of gender equality. From the mentioned aims, it can be concluded that the land reform programme had a lot to deal with.

After 10 years of being in power, the government conducted a review evaluation of all the programmes on how they had impacted on the quality of life of the citizens of South Africa; land reform was among the reviewed programmes (Hall, 2004). Criticism about land reform also began to surface. According to (Walker, 2003) the pace at which land reform had been going at in the first years of its inception was very slow, and (McCusker, 2004) said that land reform has not succeeded in meeting its objective of improving the livelihoods of the poor people in some parts of the country. Hall (2004) suggested that beneficiaries of land reform did not feel responsible for and did not participate in the land reform projects. Some researchers reported that “land reform lacks capacity” walker (1998). “In South Africa's land reform programme, there are often discrepancies between the abstract language of policy, on the one hand, and concrete field practice, on the other, in relation to local communities” (Kepe, 1999).

Literature shows that though SLAG was well meant, in 1997 when the mid-term review was carried out it had not performed as well as it was expected it would do. Some of the problems which were identified among those affecting the program were; lack of post settlement support to the beneficiaries and unreliable monitoring and evaluation system, (Hall, 2004). By 1999 only a percentage of the set target (30%, Hall2004) had been met, (Ntsebeza and Hall, 2004). Hall, (2004) in her study stated that it had been found that beneficiaries were not only dependent on land reform alone as a source of livelihood but were pursuing other forms of livelihoods. This gives a suggestion that beneficiaries were in a way not entirely doing what was expected of them by the policy. This is confirmed

by (Lahiff, 2007b) who states that; close to half of the African descent population in South Africa is staying in rural areas and most of these are engaged in agriculture in a very small scale as many are dependent on non-agricultural activities which are; migrant labour, local wage employment and welfare grants as a means of making livelihoods.

It is common knowledge that the second democratic elections in 1999 came with changes for South Africa. A new president was inaugurated as well as a new minister for the ministry of Agriculture Thoko Didiza. And this did not only end there, it brought also changes to the national policies and one of these was the land reform policy. Hall (2004) states that; when the new minister Thoko Didiza came into power she changed the land reform policy. The old system of SLAG was to a greater extent replaced by the creation of a new class of black commercial farmers. According to (Jacobs et al, 2003) the SLAG approach was replaced by the LRAD programme (land redistribution for agricultural development), which was recommended by the department of land affairs.

One of the changes to the policy was; doing away with the level of income for household as a standard for land redistribution grant eligibility (Walker 2003). The new programme did away with the old system, which required people to be poor in order to qualify as beneficiaries of land redistribution (Lyne and Darroch, 2003). There was also seen a change in the policy process, changing from a consultative approach to an expert driven approach (Hall 2004). The LRAD programme was aimed at dealing with the problem of small grants from the previous programme SLAG by doing away with the income as a standard of eligibility for land redistribution.

Though it was hoped that this new program would bring some improvements to the land reform program, (Hall and Williams, 2000) stated that the changes in policy led to moving out of most of most of the senior officials in the Department of land affairs, and critics of the new policies. Lahiff, (2007a) stated that land reform had not been successful in making a significant impact on poverty. Deininger and May (2003) also pointed out that the program land reform has not lived up to its goals, though it has managed to reach the targeted poor.

3.2 Land reform in the Northern Cape Province

The Northern Cape Province is one of the nine South African Provinces and it is the largest of all the eight other provinces in terms of land mass, as it covers 29.7% of the South African land surface and has the least population, (Northern Cape provincial government). According to Thwala in (Rosset et al, 2006) the Northern Cape province is occupied by 1.8% of the total population of South Africa. The economic growth in this province is based on the natural resources; and they are mining and agriculture which stands out as the main source of livelihoods and employment.

According to (Bradstock 2005) the Northern Cape Province is characterised by low rainfalls, which have been measured to range between 200 and 500mm per year. And the agricultural sector is dominated by the white farmers. Though bigger than all the other provinces The Northern Cape has had a leading progress in the redistribution of land between the year 1994 and 2002. However, agriculture which is the main source of employment in this province has been seen to be declining over the past years, and there has not been seen any indication that the current trend of the decline in agricultural activities will improve (Bradstock, 2005).

In a study carried out by FARM-Africa in the 8 land reform projects in the Northern Cape Province it was found that the beneficiaries are dependent on other sources of livelihoods which are governmental transfers (Pensions and grants) and wages even though they had land available to them. Conflicts which are caused by different objectives among themselves were also seen among the studied projects. Lack of clear and detailed business plans was evident from all the studied farms. It was also noticed that it was common for the main beneficiaries to recruit extra members for resource pooling in order to be able to buy land, there has however been noticed a tendency of recruited members leaving the projects because of differences in objectives with the main members (Bradstock, 2005).

Kuruman

Kuruman is one of the towns in the Northern Cape province of South Africa. It is situated south of the Kalahari Desert. The town Kuruman is characterised by erratic rainfalls, hot summers, poor soil structure and harsh environmental conditions with 15 inches of rainfall per year (Jacobs, 2003). This information suggests that cultivation is not a very common practice in Kuruman because of climatic and environmental conditions, thus, suggesting that livestock farming is one of the possible sources of livelihoods.

Chapter 4

4.1 Actors, institutions, relationships and histories

The survival of land reform projects is not only dependent on the policies that are being drawn by policy makers; it goes way beyond that. The beneficiaries and the implementers (extension officers) of land reform projects have different values, understandings and interests that they bring into the “intervention” land reform, than the makers of the policies. Within land reform projects conflicts arise due to these factors that are held by the beneficiaries and the implementers of land reform programme. Different illustrations (Wales and Mighty) will be used to show how actors in the policy process get into struggles over meanings, understanding, values and ideas. Patterns of inequalities, class, livelihoods strategies, and power relations that are being formed by those that are involved in land reform will also be shown in the everyday practices of the Land reform beneficiaries.

4.2 At Wales

When looking at land reform projects from a car passing by or just as a visitor who is not seeking to find anything, it can be very easy to conclude that there is not much happening in these projects. On the other hand it can also be easy to conclude that everything is as it should be in terms of the beneficiaries getting along well. Upon taking a closer look and spending some time with the land reform beneficiaries, the perception of a visitor or anybody who is looking to find out “what goes on in the land reform projects” will be changed.

On my first visit to Wales’s farm I was met by a very quite site that looks detached from the “real” world, this was made even more so by a long winding sandy road which seemed like it was going “nowhere”. On my arrival at the farm I met Loesboy the shepherd, he is responsible for working on the farm and looking after the animals, he was sitting in front of a two roomed house on a makeshift chair made from a wood stump. Next to his chair was an old looking enamel coffee mug. A few meters from where

Loesboy was sitting was a big kraal full of brown cattle. Just next to the kraal was a windmill pumping water into a nearby water reservoir and next to it was a small garden with two fruit trees and some vegetable growing in the small rows.

When we (me and the extension officer that I was going with) came out of the car, Loesboy stood up to come and meet us. His breath had a strong reek of tobacco and his hands and clothes looked soiled. He looked like he had been working with soil and water. The extension officer that I was with Mr Ranko, introduced me to Loesboy, and he told him that I was there to do a research about their project. We took a short walk around the farm while talking with Loesboy about how he and the other project members got the farm. He told me that he was recruited by Mr Tumelo, Ma Tumelo's husband, who was already together with his wife members of an already existing land reform project in their village Dinns. Loesboy say that Ma Tumelo's husband who is a cobbler in his village asked him to join the new project (Wlaes) which his wife together with her fellow members from the already existent project (Lesedi) were going to join.

Loesboy says Mr Tumelo asked him because the women in the new project (wales) needed some more men in the project to help them out with the difficult jobs as they were mostly ladies. He says Mr Tumelo could not afford to be a member of the two projects Lesedi and Wales because he also needed to be nearer to home in order to do his shoe fixing job, and for him Wales farm was too far from home to be able to continue with his job.

After the talk with Loesboy about how they got the farm and about where the other beneficiaries were, I was convinced that there is not much going on in the land reform farms. The story that I got form Loesboy made me think that all was well in the farm, and that the beneficiaries were working in harmony. After about an hour I and the extension officer prepared to leave. Before we left I told Loesboy that from the next day onwards I would be spending most of my days with him on the farm.

With regular visits to the farm, I noticed that Loesboy spent most of his days in the farm alone looking after the animals and the small garden. This scenario started to bring more question like; why had I not seen the other beneficiaries at the farm in more than one week? Who are these beneficiaries? Why is Loesboy alone in the farm and seemed not to be worried about it? At first it was hard to get all these answers form Loesboy, as he hardly talked unless he was talked to. This however got better with time. On my 17th visit to the farm Loesboy told me that they were having a farmers' day on the following day.

Early the next morning the farm that not so long ago was looking detached from the world was buzzing with activity. A group of old women, some of whom were limping were driving the cows into the kraal, two others were drawing water from an open reservoir with buckets and taking it to the small water vessel in the kraal. This was done to water the cattle.

A few meters away from the water reservoir were three young men who were busy erecting a tent for the farmers' day meeting. Next the place where the tent was being erected was a group of extension officer who were talking and laughing loudly. Everybody seemed to be in high spirit, despite the strong wind that was blowing and making the erection of the tent difficult. The three young men who were erecting the tent seemed not to be deterred by the strong wind. As the activities were going on, an extension officer who I had met at the office drove in a big red van, he was dressed differently from the other extension officers. He had blue overalls on as if he was going to do some heavy job and not attend the farmer's day. I asked Ranko my supervisor why the lady seemed so happy to see this particular extension officer, and he told me that he was the one who was working with the Wales beneficiaries when the project began. This extension officer was no longer working with Wales beneficiaries but working with the Mighty beneficiaries. He however came to the meeting as if he was the one responsible for calling the meeting, and dressed as if he still felt that Wales project was still his responsibility.

One middle aged looking woman, wearing formal clothes quickly walked towards this extension officer and kissed him on his lips. The extension officer had a short talk with the lady and he moved on to join the two old women in drawing water from the reservoir. It was this whole sight of activity around the farm that brought back the thought that; there may be after all, something that goes on in this land reform farm. This was however going to be confirmed within a few hours.

After about three quarters of an hour waiting for the tent to be erected and also waiting for the speakers of the day to arrive, the scheduled meeting which was then also half of an hour behind the scheduled time finally started. During the course of this meeting about 15 women were asked to stand up and they were introduced, congratulated and encouraged to keep on doing the good job. It turned out that these were the fellow beneficiaries with Loesboy the shepherd. After the introduction of the beneficiaries by the master of ceremony, a seemingly high spirited lady (wearing formal clothes) by the name of Marta was called upon to brief the audience about the progress of their project. It turned out she was the chairperson of the project.

Marta stood up, greeted the audience and started her speech. In her speech she said “we are very happy to be the beneficiaries of the Wales land reform project and we want to expand even beyond our current status”. The speech by Marta gave the impression that everything was going on perfectly in the farm, especially in terms of “the happiness of the beneficiaries”. After about two hours and a half, the meeting came to an end and food was served to the attendants of the farmers’ day. This allowed me time to introduce myself to the “new” beneficiaries and have some talk with them individually.

I started by introducing myself to Marta the chairperson. She emphatically greeted me and then took me around to introduce me to the other beneficiaries. She told me that some of the beneficiaries could not come because they were working and the other one Mr Nix, who is one the only two men in the project was too sick to come for the farmers’ day. After the long introduction to the beneficiaries of Wales project, I started to talk to Marta about the project and how it started. Dinky told me about how they got the farm and how

many of them were there. She told me that her aunt and some other members were mobilised by the local extension officer to apply for land through land redistribution programme. She was later invited by her aunt to join them in applying for the land, and she (Marta) also invited some of her relatives. This resulted in the project having more than ten related people.

To be able buy the land the beneficiaries had to make a contribution. The contribution had to be in money, assets or labour form. Because some of the members were not working and some were not earning enough money to make a contribution, it was decided that everyone would contribute a cows towards buying the farm. Of all the 23 members 18 could afford to contribute, but 5 of the members could not afford that. As a result it was decided that they would work on the farm by looking after the animals, as a form of contribution.

The method which was used to contribute towards the securing of the farm had in a way classified the beneficiaries into categories, and these categories were, those that had;

- Contributed assets (cows)
- Contributed labour (people that did not contribute)

According to Marta and the other beneficiaries that I talked to, it is these categories that led to “struggles” in the relationship among the beneficiaries. During my interviews with some of the members who had contributed in assets, I noticed that they were referring to the labour contributors as (batho ba ba sa ntshang sepe) “people that did not contribute anything”. This seemed to be a trend among all the beneficiaries that I talked to who had contributed assets. On the other hand the labour contributors referred to themselves together with the asset contributors as beneficiaries.

Commentary:

In my observation from the first day that I came to the farm, to the day when the farmers’ day meeting was held a lot of things had gradually unfolded. Loesboy is not only on the farm to do what he went there for (look after the animals). He is also finding means of

expanding his ways of making a living, by running a small garden in conjunction with being a shepherd and a beneficiary. Loesboy's choice of activities seems to also be influenced by the responsibility that he has back at home as the sole bread winner in the family.

Secondly, I noticed that there were relationships formations among the beneficiaries and even among some members that do not belong to the project (family members and extension officers and friends). During the course of the meeting in a speech that is given by Marta, I got the impression that all the members are getting long well and working towards one goal. I however noticed after the meeting when I was talking with Marta that some of the beneficiaries are not there and that there are categories that distinguish the beneficiaries.

There also seems to be a special relationship between the beneficiaries of the project with the old extension officer. The extension officer also showed his connection with the beneficiaries by joining them in what they are doing instead of joining his fellow colleagues.

Inception

Wales farm started to function in 2003 after the beneficiaries had been mobilised by the local extension officer to apply for land reform farms. The reason that the extension officer mobilised the "would be beneficiaries" was because it was realised that people in the villages did not know about land reform, and as a result a mandate was given by the department of Agriculture to the extension officer to make the people aware of the land reform programme. This resulted in people who were mobilised telling their friends and relatives to join them in forming a group that they would later become beneficiaries of.

Wales farm was acquired through land redistribution program (LRAD). According to the local extension officer Mr Pam, Wales was previously white owned and mainly used for cattle farming. Apart from the information that I got from Mr Pam, there is not much

known about the previous ownership of Wales. According to the farm record which I got from the extension officer the farm Wales is 1344 hectares big. The farm was stated with 55 cows and 3 bulls from the LRAD funds and an addition of 18 contributed cattle from the beneficiaries, thus making a total of a herd of 76 cattle.

Wales farm is situated about 5 Km, West of the nearest town Kuruman and about 50 km away from Dinns village where the beneficiaries come from. The initial number of the beneficiaries of Wales was 23 of which 10 are related and all of whom are staying in Dinns village. According to Marta reaching the farm is not easy for them, as none of them has a vehicle. As a result, they have to depend on hired transport to reach the farm.

Practises of Wales beneficiaries

Loesboy

Loesboy is an old man of about 60 years and also a member of Wales land reform project. He is one of the two men in the project of 21 women. Before he joined Wales land reform project, he used to be a seasonal worker in white farms during harvest time. Two times in a year Loesboy with one of his older children or his wife would go away for about two months to work in the white farms harvesting corn, raisins or cotton. He says this was the only way in which he could earn a living. Now Loesboy does not do seasonal work anymore because he is working in the farm on a full time basis.

He has seven children and only one of them is married and not dependent on him for food and accommodation, six of his children together with his four grand children and his wife are dependent on him. He says he has to work hard in order to provide for his family, hence his small garden in the farm. Loesboy spends most of his week days in Wales farm looking after the project cattle. He is being paid for looking after the livestock by other project members even though he is also a member of the project. Loesboy has a garden in the farm yard where he grows vegetables; he has planted two apricot trees. Loesboy sells his garden produce to the members of Wales land reform project, and he sends whatever

remains of the vegetables and fruit which he harvests from the garden home. This helps his family a lot because he is the only bread winner at home.

Ma Tumelo

Ma Tumelo (Mrs Tumelo) an old looking woman is one of the 23 members of the Wales land reform project. Apart from being a beneficiary of Wales, she is dependent on governmental grants for the old people which she describes as “Mandela’s money”. She says that she is staying with her four grand children whose mother is working in town and come home ever Friday. She says she is mostly kept busy by looking after these children.

I first met her when she was in the farm for a meeting about the end of the year cattle sale. When I first saw Ma Tumelo, she was sitting nearby in front of the house that Loesboy is staying in, with a big bowl full of spinach which she was washing. She said she had harvested it from Loesboy’s garden and was preparing a meal for the other members of the project who had gone into the bushes to fetch the cattle before the meeting. She was with a young boy whom she said was her grandson. The boy was in one of the rooms which looked more like a kitchen and a storeroom making fire in preparation for the cooking of the meal.

Ma Tumelo told me that she was going to leave the boy at the farm to help Loesboy because the school holidays had just started. During my talk with Ma Tumelo I started to ask her some questions about the farm. From asking these questions, I noticed that Ma Tumelo did not know much about what is happening on the farm. She was not sure about the number of cattle in the project. The excuse that she gave for not knowing much about the project was that; she hardly ever goes to the farm because of what she has to do at home (look after the grandchildren). She also gave the scarcity of transport to the farm as an excuse. She however tells me that they trust Loesboy to do a good job in teh farm by looking after the cattle.

Ma Tumelo says that, she together with the other project members usually go to the farm when there are some important occasions (farmers’ day and cattle sales meeting). She says that sometimes the extension officer transport them to and from the farm on farmers

days, when he has time. If the extension officer is not able to transport them, they hire a local van for R400, 00 to transport them; she says it is an expensive exercise for them

Furthermore Ma Tumelo said that at the end of every year, she together with the other beneficiaries get a share of the money for animals that were sold. She says that to her that is all that matters. I asked Ma Tumelo about her fellow project members that I had never seen on the farm. Though it was my first time seeing Ma Tumelo on the farm herself, she told me that the four member whose names she mentioned are lazy (those that have paid in labour), and they do not get the share of the money at the end of the year. She says this is caused by their lack of involvement in the project. She however said that their lack of involvement was caused by their lack of contribution (assets or capital) to the project.

Commentary:

Ma Tumelo voices her happiness of being a member of the project and earning money out of it. She also tells of the challenges that they face as the members of the project which are; failure to regularly be at the farm due to costs, and the lack of involvement by some other beneficiaries. She however does not say anything about the members who have contributed assets (animals) and do not come to the farm. Ma Tumelo made mention of her other form of income apart from the money from the project, thus making her to have multiple sources of livelihood. From the answers that Ma Tumelo gave about the number of animals that they have, I realised that she did not know much about the animals that they have, but trusted Loesboy to “do a good job” in looking after these animals.

Dinky the former member

Dinky is an unmarried woman with four kids who is still staying with her old ailing mother. She joined Wales farm when members were recruited by the extension offices. Before Dinky joined the Wales land reform project she was working as a cleaner in her village and as a seasonal worker in white farms which is very popular in her village. Dinky was also partly dependent on her mother’s old age pension. Dinky says she was very happy when she was invited by Marta to join the project. She thought her seasonal working days were over, and she would be able to nurse her mother full time as she

would soon be having some form of income from the new project that she would soon become a beneficiary of.

Dinky says the project soon started after she was invited and it was agreed that because she did not have money or animals to contribute she would sometimes work on the farm. She says the first few months of the project were happy and busy for most of the members, though some of the too old and the working did not show up. She says they were busy scuffling the yard in preparation of the building of a small house where the cattle feed would be kept and also where the shepherd would stay. Dinky say soon the job was done and the house which she had helped to build together with some of the other members was standing. She says she believed that after the building of the house and the scuffling in the farm she thought that she had made enough contribution.

The feeling of freedom from working for Dinky was short-lived, as she soon realised that her thoughts were totally different from the reality that she was soon to face. At first Dinky says it was fine as she felt she was doing her part, but everything changed when at the end of the year when the money for the sold cattle was being shared. Dinky says she and the other beneficiaries that had contributed labour did not get any share of the money and they had not had any consultation from the other members' concerning animal sale as it had been initially agreed. She says they tried to find out from the chairperson why they had not received their share but the chairperson ignored them As a result of this treatment she and the other three ladies that had contributed labour quit the project. Dinky is currently back to her old life of working as a seasonal worker in white farms and cleaning. WhenI asked Dinky if there was no any other way that she could at least get a share for the job that she did, she told me that the chairperson was friends with the extension officer, and there was nowhere she could report her case at.

Commentary:

In my interview with Dinky I learn that one of the evident reasons that she joined the project was, to escape having to work as a cleaner and a seasonal worker in the white

farms. She was also hoping to get more time to look after her ailing mother. It however turns out that what Dinky was hoping for as a beneficiary of Wales project did not materialise. As a result Dinky quits the project and goes back to one of her old jobs. Dinky also displayed a feeling of helplessness about where to report her case about being excluded by her fellow project members. The feeling of helpless in Dinky is brought by the fact that the chairperson who ignored her questions about why she did not a share of the money is friends with the extension officer.

Mr Nix the “stay at home” beneficiary

I first heard about Mr Nix from Marta the chairperson at the farmers’ day when she was talking about the members who did not make it to the meeting. On my regular visits to the farm I never came across Mr Nix or heard that he had been to the farm. I however developed to meet Mr Nix who seemed to only be a member in name. I asked for Mr Nix’s contacts from Marta but she told me that Mr Nix had no phones to reach him. As a result I got his home address.

On one very hot Friday morning I set out to Dinns village to look for Mr Nix. I arrived at Dinns around 10am. There my search for Mr Nix began. I met two small girls who were playing next to the road and were curiously looking at me. I asked them if they knew anyone by the name of Mr Nix, but they told me they knew no such name. I walked further into the village and met an old woman who was carrying a bunch of firewood on her head. I asked her if she knew Mr Nix, for a short she kept quite as if thinking. She then told me that it must be “Moss” the guy who sells sheep in the village. She gave me directions to where the house of this man is. I thanked the woman and went on my way to the direction which she had pointed me to.

On my arrival at the house I met a young man fixing the gate, I asked him if it was Mr Nix’s house and he confirmed my question with a nod. I went further into the yard and finally the house. I knocked on the door which was already opened and I could see from where I was standing two old men sitting on a couch inside the house. I was commanded

to come in by an old man whose whole head was covered with white hair. It later turned out that the old man with the white hair was Mr Nix.

I came into the house and greeted the two old men and introduced myself and why I had come to the house. Mr Nix welcomed me and offered me a seat. After I took a seat, Mr Nix told me that he would later in that morning leave to visit his son in another town, so he told me to be fast in asking whatever I wanted to ask. That was because he was apparently waiting for his son to show up at anytime from that moment on. I asked Mr Nix about what he had been doing before he told became a beneficiary of Wales. He told me that he used to work as a miner but he quit a long time ago because of old age. He was now dependent on the government pension and selling sheep to make a living.

I started to ask Mr Nix about the project and how they acquired it. His answer to this question was “has Marta not told you that already”? Because of the answer that I got from Mr Nix I figured that he had had contact with Marta. I then moved to the very specific question about why I had never seen him at the project. Mr Nix then told me that he is diabetic and he had to be closer to home at all times to be able to get his medication.

I asked if he was not worried that that the people at the farm might take decisions without informing him, and he said “my niece always keeps me updated on the progress of the farm”. He told me that Marta his niece was “very good and was keeping things under control at the farm”. After about half an hour with Mr Nix, a white van parked in front of his house. When Mr Nix saw the van he said to me “that is my son, I have to prepare to go now and I cannot answer anymore questions”. At that, I thanked Mr Nix and left his house.

Commentary:

Despite Mr Nix’s being a stay at home beneficiary, he still gets the share of the sold animals which the other beneficiaries who contributed labour are not getting, and he is also well updated on what happens in the farm. He trusts his niece to Marta to inform him about the farm and “keep things under control”. The relationship that Mr Nix has with his niece affords him to stay at home and still be well updated.

Mohau the extension officer

Mohau is a middle aged guy who is known for his aggression and short temperedness around the office where he is working as an extension officer. He is “on paper” the extension officer that is responsible for Wales farm, he however has delegated his job to another older extension officer in the office. Though Mohau is technically not the officer for Wales he keeps the spare key to Wales farm. Anybody in the office who has or wants to go to Wales farm has to go through Mohau to ask for the keys to the gate. In my endeavour to find out why Mohau was keeping the key, He told me that it is because he is “responsible” for the farm. Further question to Mohau about the farm were brushed away.

Commentary:

The behaviour that Mohau is displaying is that of “control” and “ownership” especially regarding his keeping of the farm gate keys.

4.3. Mighty farm

The farm Mighty lies about 50Km away from Kuruman town and about 12 Km away from the village Drieloop where most of the beneficiaries thereof are coming from. The road from Drieloop village to Mighty farm is on some parts very rocky and on the other parts very sandy. Shrubs are almost covering the road from the village until at the farm, and driving on this road is not appealing at all, getting there by a small car not possible as sand can easily hold on to the car. Using a big car to get to Mighty farm is also painstakingly slow because of the rocky and shrubby road. The first thought when driving on this road was “it requires somebody to be really desperate to decide to drive on that road or even go to that farm”.

Mighty farm was acquired by its beneficiaries through the land redistribution program in the 1999. According to some of the present beneficiaries of this farm and the local extension officer, the farm was previously white owned and was used for game, small and large stock farming. It is however not known by both the beneficiaries and the

extension officer why the previous owner sold the farm for land redistribution. The initial beneficiaries of Mighty, some of which are remaining had been mobilised by the local extension officer to apply for redistribution land. According to the local extension officer the beneficiaries were mobilised because it was noticed by the local department of Agriculture that the people around Drieloop did not know about the land reform programme, hence the mobilisation.

According to the extension officer, most of the beneficiaries are not working and only one of them is working at the mines. Though many are not working, they own livestock and are dependent on governmental grants and on their livestock for livelihoods. On the other hand some of the beneficiaries are solely dependent on governmental grants before they became beneficiaries of the Mighty project. In order for the beneficiaries to join the project, it was required that they should contribute labour, assets or capital to the project. In 1999 the farm Mighty which was to be used for goat farming was handed over to the 110 beneficiaries for ownership. However, many of the beneficiaries soon quit the project when they realised that they were not allowed to bring their private owned animals into the farm as the recruiting extension officer had told them. Only 60 beneficiaries were left as a result of others leaving the project. Seeing the number of beneficiaries dwindling down in 2002, the local extension officer started to recruit people who wanted to join the Mighty goat project. This was done to keep the project alive and to make the numbers.

The members who were recruited invited their family member and friends to join them. The friends that were invited also invited some fellow friends. Among those that were called to join the project, some did not have assets or capital to contribute, as a result it was agreed that they would work on the farm as a form of contribution. Many of the members that were recruited with an exception of a few were not working, and were dependent on the governmental grants (pension and child grants). The farm is currently owned by 86 members among which, 60 joined the project in 1999. Many of the beneficiaries of Mighty farm never had any form of formal employment, with only exception of a few, including the chairperson Ramatlho.

Practices of Mighty beneficiaries

On my first visit to the Mighty farm I had called the chairperson, whose number I got from the extension officer working with the Mighty farm beneficiaries to make an appointment. On the set date of the set date of the appointment, I went with the extension officer who gave me the chairperson's numbers to go and meet him (the chairperson). It was on the last day of the month of August and the appointment was set to be at four o'clock. The reason for this time for the appointment was because during the chairperson would be busy transporting people at the earlier hours of the day.

On the way which was apparently leading to Ramatlho's village where the meeting would be, we came across a yellowish van with a brown stripe stopped next to the road. At the back of the van there was a tall well built man who was holding the canopy door up to let some people into the back of the van. This van was facing the direction which we were coming from. A few meters after we had passed the yellowish van, the extension officer put on his brakes and pressed his car bell. The guy standing at the back of the car lifted his hand as if greeting. The extension officer reversed his car back to where the guy was standing. He told me that that man was the chairperson whom we were on our way to meet.

The extension greeted the man whom he called Ramatlho and asked him if he had forgotten about "our meeting". Ramatlho smiled and said that he had hoped he would not meet us on the way. He told the extension officer that it was too busy in town and he had not anticipated it when he agreed to have an appointment with us. Ramatlho then shook my hand in greeting and asked me to pardon him for not keeping the appointment. He told me to call him later that evening to set a new appointment for another day. During this short hurried talk, Ramatlho's car bell rang. It was the passengers in his car signalling their impatience in having to wait in the car for him. Ramatlho hurriedly said goodbye and went to his car.

Despite the disappointment in meeting with Ramatlho, the extension officer and I drove to Mighty farm. The road was long, rocky and sandy on some parts and mostly covered by shrubs from both ends. After what seemed like forever we finally arrived at the farm gate. I got off the car to open the gate and the extension officer drove in. The extension officer asked me to close the gate after he drove in. After I closed the gate I got back into the car, and we drove a few meters before we got to the second gate. Again I got off the car to open the gate again and close it after the officer drove in. I asked the extension officer why it was important to close all these gates if we would soon be leaving the farm, and he said that it was to stop the goats that were lying next to the second gate from going out of the farm.

The area around the farm looked dry, rocky and shrubby. To me it seemed like a deserted place which no animal can survive in. Just when I was having that thought, I saw a small antelope which looked like a gazelle running on the other side of the fence. Having spent some of my early years in Kuruman, I found it strange to see such an animal near a farm where people are living. From curiosity I asked the extension officer if there was anyone keeping these antelopes nearby the farm, and he told me that it was the remainder of the animals which the previous owner of the farm had left behind without knowing it.

We drove a few meters and got to the third gate. Beyond the third gate there was a very small unpainted house which looked like only one person could stay in. It had one small window and a door. I was told that it use to be the shepherd's house when the previous farmer was still there. At this gate the extension officer rang his car bell and a man came out of this house with a key in his hand. He lifted his hand to greet and then opened the gate. The extension officer asked him if there was anyone around and he nodded his head to the question that was being asked and went back into the small house.

We finally came to the fourth gate which led to the big house painted in an old looking peach colour which had began to wear off and was showing some white spots of the coating paint underneath it. A few meters from the house was a gate opposite to the one which we came in through, leading to a big kraal and a "laai kraal" which were also very

rocky. At the big peach house there was an old white van with four flat worn out tyres parked in the garage which the door of was left open.

Before we could call out to find out if there was anyone around, an old man who was looking a bit sleepy came out to meet us. He greeted us and offers us a seat on a long bench made from planks. He then sat on the wheel that was placed next to the van. The extension officer introduced me to the old man and told him what I was there for. The old man shook my hand, told me his name and welcomed me. His name was Raditamati, he told me that he was on leave from his job at the mines and was there to help the shepherd.

As we were talking the old man told me to not expect to see much around the farm. He further told me that most of his fellow project members were “not serious”. After the introductory talk, the extension officer asked the old man to show me around the house. The house had very big and spacious rooms. Though big and spacious, only two of the rooms looked like they were being used. One was a bedroom where the old man seemed to be sleeping and the other was the kitchen with a small paraffin pump stove, two pots, a few mugs, plates and spoons. There was also an old refrigerator with animal medication inside. Next to the refrigerator were six bags of what looked like animal feed.

After walking inside the house we went to outside to the room joined to the garage. It was a big smelly and relatively cold room compared to the rest of the rooms that I had been to in the house. There were some big strange looking machines which I had never seen before in this room. According to the extension officer, they were used for animal leather processing by the previous owner. These machines were however not being used anymore. After the introduction and a walk around the house we drove back.

Later that evening I called Ramatlho to try and set a new appointment. Ramatlho told me that he would be available the next morning, and I would find him in his village because some members of the community and some Mighty farm beneficiaries would be dipping their small stock at the communal dipping tank. The next morning we drove again with the extension officer to Ramatlho’s village. As promised we found Ramatlho

at the dipping tank with a lot of the other people from the community. Ramatlho seemed to be a very popular guy among the community, as he was the one saying a lot about what had to be done.

He did not have much time to talk to me as he was busy dipping and talking to the extension officer. It later turned out that Ramatlho's van was being used to fetch water for dipping. The dipping went on for a very long time that Ramatlho sent a small boy to buy a litre of cold drink. The sun was scorching hot at that time. When the boy came back with the drink Ramatlho went and took out two disposable tumblers from his van. He gave one to the extension officer and took the other. They both had each a drink and then gave to a fat lady standing by, who seemed to be Ramatlho's wife. The drink was soon finished.

After about nine hours the dipping came to an end. Then I thought I would finally have time to talk to Ramatlho, but before I could say much, the extension officer told me that it was time to leave because it was already beyond office hours and it was for the second day in a row. As a result I scheduled another meeting with Ramatlho which would be a week later. When I finally met Ramatlho we managed to talk about his project.

Ramatlho the chairperson

Ramatlho a very outspoken man is the chairperson of Mighty goat project. He lives in a "better" house compared to most people in his village Drieloop. His house is much bigger than a lot of houses in his village and painted in bright green. Painted house are seldom seen in this village, as most are built from mud or just built from cement bricks but not even plastered. Ramatlho used to be a mine worker until he quit in 1995 due to ill health. When he came home after quitting his job at the mines he used his pension funds to buy a bakkie, which he uses to transport the local people for a charge to and from town, which lies about 50Km away from his village.

Among all the beneficiaries of Mighty goat project it is only Ramatlho the chairperson who has a van. As a result he is the one responsible for transporting animal feeds and medications to the farm. He gets paid from the project funds for transporting animal feeds medication to the farm. In order to reach the farm most of the other beneficiaries have to either walk to the farm, and those that are lucky enough use donkey carts. This makes reaching the farm very difficult for those beneficiaries who do not own any means of transport.

Ramatlho was among the beneficiaries that joined the farm in 2002. He says he joined because he was aware of the benefit that farming in goats can bring. When he joined the project he did not quit his weekly job of transporting people to town. When I asked Ramatlho why he was still transporting people even when he was “aware of the benefits that farming in goats can bring” he said: “I have survived for years on transporting people and I make a living out of it. I cannot stop now”. Ramatlho is now the chairperson of Mighty farm and he has also brought in his daughter and wife to be beneficiaries in the Mighty goat project.

In an interview that I had with Ramatlho about his experiences since he became the beneficiary, he told me that everything had been going on well but some members were not cooperative. I asked him if he could specify which members were not cooperative but he declined to tell me saying it is an inside case. Though Ramatlho was not very open about the non co-operative members, he was referring to those that contributed labour as “owing the project”. When I asked him why he was referring to the labour contributors as ‘owing the project’, he told me that it was the easiest way of describing them.

In another meeting that I had with Ramatlho, he told me that they were having problems with some of the old members that had left the project in 2000 and 2001. He said that were continually bringing the fence down in order to make an entry into the farm to collect fire wood. When I asked him if he or any other present member of the project had caught anyone doing that he said no. He was however adamant that it was the old members doing that because they were “jealous” of them making progress in the farm.

Commentary:

In the interview that I had with Ramatlho it was clear that having a job while being a project beneficiary is very important to him. He also is interested in the benefits that are brought by farming. This gives the impression that Ramatlho is interested in multiple ways of making a living.

Angelina the former member

Angelina is a resident of Drieloop village and she used to be a member of Mighty goat project. She is now no longer part of the group; she quit the project because she sees no reason to stay. When the new members were recruited in 2002 she also joined, she joined because one of the members of Mighty goat project had asked her to join the project. Because she did not have goats or money to contribute, she worked on the farm looking after the goats, together with other member who had the same situation. They rotated in looking after the goats. Angelina says *“the work was tiring because we had to walk long distances from the village to the farm, but she was determined to make it work”*.

Angelina says in 2003 Ramatlho’s wife and daughter who contributed goats were introduced to the project as beneficiaries. With the coming of the two new members, she and the others who were looking after the goats were hoping they would soon get help in “rotational goat herding” from Ramatlho’s daughter and wife. This time never came for Angelina and the others who had not contributed assets to the project. Angelina says during the time that she spent at the project, she has only seen Ramatlho’s wife twice on the farm, when she and her daughter were being introduced to the group and when they had beneficiaries meeting. She says she is not sure about where Ramatlho’s daughter is as she had heard from some people that she is staying in Johannesburg. Though Angelina does not know about the whereabouts of Ramatlho’s daughter, she says she knows that in October 2003 Ramatlho’s daughter was sent for a short financial management course by the department of Agriculture in order to empower the Mighty project. She says they have never benefitted from the course that the girl took because she has never come back to the farm to give a report of the course that she took.

Early 2004 Angelina quit the project with her friend Bontle because they felt that they were being over worked. Angelina says that Bontle is now working as a domestic worker in town and she (Angelina) is not working, she is dependent on the governmental child grant which she gets for her two children.

Commentary:

Angelina joined the project because she was looking for a way of making a living. It seems that her friend Bontle also had the same goal. Things did not go as they had hope that they would go. As a result the two ladies quit the project. Both Angelina and her friend Bontle have found alternative ways of making a living. Angelina has resorted to government grants while her friend got a job as a domestic worker.

Raditamati the old member

Raditamati is one of the first members to join Mighty land redistribution project in 1999, and even today he is still a member though he still works in the mine. He says he has always had a love for farming and spent most of his childhood herding his father's animals. When he grew older he had animals of his own and a job as a miner.

When on leave and during most weekends, Raditamati spends his time at the farm because he has no one to go home to. He says joining the project was convenient for him because his wife passed away and he could not keep his animals at home anymore because there would be no one to look after them. His children are married and he cannot depend on them to look after his animals. Because of his wife's death he sold most of his animals and remained with only a few which he contributed to the project. Raditamati says being part of Mighty was more like a "blessing" for him. He says he can now go back to work in the mines with a clear conscience knowing that the animals that he contributed are well looked after by other members.

Commentary:

Raditamati's story shows his passion for farming and a will to still keep his job as a miner. The story also shows how Raditamati is depending on his fellow project members to look after the animals while he is away working in the mines. The way that Raditamati talked of his animals being looked after by the other members gave the impression that he does not really see the animals that he contributed as communal property but as still personally his. This further gives the impression that if Raditamati should leave his job as a mine he might want to take all his animals and go back to the village with them.

The extension officer

In an interview that I had with Muzi the extension officer responsible for Mighty farm about the progress in the project, he told me that he has not seen any improvement since he began working with the Mighty beneficiaries. Muzi says he used to work with the Wales project before he moved to Mighty and he says the beneficiaries of Wales were more dedicated than those of Mighty. He says the reason that there is no improvement at mighty farm is because the beneficiaries thereof are not willing to work together. When I asked him what makes him think that the beneficiaries were not willing to work together, he said that it was because they always had a low responded to calls for meetings and were generally lazier when compared to the beneficiaries of Wales project.

Roiland

Finding the beneficiaries on the farm was almost close to impossible; as a result I had to ask the few members that I had interviewed to tell me where the other members were staying. I found out through Angelina that there were a few beneficiaries that I could find in the village. She gave me the name of a woman called Mpho, and she told me where I could find her. A week after I got Mpho's name I went out to look for her. When I got to the house which I had been directed to I introduced myself and asked to see Mpho.

The lady that I talked to told me that Mpho had left her home some four weeks ago with the truck that takes seasonal labourers to the white farms in Upington, which is about 300km from Drieloop village. As I left Mpho's house I was ready to go back. Just when I was about to reach the gate of the village FSU (farmer support unit) an agric office in the

village where I had to wait for transport, I came across an old man who was walking towards the same direction as me. He asked me if there was anybody available at the office and I told him that there was no one but he could come around four when the extension officer would come to fetch me.

As a result of the little chat I ended up asking the old man if he knew anybody who was a beneficiary of Mighty farm either than the popularly known Ramatlho. The old man answered enthusiastically and walked with me towards the house of a man called Rooiland. When I reached Rooiland's house the old man went straight on and wished me well.

I walked towards the unfenced two roomed house with a very low door, two small windows which were stuffed with old rags and was built from clay bricks and covered/plastered with red mud. In front of the house were a woman and a small boy eating boiled maize from a big yellow enamel mug. The maize seemed like it had been preserved because it was not on the husk anymore. Not far from the house about two meters to the side was an almost dying open fire made from cow dung, and there was a small three legged black pot standing in the middle of the fire.

I greeted the woman and the boy and asked if I was at Rooiland's place. The woman confirmed and asked if I wanted to see him, and I said yes. The woman went into the douse and brought me an old 20 litre empty paint drum for me to sit on. She then went back into the house and brought me a small mug filled with boiled corn. She told me that Rooiland had gone to the shop to buy boxer (cheap tobacco) and he would soon be back.

I waited for sometime eating boiled corn while waiting for Rooiland to return. Within what seemed like 25 minutes of waiting, a huge looking man came towards the house wearing old heavy duty boots, usually worn by builders. His arms were covered with self drawn tattoos and his face looked like he had spent much of his life in the sun. His face which looked like it used to have a fair complexion looked red as if from sunburn. The woman told me that it was her husband Rooiland. When the man finally reached the house, his wife introduced me to him and told him that I had been waiting for him.

I also re-introduced myself to Rooiland and told him what I had come for. Rooiland sat flat on the ground next to his wife and kid and started to prepare for a smoke. As he was busy preparing he was talking to me about the project. He finally finished preparing his smoke and smoked for a while before passing the smoke to his wife. In my interview with Rooiland I asked him about his experience with the project. Rooiland told me of how he and the other members were recruited in 2002 by a lady called Anna who was one of the first beneficiaries of Mighty farm. He says a lot of things were not explained by Anna, but only that they had to contribute labour, assets or capital.

Rooiland says he felt that it was a good proposal but he did not have anything apart from labour to contribute. He says he was however desperate to join and wanted to make good contribution, and as a result asked his brother who works in the white farms to loan him a goat. Rooiland says he got the goat and contributed it to the project. He says as time went on they were asked to contribute a monthly amount of R50.00 which he says he could not afford to pay monthly. He says he says he was even more worried because he felt that even if could afford to pay that money part of it would be used to feed Ramatlho's personally owned goats which are always around the farm.

Rooiland said that Ramatlho's goats which are not shared with the project members are also always outside second farm gate within the farm browsing there. He said that he was not ready to make another man rich while he struggled. Rooiland says he quit the project in 2005 and took his brother's goat and the four already grown goats which the goat gave birth to while at the farm. He says he gave back to his brother the two young goats and kept the one which his brother had given to him together with the other two. Rooiland says that the goats have now grown to five and he is hoping that they will grow even more. After the interview with Rooiland I asked him if he knew of any other beneficiaries that had quit the project that I could talk to, he told me that the few that he knew of had gone to work in Upington as seasonal workers. At this I thanked Rooiland and left.

Commentary:

Rooiland seems to have been genuinely interested in being a member of the project, but some things which later came up like having to pay a monthly subscription of R50.00 and the thought that Ramatlho benefits more than the other beneficiaries causes him to leave the project. Rooiland seems to think that he can now make it on his own by rearing his own goats.

Dorkie, Ramatlho's wife

Dorkie is a very hard woman to find. After about 2 months of trying to find Dorkie, I finally met her in town in her husband's van in the afternoon. When I first met her, Dorkie was sitting in the front seat of her husband's car with a small tub of ice cream in her hand which she was eating. Dorkie is a short and fat, dark woman with a very sharp voice. She works as a cleaner in one of the supermarkets in town, and she travels there every morning with her husband.

In my interview with Dorkie, I started by asking her of her experience in the farm, and she told me that everything was well. When I asked her about the relationship with the other members, she told me that they were all working together well as they were hoping to achieve one goal. As the interview continued, I asked Dorkie if she was managing to do her daily job and still managed to visit the farm. Dorkie told me that there was really not much need of going to the farm for her as her husband was already doing that for her. She says she works from Monday to Sunday, though she works half days on Sunday and she always goes back home tired.

Dorkie says when she is on leave she tries to get as much rest as possible because her job as a cleaner in a supermarket is demanding. I asked Dorkie about her daughter who was said to be a beneficiary of the project, she told me that she and her husband had decided to send their daughter to a computer course in Johannesburg and had decided that she would for the time being be out of the project. When I asked her if they had informed the other members about this decision, Dorkie said it was not necessary. She gave the reason

that her husband goes to the farm almost every weekend and does most of the job there while the other members seldom go to the farm.

Commentary:

Some points emerged from the interview that I had with Dorkie. She started by giving me the impression that everything was well at the farm, but as the interview continued she told me that she does not see the need to go to the farms as she is almost always busy with her work and because her husband is working in the farm at most times. The talk about Dorkie's daughter who is for the time being out of the project shows that some decisions which affect the project are sometimes kept away from the other members by Dorkie and her husband. According to Dorkie this behaviour of not telling the other beneficiaries about the decisions taken is qualified by the fact that Ramatlho works a lot at the farm. From this interview I got the impression that Dorkie is interested in being the member of the project but not interested in working in the project.

4.4 Discussion: Locating policies in every day practices

Through observation and interviewing the beneficiaries of Wales land redistribution project, it is evident that there indeed is a lot going on in the farm. Values, understandings and meanings were seen to be pitched among and against fellow beneficiaries and also against the land reform policy. The cases of both Mighty and Wales farms shows how beneficiaries and policy makers come into contact at the interface "land reform projects" which are used as tools through which the policy goals and objectives are to be realised.

It is at the interface (land reform projects) and spaces which are the farms that the different actors from different life worlds get into struggles over their interlocking projects. The following paragraph discusses the patterns which were seen to be prevailing in the studied farms.

The different beneficiaries in the projects showed the different values, goals, interests, meanings and perceptions that they hold about being beneficiaries. From having

interview and observing what the beneficiaries were doing it became evident that; Some of were more interested in staying at home and just calling themselves beneficiaries, others were more interested in working and using their free time to be involved in the projects. The others seemed to have joined the projects only seeking to solely make livelihoods.

Some of the relationships that were formed among the beneficiaries seem to suggest that, family members had first priority during the recruiting. The other suggestion is that, the other members were recruited to make the project viable through numbers, and to make it not to look like a family project. Through this the project became viable yet family dominated, thus making the other beneficiaries a rented crowd which was recruited to increase the numbers.

Because some of the beneficiaries could not afford to contribute in assets or capital, they had to contribute in labour. This led to a decision that the labour contributors would work on the farm for some time, while those who had contributed assets and capital would be exempted from working on the farm. This gives the meaning that those who had assets and capital had free labour from those who did not have assets and capital.

The relationships that are formed among the beneficiaries seem to have a pattern to them. When listening to and observing the beneficiaries some patterns of behaviour in relationships is displayed. The beneficiaries that had contributed in assets and capital displayed a pattern of behaviour by referring to those that had not as lazy and not serious about the project. This pattern seemed to have been adopted by almost all the beneficiaries that I had talked to who had contributed assets and capital.

From this discussion, it shows that the beneficiaries of land reform have different values, meanings, understandings, perceptions and interests in regard to land reform. As a result they each put their agency to work by re-defining what land reform means to them, which is not necessarily in accordance with what the policy states. The objective of the agricultural policy was “to ensure equitable access to agriculture and promote the contribution of agriculture to the development of all communities, society at large and the

national economy, in order to enhance income, food security, employment and quality of life in a sustainable manner”. Furthermore the objective of the land policy was “to contribute to economic development, both by giving households the opportunity to engage in productive land use and by increasing employment opportunities through encouraging greater investment”, (white paper, 1995) through the land reform programmes.

This then proves what Einstein in Midgley (1989) stated that there are two forms of knowledge that exist, the one in the book he described as “lifeless” and the one in the consciousness of people that he described as “alive”. In this study it shows that the policy becomes lifeless while the beneficiaries “bring to life” what they feel is right for them.

Chapter5: Conclusion

Land reform in South Africa is much more than what meets the eye. There is a lot happening on land reform farms, with different people of different understanding, values and interests. At the social space called “land reform projects” there are many and different things happening, the different actors who come from different life-worlds and often conflicting ideas of development, interests, values and power relations come into contact. It is at this stage that there arises a struggle between the different ideas, interest and values and where power struggles come into action (among the internal actors themselves, who are the beneficiaries and also between the external actors who are the policy makers and the internal actors). At this point, the external actors in this social space “land reform projects” put their own agency to work, by reshaping, rejecting, transforming or accepting the programme land reform which was designed by external actors for them, thus confirming what Long (1989) said about the beneficiaries that; they do not “limit their perceptions of reality and its problems simply to those defined for them by the intervening agency as constituting the ‘project’”.

While involved in the struggle of reshaping and manoeuvring the proposed intervention, internal actors also get into struggles among themselves as well. These struggles as Long (2004) suggests, are caused by different understandings, meanings and interests, and thus leading to a “struggle over social meanings and practices among the beneficiaries. As Koponen (2004) has suggested, development policies are formulated with the thought that they will be accepted by the target group as ideal, “desirable and worth pursuing”, and “good for all”.

From studying the land reform projects in Kuruman it was clear that social actors who are local and external to specific arenas are interlocked in struggles over “resources, meanings and institutional legitimacy and control” as it had been suggested by Long in his study of actor oriented approach. McGee’s “knowledge encounter” in which some actors try to win other actors into their “projects” was also seen to be evident.

The actions that were taken by the implementers and the beneficiaries of land reform in the studied were deviating from what has been stipulated in the land reform policy. This suggests that these actors are involved in a struggle over the meanings which were suggested by the policy, thus they did what seemed to be right and doable for them. The findings of these study suggests that as it has already been found by Long and Koponen that there is therefore a need to move away from a linear and ideological interpretation of policies (as expressed in policy documents, which came with a set of prescriptions about how things should be done and what would be good for the beneficiaries of the land reform projects) to a methodological one where we situate policies in everyday lives and practices of the beneficiaries.

References:

- ADEY, S. (2007) A journey without maps: Towards sustainable subsistence agriculture in South Africa. S.l.: s.n. Wageningen University
- ANDERSON, J. A. (1999) "The Politics of Land Scarcity: Land disputes in Save communal Area, Zimbabwe. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 25, 553-578.
- BERRY, S. (1989) "Access, control and Use of Resources in African Agriculture: An Introduction. *African*, 59, 1-5.
- BOLDING, J. A. (2004). In hot water: a study on socio-technical intervention models and practices of water use in smallholder agriculture, Nyanyadzi catchment, Zimbabwe. Wageningen University and Research Centre. The Netherlands.
- BRADSTOCK, A. (2005) Key experiences of Land reform in the Northern Cape Province of South Africa. London, FARM-Africa
- COUSINS, B. (2005). Agrarian reform and the 'two economies': transforming South Africa's countryside. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS).
- DEININGER, K. (1999). Making negotiated land reform work: Initial experience from Columbia, Brazil and South Africa. *World Development*, 27(4), 651-672.
- DEININGER, K. & MAY, J. (2000) "Can there be growth with equity? An initial assessment of land reform in South Africa"; April 2000 World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No.2451
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AFFAIRS (DLA). (1997). White paper on South African land policy: Republic of South Africa Pretoria
- DU TOIT, P. (2004) The great South African Land Scandal. Centurion, South Africa. Legacy Publications
- HALL, R. (2004) Land and Agrarian report in South Africa: status report. IN GOVERNMENT, W. C. S. O. (Ed. Cape Town, PLAAS.
- HALL, R. and LAHIFF, E. (2004) Policy Brief No.13 (August 2004) Debating Land Reform and Rural Development; Budgeting For Land Reform: PLAAS
- HALL, R. AND WILLIAMS, G. (2000) Land reform in South Africa: problems and prospects. Paper presented at the conference on Southern Africa's evolving security architecture: Prospects and problems. Gaborone, Botswana.
- HARDIN, G. (1968) *The Tragedy of the Commons*. American Association for

the Advancement of Science. Vol. 162. No 3859, pp. 1243 - 1248

- JACOBS, N. (2003) *Environment power and Injustice: A South African History*. Cambridge and New York. Cambridge University Press
- JACOBS, P. LAHIFF, E. and HALL, R. (2003) Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. *An occasional paper series. PLAAS*. September 2003.
- James, D. (2007) *Gaining Ground? 'Rights' and 'Poverty' in South African Land Reform*. South Africa, Johannesburg: Wits University Press
- KARIUKI, S and VAN DER WALT, L. (2000) Land reform in South Africa: Still waiting. *Southern African Report*, Vol. 15, 3.
- KEPE, T. (1999) The problem of defining 'community': challenges for the land reform programme in rural South Africa. *PLAAS*. 01 Mach 1999 ed., Routledge.
- KOPONEN, J. (2004) Development Intervention and Development Studies; in Kontinen (ed), *Development Intervention: Actor and Activity Perspective, Journal of South Asian Development* 1(2):273
- LAHIFF.E. (2007a) *Land Reform and Poverty in South Africa*. Cape Town. PLAAS
- LAHIFF, E. (2007b) *Redistributive Land Reform and Poverty Reduction in South Africa*. Cape Town, PLAAS.
- LONG, N. (2004) Actors, Interfaces and Development Intervention: Meanings, purposes and Powers; in Kontinen, T. (ed): *Development Intervention: Actors and Activity Perspectives*; University of Helsinki, pp 14-36
- LONG, N. (2001) *Development Sociology: Actor perspective*, London, United Kingdom, Routledge.
- LONG, N. L. A. (1992) *Battle Fields of Knowledge: The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social research and Development*, Routledge.
- MCCUSKER, B. (2004) Land use and Cover change as an Indicator of Transformation on recently redistributed Farms in Limpopo Province, South Africa *Human Ecology*, Volume 32, 49-72.
- MIDGLEY, M. (1989) *Wisdom, Information and Wonder: What is knowledge for?* London, Routledge.

- NTSEBEZA, L. A. H., R. (2004) *The Land Question in South Africa: The challenge of Transformation and redistribution*, Cape Town, South Africa, HSRC Press.
- ROSSET, P. PATEL. R. and COURVILLE, M. (2006) *Promised Land: Competing Visions of Agrarian Reform*. Food First Books.
- RUSSEL, H.B. (1995) *Research Methods in Anthropology*. London AltaMira press.
- TELLIS, W. (1997) Application of a Case Study Methodology. *The Qualitative Report*. September 1997 ed. Fairfield.
- TROJMAN, S. (2005) what is a policy? Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, The Caledon institute of social policy.
- WAGERIF, M. (2004) A critical appraisal of South Africa's market-based land reform policy: The case of the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme in Limpopo. PLAAS, School of Government, University of the Western Cape: Cape Town; South Africa.
- WALKER, C. (2003) Piety in the Sky? Gender Policy and Land Reform in South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, Volume 3, 113-148.