

Ben Cousins, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. May 2000. Strictly not for citation without the author's permission.

DOES LAND AND AGRARIAN REFORM HAVE A FUTURE? AND IF SO, WHO WILL BENEFIT?

In South Africa after apartheid, the land question retains a powerful symbolic and material charge, generated by the long history of dispossession and continuing widespread rural poverty and inequality. There is also a widespread politics of land, and by extension, of farming and livelihoods. At the same time, land and agrarian reform is politically marginal to the concerns of the ANC and the government (Bernstein 1997: 26).

Land and agrarian reform at the crossroads

These conference proceedings are published at a time of extraordinary fluidity and uncertainty as to the future of the ambitious programmes of land and agrarian reform¹ initiated by the first democratic government in 1994. A number of fundamental questions are currently being asked within the sector:

- What is the future of land and agrarian reform in South Africa in the 21st century? Some observers assert that the ANC government has effectively jettisoned land reform, without actually announcing this decision to the world at large. If “agrarian questions”, including but not limited to questions as to the nature and distribution of land rights, are seen as marginal by those holding state power, then what are the implications for rural people, for land activists, and for the politics of land and agriculture in democratic South Africa?
- Alternatively, will land and agrarian reform be re-oriented so that its central focus is the fostering of a class of small, medium and large scale black commercial farmers? If so, will government attempt to alleviate rural poverty primarily through welfare programmes and expanded social services rather than through the transfer of productive assets and support for wealth-creating productive activity?
- If at least *some* elements of land and agrarian reform continue to be oriented to the needs of the rural poor, what lessons from the first five years need to inform the design and implementation of more effective policies and programmes?

These are challenging questions, but important ones to seek answers to. The papers in this collection may assist in such efforts, despite significant shifts in the political context between the early months of 1999, when the papers were written, and February 2000, as these proceedings go to press. The most obvious difference, of course, is the appointment of a new Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Thoko Didiza (formerly Deputy Minister of Agriculture). However,

¹ Land reform involves the redistribution of land, a consequent change in the structure of land holdings, and the redefinition of the character and legal status of land rights. Agrarian reform, on the other hand, connotes a fundamental transformation in the social and political relations which underpin systems of production, and thus involves changes in the balance of power between different classes in the countryside. It has a wider scope than programmes of developmental support to those who benefit from land reform ie. rural development (Levin and Neocosmos 1997; Wildschut and Hulbert 1998; Bernstein 1997).

the policy implications of this change in leadership are only just beginning to emerge, with the Minister announcing a major new policy thrust on February 11th 2000 (see below).

Some of the key policy questions are discussed in this introduction, which describes the context within which the Land and Agrarian Reform Conference of July 1999 was organized, and summarises the key issues addressed in the papers collected here

The political context of the conference

The conference was organized in the run-up to the second democratic elections of May 1999, and timed to coincide with the coming to office of a new political leadership within the country. There were indications that the concerns of rural people might be beginning to be understood by electioneering politicians, and some speculated that rural development might become an important political issue. An alliance of rural NGOs was organizing the Rural Development Initiative – a process to enable rural people to be mobilized and their demands to be expressed – which culminated in April 1999 in a national convention and publication of the Rural People’s Charter (see Greenberg, this volume). Land reform policy was also in flux, and there were indications of an emerging openness on the part of officials to new ideas and different approaches. The conference was intended as an opportunity for government and non-governmental agencies, together with researchers and policy analysts, to critically assess past experience and to debate the way forward.

The land sector has always been characterized by lively and public arguments over policy, and some of the central and recurring themes of the previous five years of debate were expected to surface at the conference. One of these is whether or not the ANC has the “political will” to seek to radically alter agrarian power relations and the distribution of resources that underlies them. The Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) of 1994 called for a wide-ranging and redistributive land reform², portrayed as the central driving force behind a large scale rural development programme. Since then the effective displacement of the RDP by the Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy (GEAR) and the derisory budget for land reform since 1994/5 (never more than one percent of the total budget) have called this commitment into question. Is government’s oft-repeated statement (most recently in President Mbeki’s state of the nation address of February 2000), that it intends to eliminate rural poverty, only a rhetorical gesture?

It has become increasingly clear that the primary orientation of economic policy is towards creating favourable conditions for local and foreign investment in industry and tourism, and attaining international competitiveness – these being seen as the key to job creation and rising incomes. In this context land reform may well be viewed by key decision makers in government as at best a “welfarist” programme to “alleviate” poverty, and agrarian change may be equated with

² The RDP’s goal of redistributing 30 percent of commercial farmland within five years has now been accepted as wildly unrealistic, and can be understood as a rhetorical gesture rather than as a serious political commitment. However, the necessity of wide scale redistribution of land in order to overcome the legacy of forced overcrowding in the former Bantustans (ie. “going beyond the 13 percent” of land allocated to blacks in the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936) is still seen by many as necessary and fundamental to agrarian reform.

enabling the emergence of a class of small scale commercial farmers – the rural equivalent of “black empowerment” in mining and industry.

The tension between issues of “production” and those of “equity, rights and historical redress” has bedeviled the land reform programme from its inception – and it may be that the ANC has increasingly seen the latter as secondary goals, if not unaffordable luxuries, in the primary drive towards economic growth. Against this backdrop, the economic dimensions of land and agrarian reform, viewed by some as perhaps the key to winning greater political support for the programme, became a central theme which the conference aimed to discuss.

Another was the design and implementation of the three key sub-programmes of land restitution, redistribution and tenure reform, as set out in the 1997 White Paper on Land Policy, together with the lack of integration of these with agricultural support services or other rural development policies. These sub-programmes have been the subject of heated debate over the past five years, with many critics pointing out their inherent limitations (as a result, for example, of constitutional constraints, inadequate capacity, budgetary limits, structural problems within government, and problematic assumptions as to the beneficial effects of market deregulation, the role of law in social change, and the nature of “community” and “household”).

By mid-1999 the tension between the limitations, on the one hand, and the ambitious goals of these programmes, on the other, had become so severe that a fundamental re-thinking of many aspects of policy was clearly necessary. This was widely recognized in the rural sector – despite the significant increases in delivery of land under both redistribution and restitution which were beginning to be evident in the annual reports of the Department of Land Affairs (DLA).

It was also clear that senior decision makers in the DLA had begun to confront these issues themselves, partly as a result of self-critical internal reviews and partly due to continuing critique and pressure from land NGOs, and in part, from rural people. A Ministerial Review of land restitution had been completed, and far-reaching changes in the administration of the programme were initiated in 1999. A systematic attempt to adjust redistribution policies and procedures to achieve a better fit between complex rural realities and the “products” of the department was under way (see Levin, this volume), and the issue of integration and improved co-ordination within government at large was acknowledged as crucial if more equitable access to land was to serve the goals of agrarian reform and meaningful rural development. Long-delayed legislative proposals on tenure reform in the former “homelands” were tabled and discussed internally. Decentralisation of decision making within the DLA, so that the enormous diversity of conditions across the country could be dealt with at provincial and district level, and to enable effective integration (eg. of land reform and agricultural support services) was well under way.

Budgetary and capacity constraints continued to frame all these efforts, however. Thus, in relation to tenure reform, doubts were expressed by some officials as to the wisdom of attempting to legislate on land rights in the so-called “communal areas”, and to intervene in a complex political terrain (in relation to the powers of chiefs), without a clear political commitment by the ANC, without an expansion of staff capacity to implement legislation, and without an adequate budget.

By mid-1999, then, the institutional environment within which land reform was being implemented was in a state of flux, and the degree of political commitment by the new government remained unclear. The conference took place two months after the new Minister had been appointed, and was potentially an ideal forum for a vigorous exchange of views on future directions. The fact that Ms Didiza agreed to open the conference was a positive sign; disappointingly, she stayed only for one full presentation and did not return³.

The eight months following the Minister's appointment have been characterized by a disconcerting lack of information and inadequate public communication, and there has been widespread confusion over where land and agrarian reform is heading. Although little hard data have been available, there appears to have been a continuing improvement in delivery of restitution, but a dramatic slowing down in the redistribution programme (due to a moratorium on new projects and an internal review of previous policies), and a placing "on hold" of the tenure reform process. This period has also seen the surfacing of internal tensions within the Department of Land Affairs and speculation as to their origins in political rivalries within the ANC⁴, the exodus of senior officials appointed under the previous Minister (Derek Hanekom), and rumours of fundamental policy shifts, as well as (thus far unsubstantiated) stories of growing inefficiency in the processing of submissions. However, in the absence of transparency or open discussion by those in the know it has been difficult to sort rumour from reality.

Integrated rural development

In September 1999 government announced a new programme of integrated rural development, and President Mbeki re-affirmed its importance at the opening of parliament in February 2000. However, details of the programme have not been released, and information on what precisely government has in mind is still hard to come by. NGOs and rural development organizations outside of government have not been consulted or informed, and "an atmosphere of unease pervades the rural sector" (Greenberg 1999: 14).

According to Greenberg (*ibid*: 12) one component of the new programme may be a co-operation agreement between the Ministry of Land Affairs and Agriculture and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), which is focused on agriculture and agro-processing, improved extension services, rehabilitation of irrigation schemes, and reform of communal tenure systems (which is reported to include the leasing of land to foreign investors by chiefs). Greenberg reports that government officials have revealed in interviews that the programme will be piloted in three provinces (the Eastern Cape, Kwazulu-Natal and Northern Province) and in the first two of these will work in regions which fall within government's Spatial Development Initiative (SDI) zones (*ibid*: 12-13). Improved integration and co-ordination of government delivery are said to form a central focus.

³ Conference organizers went to great lengths to secure the participation of senior officials in the Departments of Land Affairs and of Agriculture, but only some attended. They also extended invitations to Directors General or their Deputies in other departments with rural development responsibilities (eg. Water Affairs and Forestry, Environmental Affairs and Tourism, Constitutional Development), but none participated. This prompted some at the conference to ask: "is government truly interested in the views of civil society"?

⁴ See "A struggle rooted in the land" by Howard Barrell, Mail and Guardian January 7-13, 2000.

Recent newspaper reports suggest that five government departments (mineral and energy, housing, public works, provincial and local government, and land affairs and agriculture) have formed a cluster to be charged with formulating a rural development strategy (Business Day of 3/2/2000). With the relief of poverty as its focus, the programme will focus on infrastructure and the promotion of “viable economic projects”. As yet it is unclear what contribution land reform is envisaged as making to rural development.

New policy directions announced in February 2000

On the 11th February 2000 a major policy announcement by Minister Didiza outlined new strategic directions for the land reform programme. The proposals were thin on detail, and referred to further guidelines and policy frameworks to be developed in future. Certain components of the existing land reform programme were confirmed, others were subjected to criticism and modification, and some major new thrusts were outlined.

The detailed proposals will clearly be subjected to close scrutiny by land activists and analysts, and will no doubt generate heated debate. At this early stage only a preliminary assessment can be offered, but it is clear that two key components, the *new redistribution grants* and *tenure reform*, are going to prove highly controversial.

Some elements of the new thrust, however, are likely to be met with widespread approval. For example, the limitations of the R16 000 Settlement and Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) are clearly identified, building on the insights of previous reviews initiated in Derek Hanekom’s time, as indicated above. These include over-reliance on the market as a mechanism within redistribution. The statement that a supply-led approach will now be piloted is likely to be welcomed, as is the continued disaggregation of the diverse needs of different groups of people intended to benefit from land reform. This will allow room for the further refinement of land reform programmes and “products” (cf Levin, this volume).

Other aspects likely to be welcomed by many in the land sector include a commitment to speeding up the restitution process, an emphasis on enhancing the developmental potential of both restitution and the Extension of Security of Tenure Act, an extension of the time period for labour tenant claims, and a review of equity share schemes. In line with previous thinking, the statement emphasises that land reform must be fully integrated into government’s rural development programme, requiring joint planning and better co-ordination with other departments.

Much more problematic is the addition of a grant system aimed at gradually changing the (racial) structure of South African agriculture by creating opportunities for emergent black commercial farmers. There will be three new “redistribution windows”, at different scales, with the grant contributing different proportions of land acquisition costs. Although it is difficult to evaluate their practical feasibility at this stage, the proposal gives rise to several concerns.

Emergent farmers are legitimate beneficiaries of land reform, and have probably not been well served by the programme to date. Thus it is not the addition of a grant for full-time black farmers, operating at different scales, which is problematic. The key issue, rather, is the balance of resource

allocation between this *relatively* well-off, but currently small interest group, and the millions of poor households living either in the former Bantustans or on commercial farms. Optimistic estimates of the number of potential emergent farmers range between 20 000 and 30 000 (and skeptics will, no doubt, put it at a much smaller number). Compared to the bulk of the rural poor, this is a tiny fraction of those in need of land for improving their incomes – at best less than 2 percent. Thus any allocation of funds to this group (from the very limited budget for land redistribution) larger than, say, 10 percent of the total, would not seem justified if the primary goal of land and agrarian reform to address deep poverty and inequality.

The balance in resource allocation envisaged by government is not at all clear at present, and urgently needs to be addressed. The Minister's announcement is ambiguous as to priorities – although occasionally it does assert that the core business of the Department of Land Affairs remains “land redistribution to the landless poor”.

The second concern in relation to the redistribution grants is the sharp and entirely false dichotomy drawn in the document between commercial, “market based” agriculture, on the one hand, and farming as a “food safety net” (read: “subsistence farming”), on the other. With a lineage as old as early colonialism, this stereotype of African agriculture attempts to separate the mass of “backward peasants”, farming on household plots in the reserves, from “progressive”, market-oriented farmers who deserve to own land under individual title and to receive real support from the state.

In the Minister's statement only the emergent farmers are seen as having the potential to contribute to local economic development in rural areas, and implicitly, only the increasing ownership of land by them is seen as significant “structural change” in agriculture. This view of the part-time farming practiced by most rural people, as one livelihood strategy amongst many, ignores its very real economic value and potential, as is evident all over Africa, and as shown by recent research to be true for South Africa as well (see Shackleton *et al*, this volume). Thus large scale land redistribution to part-time farmers operating on a very small scale, often in communal tenure systems, *if* accompanied by real improvements in infrastructure and services, would not only directly address the poverty of the majority (many of whom are women). It would also contribute greatly to both the local and the national economy. This is the real challenge for redistributive land reform – and, it must be said, one which has not been effectively addressed thus far.

A key resource for land redistribution is state-owned agricultural land, most of which is at present leased out to commercial farmers (black and white), on short term leases. This is indeed unsatisfactory, as the policy statement asserts, but the proposal to dispose of this high potential land only to emergent farmers is even more so. It will rob the rural poor of a potentially crucial route to an expanded land base beyond the boundaries of the Bantustans, and flies in the face of President Mbeki's recent commitment, in his state-of-the-nation address, to “reverse a century-old legacy of white minority rule according to which millions of our people were confined in poverty stricken areas described as native reserves, bantustans and homelands”

Another central issue is tenure reform in the former homelands and South African Development Trust areas. The Minister's statement asserts that a new “draft framework document” to guide tenure policy and legislation is to be prepared, although it is not clear what is seen as inappropriate

in previous policy frameworks (for example, as set out in the 1997 White Paper). Elements of this previous framework, including some (such as the rights enquiry approach) which were drastically altered after field testing and much debate, reappear in the new policy statement, prompting fears that there has not been a thorough and considered appraisal of tenure reform policy options.

Most worrying of all is the clear intention of the Minister to address tenure security by an attempt to transfer state land to “tribes”(as well as to communities and individual occupants), and to use the Upgrading Act of 1991 (a National Party land law) to do so. The dangers of transferring ownership of communal land to a legal entity known as a “tribe” were extensively debated within the land reform sector over a five year period, and also at the conference. They include the fact that chiefs, who may or may not be legitimate leaders for the members of a particular community, and may or may not be abusive or corrupt, will be given enormous amounts of *de facto* power by any such transfer.

Since the only rules which govern a “tribe” are those of custom, as interpreted by (usually male) elders, there will be no way from within the tenure system itself to protect the rights of community members (eg. through a system of checks and balances, including mechanisms to appeal against abuse and seek redress). Compare this to the provisions of laws governing companies, trusts or Communal Property Associations. However, since these legal entities, highly formal in character, are often seen as inappropriate by rural people, they are clearly not the answer either. Hence the provisions in the draft Land Rights Bill for strong statutory rights just short of full ownership, vested in members not in institutions, and state funded support structures, such as Land Rights Officers (see Sibanda, this volume, and Claassens, this volume).

These proceedings are thus published at a time when information on the new directions in government’s land and agrarian reform programme is only just beginning to emerge, albeit in sketchy detail, and when fierce debates as to the appropriateness and feasibility of policies look set to be renewed.

Structure and contents of this volume

Limitations and omissions

The conference was intended as a vehicle for debate on the politics of land and agrarian reform and on appropriate policy frameworks, and most of the papers presented had an “applied” or policy focus. Few attempt to assess political dynamics within the state or within the agrarian/rural sector. In addition, some important issues received only cursory attention or were not discussed at all – mostly because of time constraints. There are simply too many aspects and dimensions of land and agrarian reform for them all to be addressed in a three day conference. Thus the conference did not allow for adequate consideration of issues related to, amongst others, farm workers, labour tenants, new directions in restitution, natural resource management and environmental issues, and mineral rights.

In addition to commissioned papers which were formally presented at the conference, two poster sessions allowed twenty volunteered papers to be discussed in a less formal setting (see list in Appendix 2). Some of these are published here; constraints of space did not permit the full set to be

included. Other omissions from the proceedings⁵ include papers by Naidoo (on monitoring and evaluation of land reform), Mbongwa (on policies for small scale agriculture), Africa (on district level co-ordination), Newton (tenure upgrading in the Free State), Cousins (on the performance of legal entities), and Simbi (integrating land reform and agricultural support). A brief summary of the main arguments of these papers is included in the overview of the conference by Husy, which follows this introduction.

The impact of land and agrarian reform on livelihoods

Papers in section 1 of the proceedings focus on the achieved or potential impact of land and agrarian reform on rural livelihoods. The theme for this section is thus the “economic” dimensions which were somewhat neglected in earlier years. Papers by May and by Shackleton *et al* describe poverty and livelihoods in the former “homelands”, where the bulk of South Africa’s rural population are still resident, and assess the economic value of land-based livelihoods. They thus help set the scene for the policy-oriented papers which follow. A feature of these contexts is marked social and economic differentiation, along lines of gender, class, age and status.

Levin’s paper focuses largely on the re-design of land redistribution policies and procedures, but in so doing provides a useful critique of those features of policy which have limited the impact of redistribution projects on livelihoods⁶. Du Toit critically examines fundamental assumptions which have underpinned restitution policy, and which have led to the neglect of developmental aspects of restitution. He also suggests ways forward, building on the positive experience of urban land claim in Port Elizabeth.

Lahiff’s paper on the impact of land reform in the Northern Province and Mokgope’s case study of a redistribution project in the Eastern Cape both illustrate the problematic nature of both certain features of the policy framework, and the importance of sustained commitment and engagement by government if land reform is to succeed in addressing poverty and inequality. Both papers emphasise the highly differentiated nature of rural communities, and the need for policies to address this in a disaggregated manner (eg. through addressing unequal gender relations).

Three papers on the economic dimensions of tenure reform policy (in the form of the draft Land Rights Bill) follow. Adams *et al* argue that tenure reform in the “communal areas” has the potential to impact positively on rural livelihoods. Claassens outlines the manner in which the draft Bill defines the form and content of land rights, with major implications for decision making on land transactions, investment, and common property management. Makopi discusses the draft Bill’s proposals for resolving disputes over overlapping and conflicting rights through making additional land available, thus giving tenure reform a redistributive dimension.

Two papers follow which focus specifically on agricultural production: Mather suggests that deregulation and liberalization of the agricultural sector, as one segment of the country’s macro-economic policy, will have negative effects on the livelihoods of smallholder farmers,

⁵ These papers were incomplete or not in publishable form at time of publication.

⁶ To date there have been few systematic attempts to assess the impact of land reform in South Africa. One is the *Quality of Life Report* produced by DLAs Monitoring and Evaluation directorate (DLA 1998), which is limited in its scope. Another is a paper by Deininger *et al* (1999).

farmworkers and the rural poor. Mohamed discusses the need for environmentally sustainable farming methods, and outlines the possibilities for integrating this approach within land reform projects.

The section concludes with two papers which examine non-farming options as sources of livelihood for rural people benefiting from land reform, with a particular focus on tourism and forestry. Koch and de Beer provide case studies of the Makuleke and Madikwe experiences in eco-tourism, and discuss the potential for community based forestry schemes, but also warn against lack of realism: these options cannot provide all the answers. They also emphasise the centrality of land rights to attempts to develop viable models in these two sub-sectors. Fay and Palmer illustrate these points with a richly detailed case study of Dwesa-Cwebe on the Wild Coast, and once again call attention to social differentiation as a key feature of rural social formations.

Institutional dimensions of land and agrarian reform

The papers in section 2 of these proceedings focus on a range of institutional issues within land and agrarian reform, some of which (eg. in relation to gender relations, and traditional authority) also involve deeply *political* questions. This should come as no surprise: institutional realities are often embedded within more or less taken-for-granted relations of power, and in contemporary South Africa are often highly contested.

The section begins with a review by Shepherd of current thinking about the design and implementation of rural development aimed at poverty reduction, drawn from an analysis of experiences elsewhere in the world. The paper's lessons in relation to the need for asset redistribution as a key strategy for addressing poverty, and for more effective integration and co-ordination, are particularly relevant for South Africa. This is followed by McIntosh and Vaughan's paper on the limits of state interventions in rural administration, given the legacy of the "bifurcated state" (Mamdani 1996), which granted significant powers of administration to traditional institutions. They suggest that these limits make the approach to tenure reform proposed in the draft Land Rights Bill appropriate and feasible, and of relevance to other aspects of land reform (including local level co-ordination of development).

Lebert and Westaway review progress in the decentralisation of the development planning process, first examining the policy and legal frameworks which have evolved, and then critically assessing experiences of implementation. This reveals a worrying disjuncture between policy and practice which impacts negatively on land reform, and an urgent need for institutional clarity, training, resources, regulation of consultants, and institutional dialogue. Mahlati's paper on the Wild Coast Spatial Development Initiative (SDI) also addresses the key issue of integrated planning and implementation, and underlines the importance of clear institutional roles and responsibilities (eg. for the community, the state and the private sector), capacity building at community level, and the mobilisation of private investment. Mahlati emphasises that land reform is a pre-requisite for revitalisation of the rural economy, which is seen as requiring a transition from "peasant" to commercial agriculture, together with other forms of profit earning land uses such as tourism.

Kepe also uses the Wild Coast SDI as an example in his discussion of the importance of paying attention to the processual dimensions of development planning and implementation. He analyses problems experienced within the SDI in relation to communication strategies and conflict management, and suggests that significant investment in securing the conditions for meaningful participation in development projects is money well spent.

Hargreaves and Meer critically review gender policies and practices in both the Department of Land Affairs and the National Land Committee. They argue that land reform policies and programmes have thus far not addressed the goal of gender equity in a meaningful manner, and that this derives from a lack of conceptual clarity on gender as a key social relation. As a consequence, gender remains on the margins rather than being seen as part of the core business of both government and the NGO sector. This means that a central objective of land reform is failing to be met.

Ntsebeza's paper examines the role of traditional authorities in land tenure systems and in rural local government, from the colonial period through to the post-apartheid era. He analyses emerging policy frameworks, and points to a fundamental contradiction: both local government and tenure reform policies are premised on the extension of democracy to the local level, but the Constitution also recognises the non-democratic institution of traditional leadership. Case study material from Tshezi, on the Wild Coast of the former Transkei, highlights the complexities and difficulties of attempts to implement policy within this framework.

Sibanda's paper summarises the key provisions of the (unpublished) draft Land Rights Bill in relation to decision making within reformed land tenure systems, which address some of the problems identified by Ntsebeza. These provisions vest rights in members of groups, and give rights holders the power to decide which institution will manage land on their behalf, thus creating accountability. This would allow popular and legitimate chiefs to be selected as a management structure by rights holders, but also require principles of democracy, equality and due process to be observed. Sibanda thus argues that the draft Bill is not anti-traditional authorities (cf McIntosh and Vaughan's paper).

Three papers address the issue of land rights and land administration through presenting case study material. Two describe viable systems which have evolved through local practice: Hornby describes community land rights in Ekuthaleni in KwaZulu-Natal, and Rawlins discusses the system which has recently emerged in Gasela in the Eastern Cape with the assistance of an NGO, and where land use planning has been integrated into land rights management. In contrast, Pienaar's paper describes the difficulties and conflicts experienced in a number of land reform projects when trusts or Communal Property Associations have been formed to take ownership of land, but where fundamental questions in relation to land rights, management systems, rule enforcement and development support have not been resolved.

Two papers take up the question of appropriate support services within South Africa's land and agrarian reform programme. Machethe and Mollel discuss the difficult issue of how to define "small holder farmers" in South Africa, and distinguish between "resource-poor farmers" and "middle income farmers". They also review key aspects of improved extension services – access, quality, expenditure and accountability, and suggest that public sector extension should focus

mainly on the resource-poor group. Philip describes the rural enterprise support programme of the Mineworkers Development Agency, which has developed innovative strategies to support small scale manufacturing, processing and agricultural production activities. Success has resulted from the effective integration of a range of support services, enabling increasingly diverse and sustainable local economic activity. This example demonstrates clearly the potential for sustainable rural livelihoods in South Africa.

Finally, Greenberg's paper takes up the central but vexed question of political mobilisation and organisation in South Africa's rural areas. He describes recent attempts by the NGO sector to facilitate the emergence of a rural social movement through the Rural Development Initiative and the drafting of a Rural People's Charter. The paper provides a critique of government policy, from a civil society perspective, and outlines a way forward for rural and land activists who are located outside of the state.

References

Bernstein H. 1997. "Social change in the South African countryside? Land and production, poverty and power". *Land Reform and Agrarian Change in Southern Africa*, Occasional Paper Series, No. 4, Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of Western Cape.

Deininger K., I. Naidoo, J. May, B. Roberts, J. van Zyl. 1999. "Implementing "Market-friendly" Land Redistribution in South Africa: Lessons from the First Five Years". Unpublished paper.

Department of Land Affairs. 1998. *Annual Quality of Life Report*. Pretoria: Department of Land Affairs.

Greenberg S. 1999. "Mbeki's rural plan of action". *Land and Rural Digest*, November/December 1999.

Levin R. and M. Neocosmos. 1989. "The agrarian question and class contradictions in South Africa; some theoretical considerations". *Journal of Peasant Studies* 16 (2): 230-259.

Mamdani M. 1996. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Wildschut A. and S. Hulbert 1998. *A Seed Not Sown. Prospects for agrarian reform in South Africa*. Johannesburg: National Land Committee.

(NB. This is a separate section in the proceedings, following the TOC)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) and the National Land Committee (NLC) wish to thank Kellogg Foundation for their generous grant which made the conference possible, and the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom government, which made funds available for the publication of these proceedings. DFID also provided funds for the preparation of Andrew Shepherd's paper, and for travel costs for Dr Shepherd to attend the conference.

Many thanks too to the Conference Steering Committee (Dave Husy and Abie Dithake of NLC, Ben Cousins of PLAAS, and Vuyi Nxasana of the Department of Land Affairs) for their time and commitment. Dave Husy acted as Conference Co-ordinator and somehow managed to pull everything together, despite the odds, and thus make the conference the success it was; his contribution was particularly valuable. Other staff who worked long hours behind the scenes, often way beyond the call of duty, include Natasha Emmett of PLAAS, and Dinah Madliwa of NLC, ably assisted by Florence Cairncross, Elizabeth Kgwadi and Neo Mogale of NLC.

This publication would not have been possible without the sterling efforts of Rosie Campbell, who designed the publication and managed the production process, and Steven Heyns, who undertook proofreading and copyediting. Grateful thanks to them too.