



HAL
open science

Can We Speak about Effective Land Reform in South Africa?

Ward Anseeuw

► **To cite this version:**

Ward Anseeuw. Can We Speak about Effective Land Reform in South Africa?. IFAS Working Paper Series / Les Cahiers de l' IFAS, 2006, 8, p. 77-90. hal-00799113

HAL Id: hal-00799113

<https://hal.science/hal-00799113v1>

Submitted on 11 Mar 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**TEN YEARS OF
DEMOCRATIC
SOUTH AFRICA
TRANSITION
ACCOMPLISHED?**

BY

AURELIA WA KABWE-SEGATTI,

NICOLAS PEJOUT

AND PHILIPPE GUILLAUME

Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series is a series of occasional working papers, dedicated to disseminating research in the social and human sciences on Southern Africa.

Under the supervision of appointed editors, each issue covers a specific theme; papers originate from researchers, experts or post-graduate students from France, Europe or Southern Africa with an interest in the region.

The views and opinions expressed here remain the sole responsibility of the authors. Any query regarding this publication should be directed to the chief editor.

Chief editor: Aurelia WA KABWE – SEGATTI,
IFAS-Research director.

The text herein presented as well as back issues of *Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series* are available on the IFAS website:
www.ifas.org.za/research

IFAS – Research
PO Box 542 – Newtown 2113
Johannesburg – RSA
Tel: +27 (0)11 836 0561
Fax: +27 (0)11 836 5850
Email: secretariatrecherche@ifas.org.za

Institut français d'Afrique du Sud, Johannesburg, 2006
(Les Nouveaux Cahiers de l'IFAS / IFAS Working Paper Series N°8).
ISSN: 1608 - 7194

SUMMARY

For the past ten years, South Africa has been progressively coming out of the apartheid system. Although all ties with the former regime have been severed completely, managing the heavy structural legacy has made the transition a difficult as well as an ambivalent process - difficult because the expectations of the population contrast with the complexity of the stakes which have to be dealt with; and ambivalent because the transition is based on innovations as well as continuities.

The contributions gathered in this book will try to clarify the trajectory of that transition. Offered analyses share a critical look, without complacency nor contempt, on the transformations at work. Crossing disciplines and dealing with South Africa as an ordinary and standardised country that can no longer be qualified as being a “miracle” or an “exception”, gives us an opportunity to address themes that are essential to understanding post-apartheid society: land reforms, immigration policies, educational reforms, AIDS...

This issue of IFAS Working Papers is the translation of a book published with Karthala publishers to celebrate 10 years of the Research section of the French Institute of South Africa (IFAS) and to highlight its major contribution to constructing francophone knowledge on Southern Africa.

RÉSUMÉ

Depuis dix ans, l'Afrique du Sud sort progressivement du système d'apartheid : si les ruptures avec l'ancien régime sont nettes, la gestion d'un héritage structurel lourd rend cette transition à la fois difficile et ambivalente. Difficile car les attentes de la population contrastent avec la complexité des enjeux à traiter. Ambivalente car cette transition est faite d'innovations et de continuités.

C'est cette trajectoire que les contributions réunies ici tentent d'éclairer. Les analyses proposées partagent un regard critique sans complaisance ni mépris sur les transformations à l'œuvre. Le croisement des disciplines et le traitement de l'Afrique du Sud comme un pays ordinaire, normalisé, sorti des paradigmes du « miracle » ou de l'« exception », donnent l'occasion d'aborder des thèmes essentiels à la compréhension de la société post-apartheid : réforme agraire, politique d'immigration, réformes éducatives, sida...

Ces Cahiers sont la traduction d'un ouvrage paru chez Karthala en 2004 à l'occasion des dix ans d'existence du pôle recherche de l'Institut Français d'Afrique du Sud (IFAS) afin de souligner sa contribution majeure à la construction des savoirs francophones sur l'Afrique australe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

	Normalising Reportson South Africa, <i>by Aurelia Wa Kabwe-Segatti, Nicolas Pėjout and Philippe Guillaume</i>	5
CHAPTER 1.	Who Is Governing the “New” South Africa? Elites, Networks and Governing Styles (1985-2003), <i>by Marianne Séverin and Pierre Aycard</i>	13
CHAPTER 2.	“Big Brother” in South Africa? e-Government and Panoptic Control During and After Apartheid, <i>by Nicolas Pėjout</i>	39
CHAPTER 3.	From Free Housing Policy to the Payment of Rates and Taxes in South African Cities (1994-2003): The Cape Town and Port Elizabeth Cases, <i>by Marianne Morange</i>	57
CHAPTER 4.	Can We Speak About Effective Land Reform in South Africa?, <i>by Ward Anseeuw</i>	77
CHAPTER 5.	Education, Democracy and Decentralisation: Educational Policy Reforms in South Africa (1994-2004), <i>by Ingrid Bamberg</i>	91
CHAPTER 6.	Crossing Frontiers, Changing Trajectories? Renewal of Literature in Post-Apartheid South Africa, <i>by Donald Moerdijk</i>	107
CHAPTER 7.	The Reappearance of the Khoesan in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Invention of Tradition and National Reconciliation, <i>by François-Xavier Fauvelle-Aymar</i>	125
CHAPTER 8.	Linguistic Diversity in South Africa or How to Transform a Factor of Division into a Tool for Nation - Building?, <i>by Michel Lafon</i>	141
CHAPTER 9.	Reformulating Immigration Policy in Post-Apartheid South Africa: From the Aliens Control Act of 1991 to the Immigration Act of 2002, <i>by Aurelia Wa Kabwe-Segatti</i>	171
CHAPTER 10.	HIV/AIDS in South Africa 1990-2004: Governmental Logic and Social Mobilisation, <i>by Judith Hayem</i>	179
APPENDICES	205
	Maps	
	Webliography	
	Acronyms and Abbreviations	
	Authors	

chapter four

can we speak about
effective land reform
in south africa?

ward anseeuw

ABSTRACT

Land reform was one of the main promises of the ANC during its ascension to power: the objective was to redistribute 30% of the land within 5 years after the end of apartheid. However, by the end of 2003, only 1,5% had been redistributed. This situation remains problematic for South Africa as the reform is a crucial element of the ideological transition and a requirement for the political, social and economic stability of the country. It seems that land reform, guided only by offer and demand and not complemented by regulatory measures, does not have the capacity to transform the racial configuration of the South African territory.

RÉSUMÉ

La réforme foncière constituait l'une des principales promesses de l'ANC au moment de son arrivée au pouvoir : l'objectif était de redistribuer 30% des terres en 5 ans après la fin de l'apartheid. Cependant, fin 2003, 1,5% des terres seulement avait effectivement été redistribué. Cette situation demeure problématique pour l'Afrique du Sud dans la mesure où la réforme foncière est un élément crucial de la transition idéologique et une condition sine qua non de la stabilité politique, sociale et économique du pays. La réforme foncière, fondée sur le seul principe de l'offre et de la demande sans mesure complémentaire de régulation, ne semble pas avoir la capacité de transformer la configuration raciale du territoire sud-africain.

As Cyril Ramaphosa¹(ANC, 1993) noted during the first conference on land redistribution in Johannesburg in 1993, while unequal land distribution is not unique to South Africa, policy measures implemented to arrive at this situation are. Indeed, contrarily to other countries displaying unequal land distribution, the South African land situation results from a spatial organisation associated with specific racial policies. The heritage of land inequality in South Africa has been formalised mainly through two land acts, the Natives Land Acts of 1913 and that of 1936. These acts attributed 8%, and later 13%, of South Africa's territory to non-whites who represented about 90% of the population. With this legislation, coloured and black populations were restricted to reserves and Bantustans respectively, where land tenure remained insecure and farming practices were mainly communal. Furthermore, other measures have restrained land tenancy or sharecropping possibilities for the black populations on land owned by white farmers. This implied the strangulation of the commercial farming activities of black populations and their increasing exodus towards reserves and Bantustans. The objective of these measures was mainly to enable white populations to acquire the land as well as to eliminate the important black peasantry (Van Onselen, 1996). This resulted in

¹ Cyril Ramaphosa was the Secretary General of the ANC during the negotiation years at the end of apartheid.

the complete subordination of the black populations who became a mere production factor for white-owned industries and the migrant labour system from the reserves and Bantustans.

Spatial segregation measures engendered extreme inequalities concerning land distribution. These measures, combined with the limited commercial farm activities of black populations, also led to important inequalities between white and black farmers. In 1994, the date of the first democratic elections in South Africa, about 60 000 white farmers occupied 87 million hectares. They practiced farming activities on private-owned land. Commercial farms contributed 95% of the total agricultural production of the country (World Bank, 1994) and, as far as most agricultural products were concerned, assumed the country's self-sufficiency. They employed between 750 000 and 1 million farm workers (SSA, 2000). On the other hand, the 14 million Blacks gathered on the former Bantustans and reserves shared 13% of the total area of the country, i.e. 13 million hectares (Department of Agriculture, 1995). The large majority of these people were engaged in one way or another into small-scale farming, mainly for their own consumption². Their farming production only represented 16% of their food needs. According to the Southern Africa Department of the World Bank (World Bank, 1994), about 13% of farming households partly commercialised their production on occasion. Nevertheless, only 0,2% of these households could effectively live from it. Furthermore, it was estimated that one third of rural households had no access to land.

Land reform was one of the main promises made by the ANC during its ascension to power in 1994. The ANC noted in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) that land reform was necessary to redress unjust forced deportations and the denial of land access (ANC, 1994). Aiming to find a solution to the overpopulation of certain rural areas of former reserves and Bantustans and to promote access to residential and farm land, the land reform represented the masterpiece of the Government's strategy for Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR). The land reform process thus not only represents a decisive element of ideological transition, it is also seen as one of the conditions for the political, economic and social stability of the country. The importance of this issue brought the ANC to aim at redistributing 30% of the land during the first five years after the apartheid era. This new situation required the implementation of adapted economic policies (Department of Agriculture, 1995).

² The Department of Agriculture estimated the number of non-white farming households at 2 million. Nevertheless, this estimate should be used with caution since the definition of farming household is not certain nor precise.

SOUTH AFRICAN ECONOMIC POLICIES AND VARIOUS INSTRUMENTS OF LAND REFORM

While the first democratic elections held in 1994 represented political democratisation, they also had economic consequences. One of the compromises reached during negotiations at the end of apartheid required that political liberalisation should be accompanied by economic liberalisation. This implied implementing economic policies advocating a reduction of the role of the State and redistribution through economic growth (Habib and Padayachee, 1999). Progress towards liberalising the South African economy would enhance the efficiency of the economic system and ensure access equality as far as markets and services are concerned, according to the World Bank (World Bank, 1994) and the ANC (ANC, 1994).

Concerning the agricultural sector, the compromise on economic liberalisation implies that agrarian and land reforms should be realised within the framework of a free market³ excluding every form of expropriation. A market-led approach can be opposed to State interventionism (Borras, 2003): land reform has to be implemented according to the willing buyer-willing seller principle (Department of Agriculture, 1995). This principle takes into account the rights of present owners and is officially transcribed in the new Constitution under the “Property Clause”. Officially, from now on, access to land, to agriculture and to commercial agriculture in particular is possible, but at market price. Adopting a market-led reform makes it possible, according to the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs, to underscore the necessity of maintaining national productive capacities - in order to ensure economic stability - without neglecting the greater equity imperative. Such an approach is also the least costly, the easiest to implement and, above all, represents a condition to benefit from the support of international organisations (the World Bank in particular) and maintain investors’ confidence.

Yet, taking into account the history of land appropriation, the level of protection and subsidies from which white farmers benefited and the poverty level of the majority of the black populations, the ANC and other stakeholders admitted that total liberalisation would not have the capacity to erase apartheid-inherited spatial segregation. Concerning the possibilities for manoeuvring within the liberal economic framework, State intervention has been provided for and will be applied on a case by case basis with very little funds (only 4% of the national budget is appropriated for the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs and 0.3% for land reform). Thus, the liberalisation process does not include a complete deregulation but enables

³ This meant cancelling the direct subsidies from which white farmers benefited for several decades, suppressing every associated system for agricultural marketing and changing the status of most institutions related to farm development (co-operatives, financial services, etc.).

legal mechanisms of redistribution and restoration of land rights to prevail, and limits State intervention so as not to create distortions in the smooth operation of the market. Three main programmes recognised by the Constitution (and thus resulting from the negotiations at the end of apartheid) are included in the land reform of the Government: Land Restitution, Land Redistribution and Land Tenure Reform (Department of Land Affairs, 1997).

1) THE LAND RESTITUTION PROGRAMME

This programme, resulting from the Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994, enables people or communities dispossessed of their land after the 19th of June 1913 (implementation date of the first Natives Land Act) to claim for the restitution of their land rights (or the equivalent, i.e. another land or financial compensation). In March 1996, the deadline for claim submission, 68 878 individual or grouped demands were submitted.

2) LAND TENURE REFORM

This is the most complex programme of the land reform process. Its objective is to define and institutionalise every existing mode of land tenure, making it possible to confer well defined and more equal rights to various landowners and occupants.

While this programme concerns communal land primarily, it also focuses on other conflict situations such as those concerning farm workers having worked for their own account for several years already on properties owned by others, mainly whites. Another objective of this programme is to manage State-owned land (i.e. 25 509 004 hectares, of which 13 332 577 hectares are covered by the former reserves and Bantustans; the rest being mainly rented out or informally occupied).

3) LAND REDISTRIBUTION

The aim of this programme is to assist previously disadvantaged populations who do not fall under either of the two previous programmes to purchase available land at market price, thanks to a subsidy.

Land redistribution can take on different forms: individual or grouped resettlement (merging subsidies), commonage principle (communal access to land, i.e. an entire community uses available subsidies to purchase land, which will then be added to existing communal lands occupied since 1913 or 1936).

TWO LAND REFORM PHASES

Political and economic transitions are often accompanied by land reforms (Kay, 1998). While many agree about the necessity of land reform to address inequality and rural poverty

(World Bank, 1999), views on the means to achieve it remain diverse and contradictory. This is also the case in South Africa. The land reform economic framework has not changed since 1994, although various existing policies and programmes underwent changes.

■ *FIRST PHASE (1994-1999): LAND POLICIES FOCUSING ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBSISTENCE FARMERS*

The objective of the first phase of the land reform policies implemented by Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs Derek Hanekom, concerned the development of subsistence farming. Such an orientation highlighted the importance of the land reform and small-scale agricultural production development impact on the social and economic development of rural areas. As such, the government was privileging the security of food and subsistence means in a country where resource distribution inequality is extreme and where the link between black populations and commercial farming has been broken for several decades already. It is for this reason that the first phase was implemented by the Department of Land Affairs only and concerned farmland as much as residential or urban land.

Thus, the Department of Land Affairs allocated “Settlement/Land Acquisition Grants” (SLAG) of R15 000⁴ per household between 1994 and 1999 (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). Although these grants were mainly allocated within the land redistribution programme framework with the aim of purchasing land, they could also be used for agricultural investments (on communal land or land acquired through the restitution programme) or even for housing projects (external to the farming sector).

SLAG benefited mainly the rural populations for several reasons: first of all, rural environments are more marginalised and characterised by higher poverty rates than urban environments (SSA, 2000). Furthermore, as detailed by the Department of Land Affairs (1997), it is easier to obtain results by focusing on those who show interest or who are already engaged in agriculture. Nevertheless, focusing on the poorest implied working with a population group that has no means of investment and, especially, that does not have the capacity to revitalise rural livelihoods.

⁴ A R15 000 SLAG (increasing to R16 000 in 1999) can be accessed only once per household. When a household, in purchasing land, uses the whole subsidy amount, it can no longer be eligible for another subsidy to build on, improve or develop.

■ *SECOND PHASE (1999-2004): LAND POLICY AIMING AT CREATING SMALL SCALE COMMERCIAL FARMERS*

In 1999, after the second democratic elections and the appointment of Thoko Didiza as Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, the approach whereby only subsistence farming was being promoted was questioned and, as a result, the development of an emergent commercial and small scale farming sector became the priority. Land reform no longer aimed at transferring land to black households promoting self-sufficiency, but at creating a structured small-scale commercial farming sector with a view to improve farm production, revitalise the rural environment and create employment opportunities. This strategy coincided better with the more liberal orientations of the government.

The Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) sub-programme later became the leading programme of the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs (2000). It did not replace previous programmes implemented in and ongoing since 1994, but only replaced SLAG for projects on agricultural development. SLAG have been restricted to residential projects since 1999. The LRAD programme allocated subsidies to previously disadvantaged people so as to facilitate their access to private farmland or to enhance the development (infrastructure) of lands already acquired privately. Even if part of the LRAD programme concerned commonage projects, it focused mainly on the transfer of agricultural land to individuals or small groups planning to develop commercially oriented farming activities (Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs, 2000).

To encourage the development of farming activities, the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs insisted that beneficiaries had to invest proper funds into their project. For proper contributions going from R5 000 to R400 000 per person, LRAD subsidies varied from R20 000 to R100 000, as per a decreasing curve. Furthermore, subsidy approval was not only based on the equity principle but also on the viability of the project. As a result, it was expected that the Department of Land Affairs and the Department of Agriculture would cooperate better.

If this political choice is as justifiable as the previous one, the new orientation implies a predisposition to focus on a category of potential farmers having specific means (financial and skill-related) at their disposal. While some associations (NLC, 2000) assert that these subsidies only benefit a small elite (less dependant on financial support than the most impoverished), others note, nevertheless, that these measures promoting the commercialisation of agriculture will represent a driving force for agricultural and rural revitalisation (Van Rooyen, 1997).

DISAPPOINTING RESULTS

The land reform process shows little progress when seen in terms of the number of completed projects.

Of all the programmes, the tenure reform programme has been the slowest. Uncertain land tenure saw little change concerning lands occupied by black populations (since the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936). In 1996, due to the complexity and diversity of existing tenures, the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act was passed to protect former Bantustan and reserve residents from the abuses of corrupted traditional chiefs, from administrative measures and investors failing to respect occupants' rights. A new charter of land rights was developed with a view to transfer (still State-owned) communal land property rights to residents. The charter recommended intermediate flexible rights between individual and traditional rights. As such, rights could be attributed to individuals, to groups as legal entities or to communities with democratically-elected management committees. However, due to potential conflicts with traditional authorities in particular, tabling the bill was postponed until after the second democratic elections and, in fact, was forgotten. The bill was re-introduced only in August 2002 by Minister Thoko Didiza under the Communal Land Rights Bill (Draft 8). It was already highly criticised by scientists (Cousins, 2002) and had been denounced by the defenders of traditional rights in that the bill restricts tribal property and power. Furthermore, the Department of Land Affairs remarked that securing farm workers' rights through the Labour Tenants Act and the Extension of Security of Tenure Act had, on the contrary, made commercial farmers fearing the partial loss of their land, become even more suspicious. As a result, employment relations have been deteriorating while illegal evictions and mechanisation have been increasing (with fewer jobs as a result).

Concerning the restitution programme, by 1999, only 3 508 households had been given access to 112 919 hectares of land (Table 1), i.e. 41 restitution claims or 0,06% of the total 68 878 claims. Following an instruction President Mbeki gave in 1999 to finalise land claims by 2005, claim processing was accelerated between 1999 and 2003, with 36 645 claims for 80 153 households being settled. Nevertheless, since 80% of the restitutions were urban cases and since only one third gave rise to effective land restitutions (the remaining two thirds were settled through financial compensation⁵), only 516 910 hectares were in fact redistributed.

⁵ However, since every claim concerns a large number of individuals (sometimes more than 1 000), this financial compensation (representing the equivalent of the acquisition price of one or a certain number of commercial farms) represents only a small sum per household.

TABLE 1: RESTITUTION CLAIMS SETTLED BETWEEN 1995 AND 2003

Year	Restitution Claims Settled	Concerned Households	Hectares Redistributed	Total Costs (Thousands of Rand)
1996-1999	41	3508	112 919	12 601
1999-2003	36 645	80 153	403 991	1 873 456
Total	36 686	83 661	516 910	1 886 057

Source: Commission on Restitution of Land Rights (2003)

While it did not reach the expected objectives, the redistribution programme progressed at a slightly faster pace than before. By the end of 2000, the SLAG programme had enabled the redistribution of 821 134 hectares to 53 950 households (Table 2). The LRAD programme took over in 2001. Despite the lack of available official data and results on the LRAD programme, Minister Didiza noted that for the financial year 2001-2002, 214 commercial farms (representing 185 609 hectares) had been redistributed to 6 769 beneficiaries. As to the financial year 2002-2003, the programme concerned 130 810 hectares for 6179 beneficiaries.

TABLE 2: REDISTRIBUTION PROJECTS SETTLED BETWEEN 1995 AND 2003

Grants Programmes Settled	Redistribution Projects	Concerned Households	Hectares Redistributed	Total Costs (Thousands of Rand)
SLAG*	5606	53 950	821 134	832 000
LRAD**	365	12 948	316 419	NA
Total	5971	66 898	1 137 553	NA

NA: Not Applicable

Source: Department of Land Affairs (2002); ** Irin (2003)

By the end of 2003, almost 10 years after the first democratic elections, only 1,5% of the 87 million hectares of farmland had been redistributed (all land transfers taken into account, i.e. tenure reform, land restitution and land redistribution). The target of 30% of redistributed land had already been postponed to 2015. At that rate, South Africa could not manage to redistribute even 5% of the land by 2015.

The problem is not only linked to the number of projects. One characteristic shared by all land reform programmes is the need for regrouping households. The number of households necessary to acquire land is generally much higher than that able to live off it. While this is especially the case with the restitution and SLAG redistribution projects⁶, the data of Table 2 as well as recent studies (Anseeuw, 2004) show that this is also the case within the framework of LRAD grants. In addition to the viability issue, the need for regrouping households questions the pertinence of such programmes in a country where tenure security remains problematic. Furthermore, since lands acquired within the framework of the land reform programmes are, according to the NLC, generally less productive (e.g. lands characterised by a lack of elementary rural infrastructures as well as isolated and far removed from original communities), they are generally inhabited and are not subject to any economic activity. Some authors, South African (McIntosh and Vaughan, 2000) and others (Sender and Johnston, 2003), went as far as noting that land reform had created poverty.

QUESTIONING IMPLEMENTED INSTRUMENTS AND THE INSTITUTIONALISED COMPROMISE OF THE END OF THE APARTHEID

Available and released means to compensate, in part at least, existing inequalities did not reach expected objectives. Many criticise the insufficient funds appropriated for land reform (NLC, 1998; Mayson, 2001). According to them, the 0,3% of the national budget (685 million Rand available per year) appropriated for land reform does not reflect the capacity nor the will of the Government to accomplish the colossal task of reducing land inequality⁷. Others blame administrative sluggishness and bureaucratic complexity (Aliber and Mokoena, 2000; NLC, 2000). They remark that a transaction within the land reform framework takes up to two years. Such a long cycle would not only imply that land owners privilege faster and less bureaucratic possibilities, but would also restrict beneficiaries in benefiting from the best opportunities. The lack of public funds appropriated for land reform and an excessive bureaucratisation would explain, according to Aliber and Mokoena (2000), the fact that the Department of Land Affairs is only a second choice negotiator.

⁶ However, these two programmes did not focus solely on the development of farm activities. As noted by Williams et al. (1996), these programmes took into account other objectives of land demand. Indeed, most black populations still do not own the land on which they reside and these programmes would enable them to secure these sites.

⁷ These opinions are all the more justified since out of 685 million Rand available per year for land reform, only 359 million Rand and 103 million Rand were used respectively in 1998-1999 and in 2000-2001 (Mayson, 2001). Furthermore, these concerns are reinforced when knowing that only 50 million Rand are allocated to the LRAD programme. Considering land prices, this amount is by far insufficient to meet the set objectives.

However, pointing out the lack of means and administrative incoherence as the only causes for the sluggish land reform process would be too simplistic. Indeed, as discussed previously, the 1999 administrative acceleration and LRAD grants implementation only had very limited impact. Critics neglect other, more structural aspects that cannot be solved by the measures implemented so far. In addition to the lack of articulation between the land reform and other reforms, whether land or territorial (Anseeuw, 2004), one major point stands out in particular: an analysis of agricultural and land policies as well as public measures actually implemented highlights a total absence of public intervention concerning regulations. It appears that an approach based solely on offer and demand which, in addition, is not complemented by regulatory measures, does not have the capacity to transform the racial configuration of the South African territory. Since the expenditures to attain the anticipated redistribution are minimised and available means are insufficient, why have regulations for public interventions not yet been developed?

Union of Commercial Farmers Agri-SA noted that the State intervening in the land issue would be against the Constitution. Yet, the Union fails to mention that several land-related laws, acts, regulations and privileges resulting from the apartheid era are still in place today and are hindering the transformation of the racial configuration of the South African territory. These not only limit the incentive to commercialise land but counteract also the possibilities black populations have to access it.

Also, no land tax has been implemented in South Africa to this day. Neglected during the 1980s to avoid putting white farmers – sole land owners – at a disadvantage (Nieuwoudt, 1987), the absence of land tax is not at present encouraging commercialisation and, therefore, land offer. Furthermore, the absence of regulations concerning land utilisation, underutilised or non-utilised land conservation does not engender any costs: as a result, landowners have little incentive to sell. In addition, the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970, passed to restrict farm workers' access to land during apartheid, has not yet been abolished (Department of Agriculture, 2001). This law continues to make it difficult for disadvantaged farmers with credit access problems to acquire equipment and installations.

The National African Farmers Union (NAFU) has been drawing attention to the organised acquisitions of white farmers and denounced the fact that 97,5% of land transactions take place outside the framework of the land reform programme. Indeed, these transactions are mainly set up on local markets or through intra-communitarian arrangements. The absence of intervention instruments makes it impossible to limit these practices and does not bring any solution to the lack of transparency within a market totally controlled by the white community. The lack of public intervention on land transfer also makes the State unable to

sanction any voluntary practice resulting from the influence of certain persons or communities (e.g. price increase of land that could be commercialised within the framework of the land reform programme).

While these examples show a lack of public intervention involving regulations, they highlight above all the inability of the measures implemented so far to transform the racial configuration of the South African territory. This inability does not only compromise land redistribution as a highly symbolic issue in a country where land inequality is extreme, and where access to land has been restricted for more than a century. It also restricts the development of black farming activities and revitalisation of the rural sector, blocking land reform and the alleviation of poverty and inequalities. This is resulting in the incoherence of the economic policies implemented with a view to integrated development and redistribution (ANC, 1994).

The absence of South African economic policy instruments and the resulting incoherence point to a questioning of the institutionalised compromise of the end of apartheid with, as a result, a paradoxical and problematic situation for South Africa. While land reform has been guided by market forces, admittedly legally offering equal access to land and services required for their development, it has engendered the maintenance and even the reinforcement of previously acquired advantages. Such an approach is oblivious of the history of South Africa. As such, the liberal development model does not represent a negotiated economic compromise but, rather, the structural counterpart to access political liberalisation. At this stage, we agree with the works of Meunier and Copans (1999), insisting on the fact that “the ascension to power of the ANC is the result of a negotiated compromise at a time chosen by the apartheid regime and on its terms”. The 1994 transition was the subject of a political will to see the main function of economic power being fulfilled without political power intervention. Thus, the transition, from an economic viewpoint at least, had relatively little transforming impact since it was based on the renewal of the social structures making up the South African society during apartheid.

ACCELERATING LAND REFORM: A NECESSITY

Land reform instruments contributed very little to eradicating existing land inequalities. Almost ten years after the first democratic elections, only 1,5% of the land was redistributed. However, these instruments have greatly contributed to the perpetuation and extension of subsistence farming activities practiced on lands - still characterised by insecure land tenures and symbolic of apartheid from the time of the Land Acts of 1913 and 1936.

Land reform is still a long way for South Africa. While the consensual aspect of land reform remains essential (Moyo, 2001), the increasing importance of the social demand of the landless and most disadvantaged populations, the growing inequalities (Irin, 2003) and the 1 500 murders of farmers committed since 1994 (ISS, 2003) reveal the need to accelerate the land reform process. This, however, seems only possible when new economic policy instruments will have been implemented, questioning again the development model into which South Africa has been engaged for the past 10 years.

REFERENCES

- ALIBER, M. & MOKOENA, R., 2000, The land redistribution programme and the land market. Pretoria, Department of Land Affairs, Unpublished paper, 59p.
- ANC (AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS), 1993, Cyril Ramaphosa's address to land distribution conference in Johannesburg from 12 to 15th October 1993. Johannesburg, African National Congress, www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/speeches/1993, 4p.
- ANC (AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS), 1994, The reconstruction and Development Programme. A policy framework. Marshalltown, African National Congress, 90p.
- ANSEEUW, W., 2004, Politiques publiques et reconversion professionnelle vers l'agriculture marchande. Le cas des mineurs du Northern Cape. Grenoble, Université Pierre Mendès France, Thèse de doctorat en Economie Internationale, 420p. + annexes.
- COMMISSION ON RESTITUTION OF LAND RIGHTS, 2003, Land restitution in South Africa : Our achievements and challenges. Pretoria, Department of Land Affairs, 8p.
- COUSINS, B., 2002, Controversy and consensus in South Africa's land reform programme. Kampala, Invited paper presented at a World Bank regional workshop on land issues in Africa, 29 April-2 May.
- DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 1995, White paper on Agriculture. Pretoria, Department of Agriculture, 37p.
- DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 2001, The strategic plan for South African agriculture. Pretoria, Department of Agriculture, 25p.
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AFFAIRS, 1997, White paper on South African land policy. Pretoria, National Department of Land Affairs, 34p.
- DEPARTMENT OF LAND AFFAIRS, 2002, Annual report 2001/2002. Pretoria, Department of Land Affairs, 43p.
- HABIB, A. & PADAYACHEE, V., 1999, Afrique du Sud : pouvoir, politique et stratégie économique dans la transition démocratique. *Revue du Tiers Monde*, 1999, t.XL, p.499-529.

- IRIN (INTEGRATED REGIONAL INFORMATION NETWORK), 2003, Blacks getting poorer. Johannesburg, United Nations Integrated Regional Information Network, South Africa Regional Office, Newsletter, 14 May 2003, 2p.
- ISS (INSTITUTE FOR SECURITY STUDIES), 2003, Report on farm attacks. Johannesburg, ISS, Report of Committee of Inquiry Into Farm Attacks, 448p.
- KAY, C., 1998, The complex legacy of Latin America's agrarian reform. The Hague, Institute of Social Sciences, Working paper, n°268, 30p.
- MAYSON, D., 2001, A critical analysis of the 2001/2002 budget for land reform in South Africa. Johannesburg, SPP & NLC, National Research Programme research report, September 2001, 12p.
- MC INTOSCH, A. & VAUGHAN, A., 2000, Experiences of agrarian reform in South Africa : Limits of intervention. IN : COUSINS, B. *At the crossroads : Land and agrarian reform in South Africa into the 21st century*. Cape Town, PLAAS and National Land Committee, p.224-234.
- MEUNIER, R. & COPANS, J., 1999, Les ambiguïtés de l'ère Mandela. *Revue du Tiers Monde*, 1999, t.XL, p.489-598.
- MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND LAND AFFAIRS, 2000, Land redistribution for agricultural development. A sub-programme of the land redistribution programme. Pretoria, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs, 12p.
- NIEUWOUDT, W.L., 1987, Taxing agricultural land. *Agrekon*, Vol. 26, p.10-17.
- NLC (NATIONAL LAND COMMITTEE), 1998, Summary and recommendantions of a national research on land reform. Pretoria, National Land Committee, Unpublished Report, 45p.
- NLC (NATIONAL LAND COMMITTEE), 2000, Implementation of Integrated Programme of Land Redistribution on Agricultural Development : The National Land Committee's respons. National Land Committee, <http://www.nlc.co.za/pubs/indaba.htm>.
- SENDER, J. & JOHNSTON, D., 2003, Searching for a weapon of mass production in rural Africa: unconvincing arguments for land reform. Durban, IAAE Conference "Reshaping agriculture's contribution to society, 166-22 August, Conference paper, 23p.
- SSA (STATISTICS SOUTH AFRICA), 2000, *Statistics in brief*. Pretoria, Statistics South Africa, 74p.
- VAN ONSELEN, C., 1996, *The seed is mine: The life of Kas Maine, a South African Sharecropper 1894-1985*. New York, Hill & Wang, 649p.
- VAN ROOYEN, C.J., 1997, Challenges and roles for agriculture in the Southern African region. *Agrekon*, Vol.36, n°2, p.181-205.
- WORLD BANK, 1994, South African agriculture : Structure, performance and options for the future. Washington D.C., World Bank, Southern African Department, Discussion paper 6 on Aspects of the economy of South Africa.
- WORLD BANK, 1999, Land policy in developing countries. Washington D.C., World Bank, Rural Development note, n°3, 4 p.