UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them: a study of three government Agriparks in South Africa

By

Nelco Zenzele Hlatshwayo

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree PhD in Development Studies in the Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria

November 2023

Declaration

I, Nelco Zenzele Hlatshwayo, declare that this dissertation is my original work. As per departmental requirements, acknowledgement was given, and reference was made where someone else's work was used. I understand what plagiarism entails and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.

I have at all times complied with the University's Policy on Research Ethics and Integrity and have in general observed the principles of honesty, objectivity, the duty of care and fairness in giving credit and appropriate acknowledgment to the work of others. I declare that I have observed the ethical standards required in terms of the University of Pretoria's Code of ethics for researchers and the Policy guidelines for responsible research. This work has not been submitted elsewhere.

Signature: NZ Hlatshwayo

Emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them: a study of three government Agriparks in South Africa

PhD in Development Studies

Faculty of Humanities

Department of Anthropology, Archaeology and Development Studies

University of Pretoria

By

Candidate: Nelco Zenzele Hlatshwayo

Student No: U18396799

Contact details: + 27 72 720 7732

Email: zakes.hlatshwayo@gmail.com

Supervisor: Dr Marc C.A. Wegerif

November 2023

Abstract

This study examines the political and economic challenges that confront agrarian change by looking into how the Agriparks, set up under the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme, support emerging black farmers' practices to achieve equity. To do this, I examine the global agrarian context, discourses on farmer practices, the global expansion of neoliberal capitalism by means of public-private partnerships, and the commodification and commercialisation of agriculture production, especially in the context of justice and equality. Through studying existing literature and case studies in Agriparks in Gauteng, Limpopo and Northern Cape, I explore issues of emerging black farmer practices, the state and private sector's role, and justice and equality in the agrarian sector. Within the case studies I used qualitative research and ethnographic methods, such as go-along interviews and semi-structured interviews with emerging black farmers and key informants.

Agriparks, and their particular racial form in South Africa, emerge within a context of, on the one hand, global neoliberal agro-industrialisation and commercialisation and, on the other hand, historical land dispossession, growing inequality, environmental stresses, and counter-movements such as food sovereignty. Agriparks are a local manifestation of the agro-cluster model that is embedded in a particular corporate and industrialised model of agricultural development. This approach to farming puts responsibility for dealing with farming, production and distribution challenges increasingly in the hands of private interests as part of the promotion of a particular neoliberal approach to agricultural development. This model simply does not work for the majority of small-scale and marginalised farmers in the context of failed land reforms and a still highly divided society and agricultural sector. The analysis suggests that the state needs to better align interventions to further emerging black farmer achievements and to bolster sustainability and the realisation of justice and equality. It also demonstrates the importance of building capacity for change and focusing on successful farmer practices, actions and changes that are efficient and effective. Pre-existing institutional racism in the sector impacts the implementation of the Agriparks programme and needs to be addressed in reshaping it for the future. I advocate a Critical Race Theory of Agrarian Reform to configure post-apartheid agrarian reforms and tools to analyse and inform changes in the agrarian sector.

Keywords: Agriparks, agrarian reforms, critical race theory, emerging black farmers, land reforms, neoliberalism, small-scale farmers, South Africa.

Dedications

This work is dedicated to my beloved parents, grandparents, and children.

Acknowledgments

Acknowledgments are extended to my comrades, my extended families of Messieurs Abraham Malo, John Nkomo, and John Tshenolo Monyamane. I am thankful to all the people for their support at various stages of this undertaking.

This Ph.D. would not have been possible without the financial backing provided by the Human Economy Research Programme and constant support from my supervisor, Dr. Marc Wegerif.

People had faith in me and I believed that I could achieve this goal.

Ngiyabonga

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

ANCRA:	Association for Northern Cape Rural Advancement
APAP:	Agricultural Policy Action Plan
ASGISA:	Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa
B:	Beneficiary
CASP:	Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme
CRDP:	Comprehensive Rural Development Programme
CRT:	Critical Race Theory
DAFF:	Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
DRDLR:	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform
EU:	European Union
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
GEAR:	Growth, Employment, and Redistribution programme
IFAD:	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGDP:	Integrated Growth and Development Plan
JTGDM:	John Taolo Gaetsewe district municipality
KI:	Key informant
NB:	Non-beneficiary
NDP:	National Development Plan
NGP:	National Growth Path
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PPP:	Public-private partnerships
RAI:	Responsible Agriculture Investment
RDP:	Reconstruction and Development Programme
SDGs:	Sustainable Development Goals
UIGC:	Univen Innovative Growth Company
UN:	United Nations
UNCTAD:	United Nations Conference on Trade and Development
WSWB:	Willing-seller willing-buyer

Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

In this ethnographic study, I explore emerging black farmers' practices and the state support delivered to them[1]. I examine the implementation of the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP) via the enactment of three provincially established Agriparks projects (i.e. in Gauteng, Northern Cape, and Limpopo). The objective of the CRDP is to transform the country's agrarian structure sector and enhance the ability and capacity of small-scale farmers, especially rural women and youth, to gain access to land, productive resources and viable means of progress, such as knowledge, technology and institutional finances. Agriparks are the Department of Rural Development and land Reform's (DRDLRs) now known as the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development's (DALRD's) national programme for small-scale farmers' incubation and support services. The DALRD came into existence with the merger of the Department of Land Affairs and Department of Agriculture following the adoption of the CRDP which underpins the establishment of the Agriparks. With one in each of the country's 44 district municipalities, Agriparks' extension services, namely: advisory, facilitation, facilities, input supply and skills training, are mainly directed towards rural areas with populations that typically have low income and high unemployment rates. Agriparks, as change catalysts, promote and support public-private partnerships (PPPs) as agriculture development and growth models. The intended beneficiaries of the Agriparks are emerging black farmers who constitute the biggest proportion of black citizens living in former homelands.

I use ethnography approaches to understand the nuanced experiences of emerging black farmers in three case study sites. These ethnographic tools are semi-structured interviews, participatory observation, go-alongs, and ongoing data collection. The ethnographic tools provide me with insight into the complex setting and nature of the three cases studies, including how the support services are delivered and how they impact on the practices of the beneficiaries who are all black farmers. This study draws on the experiences and views of the beneficiaries and non-beneficiary black farmers and key informants with a focus on emerging black small-scale farmers and their interpretation of the changes brought by the Agriparks. The thesis maintains that there is ongoing dynamic interaction between emerging black farmers and the state, which influences the (re)configuration of agrarian relations. The chosen interpretive paradigm, further explained in the methodology in chapter three is appropriate to the ethnographic approach in that it emphasises that a fixed social reality does not exist and, instead, social

[1] The Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development use the concept of emerging black farmers and small-scale farmers interchangeably and I do the same in this thesis. This is because writing small-scale emerging black farmer is lengthy, and all the farmers involved in the study are black, small-scale and considered in South Africa to be 'emerging'. The term 'smallholder' is used in this thesis only when that is the term the research participants, programmes or writers being referred to use.

reality is the product of subjective experiences. No research, to the best of my broad investigation, has been undertaken into emerging black farmers' practices and the extension services they receive from the Agriparks. The focus of the study, emerging black farmer practices and the Agriparks of the CRDP, takes a historical perspective of agrarian change and discourses around agrarian change. A further important theme upon which this study is premised is understanding the globally utilised models of agricultural and farmer development. This study provides a broad overview of land reforms in South Africa, but the main focus is on emerging black farmers' practices as envisaged in the CRDP. For width and depth, this study also taps briefly into redistribution programmes. Major topics in this thesis are therefore the challenges and opportunities of emerging black farmers, particularly in terms of the state's current role in reconfiguring agrarian relations.

South Africa's post-apartheid land, agriculture, and rural development programmes include elements of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), the Growth, Employment and Redistribution strategy (GEAR), the Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative for South Africa (ASGISA), the National Development Plan (NDP) and the CRDP. The programmes were ushered in under three different ANC-led political administrations and the three waves are arguably interlinked.

On 24 May 1994, President Nelson Mandela announced South Africa's RDP, which aimed at democratic consolidation, political unity, and economic, social, cultural and economic cooperation. The RDP committed to eradicating racial prejudice and to bringing about an inclusive society with respect and equal opportunities for all citizens. Notably, the RDP provided the framework for the 1997 White Paper on South African Land Policy, which adopted a market-based approach, particularly the willing-seller willing-buyer (WSWB) model as the means for land reform (Hall, Jacobs & Lahiff, 2003; Williams, 1996; World Bank, 1994).

In 1996, the African National Congress adopted market-based approaches (Lahiff & Li, 2013) and President Mbeki launched the GEAR strategy and ASGISA, which promised modernisation and liberalisation aimed at inclusive trade and economic cooperation priorities. Economic growth and employment became the main intended outcomes of agriculture and land reform. The National Planning Commission, a special ministerial body first constituted in 2009 by President Jacob Zuma, drafted the NDP Vision 2030. From a policy point of view, the NDP 2030 Vision plan and the CRDP are in sync with various universal obligations and protocols South Africa is a signatory to, such as the SDGs and others (see, 4.12.3). The NDP Vision 2030 and the New Growth Path aimed to spur on agriculture and rural development and provided alternative development models to support the district municipality economies. The NDP asserts that land reform will advance the possibility for a dynamic, growing and employment-creating agricultural sector. Positing that land reform will enable the fast transfer of agricultural land to black beneficiaries without deforming land markets or business certainty in the agri-business sector. The CRDP will also safeguard sustainable production on transferred land by developing

human capabilities before land transfer around incubators, learnerships, mentoring, apprenticeships and accelerated training in agricultural sciences. In 2009/2010, Mr Zuma launched the CRDP. The CRDP paradigm and praxis are committed to political, organisational and societal changes that increase individual agency and institutional support regarding agriculture-led economic growth (Nkwinti, 2009).

In this thesis, I argue that Agriparks in South Africa promote the globally recognised concept of agro-clusters. Eva Galvez-Nogales (2010, xi) in her book *Agro-based clusters in developing countries: staying competitive in a globalized economy*, commissioned by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), says not much attention is awarded to clusters in the agricultural sector. An agro-cluster is a network of producers, agribusinesses and institutions that are involved in a similar agricultural or agro-industrial subsector, and that connect together to build value networks when tackling collective challenges and pursuing collective opportunities. In addition, it is argued that agro-cluster policies are important for small-scale farmers and agribusiness development as they improve productivity, marketisation and high value-added production. In South Africa, the DRDLR (2016) states that an "Agri-park is a network innovation system of agro-production, processing, logistics, marketing, training and extension services, located within a District Municipality. As a network it enables a market-driven combination and integration of various agricultural activities and rural transformation services".

The recurring research themes of this thesis are:

1. What are the dominant discourses on land reforms, agriculture, agrarian reforms, and practices in the literature? Here, I examine the critiques of literature that neglects to enrich the status and positioning of farmers in agrarian power structures and relations (World Bank, 1991; Binswanger & Byerlee, 2011, 2012; Deininger & Byerlee, 2011, 2012). I focus mainly on literature reviews that locate small-scale farmers as key information sources for the study (Bernstein, 2005, 2010; La Via Campesina, 2003, 2010; Van der Ploeg, Jingzhong & Schneider, 2012 Hebinck, Mango & Kimanthi 2015; Schneider, Salvate & Cassol, 2016) and calls for state intervention (Boone, 1994; Long & Van der Ploeg, 1994; Evans, 1995; Kohli, 1996; Moyo; 2005, 2010; Scoones 2005; Cousins & Chikazunga, 2013).
2. What are the key concepts and interpretations and what processes support and facilitate change? In addition, I chart major discourses, defining them as frameworks of meaning that conform and manifest social reality.
3. What are the social agencies and practice that support land reforms? Here, I examine perspectives and unequal power relations in agrarian practices and policies.

These themes attempt to clarify the shifts that have influenced land reforms and agrarian relations, and their linkages to agriculture as well as to power and wealth distribution. These themes aim to inform as well as to debunk familiar assumptions in land debates on power dynamics, and I hope that by examining them it might help to recalibrate approaches to state support, agency, and agricultural practices. As the

study evolves, in the context of South Africa, it links with contemporary development concerns of gender, race, developmental states, rural social movements, and intersectionality in land debates. Like similar small and medium-scale farmers in the developing world, emerging black farmers in South Africa negotiate and integrate compound marginalised identities (Hall, 2009; Lahiff, 2001).

Critique among respondents and key informants of this study is that state land reform efforts maintain and perpetuate pre-existing apartheid inequalities and a neoliberal capitalist status quo, both serving the interest of the minority white commercial farmers. But, the nexus between race, racial isolation, and attrition has not been examined, either theoretically or empirically. The government's inability to dismantle the legacy of separate and unequal agriculture demonstrates the complex and intractable reproduction of systemic racial inequality in agriculture. Hence, transition from racialised agrarian relations to more egalitarian relations involves a transition in the racialised cultural and power mechanisms — a collaboration between civil society and the state is necessary.

1.2 Research Problem Statement

South Africa's agriculture sector confronts several interrelated challenges. Not only are agriculture structures dual and parallel but they are becoming ever more segregated and black farmers remain largely on the margins of industrial and commercial agriculture (see Deininger, 1999; Adams & Howell, 2001; Lahiff, 2001, Wegerif, 2005; Hall, 2009; 2009; Van den Brink, Thomas, & Binswanger-Mkhize, 2009; Bernstein, 2013). The politico-racial separation of the majority of black people into marginal homelands perpetuated socio-economic injustice and inequalities; black farmers were isolated from state and institutional support afforded to white farmers (Aliber, Baipethi & Jacobs, 2009; Bernstein, 2013). Since 1994, with the onset of a non-racial government, agrarian and land reform measures have not been meeting the needs of the landless poor and poorly resourced black farmers, especially in terms of access to prime agriculture land (Cousins, 2013, 2014). Although agrarian and land reform research has contributed significantly to our understanding of how inequalities, such as socioeconomic background, shape emerging black farmers' practices, opportunities and challenges, to date, the research is comparatively slim documenting the ongoing complexities associated with injustices and inequalities experienced by emerging black farmers (see Aliber, et al., 2009; Cousins, 2013, 2014). Scholars have acknowledged that the complexities of emerging black farmers cannot be thoroughly understood if the multiple experiences of farmers are considered in isolation, especially as they relate to agrarian reform efforts – in this case, Agriparks. Research concerning farmer support in Agriparks is limited as the few existing studies were undertaken by officials linked to the DRDLR, and undertaken in insular frameworks. Most of the studies are policy analyses and do not use ethnography or a global analysis to understand current programme processes.

1.3 Objective

The objective of the study is to add to our knowledge and enrich the theoretical and programme debates around farmer development and agricultural transformation in South Africa. This is done through exploring how emerging black farmer practices are supported by the state, as conceptualised in the CRDP and delivered through Agriparks in three district municipalities located within three different provinces.

1.4 Research Questions

The overarching research question is: What can we learn about the nature and effectiveness of the South African government's Agriparks programme as a vehicle for promoting the development of emerging black farmers?

The following sub-questions guide the research process:

- What is the historic socio-economic context of the emerging black farmers in each of the three sites?
- What are the agriculture practices of emerging black farmers in the study sites?
- What are the emerging black farmers' inputs and outputs — their production and marketing practices?
- What are the main challenges and opportunities that drive emerging black farmers?
- What support services do black farmers receive, from whom and where (including Agriparks, but beyond them)?
- What has shaped the Agriparks and the nature of support they provide?

1.5 Limitations

In compliance with the terms of my bursary and the university's PhD programme, I had to complete the study within three years. This limited the potential depth of the study, including that I had selected only three study sites. As such, perspectives from other provinces and sites could not be represented. This limits the level of generalisation and transferability of findings.

Ethnographic approaches were used, such as participant observation, in-depth interviews, and go-alongs (walk alongs) accompanying research participants. However, the time limitations and work across three main sites prevented me carrying out the type of long-term ethnographic work associated with some classic ethnographic studies. The study has, nevertheless, recorded important experiences of black farmers and state provided agricultural support services.

While this study is interpretive, however, it offers explanatory and descriptive findings and invites others to make their own determination as to whether the lessons from these distinctive Agriparks and the findings shared add value to their own understandings and other circumstances in which they may be

working or studying. One other concern is the scope of issues not covered due to time limits and the vastness of issues, for example issues of global markets and food systems, among others, are not extensively covered.

1.6 The Structure of The Thesis

The thesis is structured into eight chapters. **Chapter one** introduces the study by outlining a number of its features and then explains the research problem, objective and research questions' purpose in more detail. **Chapter two** provides background to the main topics of the study and brief perspectives on these. This is followed by a historical background to the study in terms of land dispossessions and post-1994 land reforms. The chapter then turns attention to an overview of the policy context of the CRDP within Agriparks. **Chapter three** explains the methodology. It provides the justification for the qualitative methodology, ethnography, the case studies, interviewing process and the selection of participants. **Chapter four** introduces various discourses on land and agrarian reforms, provides definitions of emerging farmers, agriculture, rural development and the role of the state in reforms. **Chapter five** presents global challenges and opportunities. It explores the global framework within which the study is located, neoliberal influence in the land and agriculture sector, agro-clusters and global value chains, land grabs and the role of foreign agencies in the sector. **Chapter six** presents the findings and provides the emerging themes based on the data collected through the various research tools. **Chapter seven**, in presenting the promise of agrarian equity, gives an analysis of Agriparks, emerging black farmers, the state, vestiges of racism in the sector and issues of justice and equality. **Chapter eight** expresses the study conclusion and final thoughts. It focuses on the analysis and makes recommendations and suggestions which are important for the development of emerging black farmers and services from the Agriparks. It does this by extracting key themes in the process of understanding what happened and why.

1.7 Conclusion

In South Africa land and agrarian reforms are highly contested. I show that a high-equity state intervention programme will ensure that family farmers deliver for livelihoods and the economy. The discourses are broad, controversial and nuanced. This chapter provides the introduction to the study, research problem, research objective, research questions, limitations and the structure of the thesis. Studying the background, conceptualisation and implementation of Agriparks was rewarding. Not only is the Agriparks programme an under-studied and under-theorised contemporary phenomenon, but the research topic also responds to my own personal interest in the agrarian question. My own personal interest stems from my own childhood experience working in the family fields that was financed from a measly urban remittance, causing us to sacrifice other priorities such as education There are many aspects of agrarian reforms, such as agro-clusters, that are less analysed or interpreted. Studying Agriparks provided an opportunity to examine a variety of complex issues related to the success of small-

scale farmers, embedded in multiple systems of injustice and inequality. It enabled the exploration, in my mind, of the development of an agrarian culture and the consequences of its implementation. Perhaps most importantly, this study enabled my interaction with emerging black farmers and the contemplation of an agrarian social movement that will be true to the ecosystem. Perhaps this thesis becomes complicated, but it is important to consider all the findings as any single finding would not provide the full story.

Chapter 2 Background: Perspectives and Reflections from the Colonial Past to Post 1994 Era.

2.1 Introduction

Historically, through various forms of colonial rule and settler colonialism, the majority of black people lost access to their land, especially prime agricultural land, and other development resources (Lowis, 1995; Van Aswegen, 1989). In this background chapter, I draw on the history of land dispossessions under various racially discriminatory laws and practices of various colonial regimes. I indicate how, under various settler policies, the majority of black people lost their land. I refer especially to the Natives Land Act of 1913 and the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936, which both singularly and collectively usurped the bulk of the country's land for the use of a white minority population. I look at the vestiges of racism in the agriculture sector and its impact on black farmers. I focus on the post-apartheid democratic reforms and the constitutional mandate to take the necessary legislative and administrative measures to redress historical injustices and inequalities. I focus on the legislative frameworks and touch on the land reform programmes and other policies that relate to land, agriculture and rural development, for example, the NDP and the New Growth Path (NGP). I look into the CRDP, its policy objectives and implementation framework, and I explore the issues relating to emerging black farmers. In doing this, I give both a historical and contemporary context within which to answer the research questions.

2.2 Brief Historical Background

2.2.1 Settler Colonialism: Implications for Land and Farming

On 6 April 1652, Jan van Riebeeck and his entourage from the Netherlands arrived in Table Bay in search of a halfway station to establish an outpost for the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie, known as the VOC or the Dutch East India Company. The land occupation would serve as a halfway point for the sailors to replenish resources on their travels around the southern part of Africa on their way to the East. To this end, the sailors were to build a fort to secure the occupied area against invaders like the Khoikhoi people and other indigenous people already occupying the area. In 1657, the company allowed nine of its members to establish private farms at Rondebosch, beneath the eastern slopes of Table Mountain (Lowis, 1995: 10). In 1679, Simon van der Stel was confirmed as governor of the Cape and in 1689 the Huguenots fled from France and settled around Franschoek. As the number of white minority settlers increased, the initially small colony grew to a commercial enterprise, which expanded into the interior parts of the country. Both the expansions and occupations were met with resistance by indigenous people on the eastern frontier; at the core of the internecine battles was the ownership of the land and dispossession of livestock (Van Aswegen, 1989: 118). Indigenous people were driven off portions of their land, which were then occupied by white settlers (ibid). These confrontations illustrate by what means the relationship between settlers and the indigenous people broadly deteriorated (Boucher, 1991: 69-70).

With the ongoing conflicts, given the settlers' superior weaponry, indigenous peoples' land was further annexed; this condition of warring was intensified with the British taking over the Cape Colony in 1806 to strengthen their trade with the East (Omer-Cooper, 1988: 22). Increasingly, indigenous people became workers on white farms. Throughout the 1800s conflicts, indigenous people were displaced from their land and dispossessed of livestock. In 1834, white settlers took off to the north, away from British rule. These conditions led to more prevalent conflict over land in the country (Lowis, 1995: 11). Under British control, indigenous people in the Cape Colony were forced to pay a "hut tax". The hut tax, which was a set amount of tax payable per hut per annum, was imposed on African rural households many of whom had no cash. The tax forced Africans to seek work as cheap migrant labourers in white owned urban mines in order to get cash to pay the tax. Others, unable to pay, the indigenous people were forced to work on white farms. It set-off South Africa's Trekboer system, men left their homes for work on white farms, became poorer, and could no longer take care of their own farming (Geldenhuys, 1991: 285).

2.2.2 The Great Trek

In 1835 with The Great Trek, more minority white settlers Voortrekkers (Trekkers) moved into the interior of South Africa. The Great Trek consciously rebuffed the authority of the British government in the Cape and the white settlers went on to establish an independent community in the interior, away from the British rule (Omer-Cooper, 1988: 70). The Great Trek continued the inward expansion and occupation of land. 'Trekkers' moved beyond the north-eastern districts across the Orange River to settle in Trans-Orania. The inward move was met with resistance but because of their superior weaponry, the Trekkers had an advantage over the indigenous people. The Trekkers settled in various small, congregated groups over wide areas of land (Omer-Cooper, 1988: 72). The invasion of the interior culminated in the founding of two Boer Republics, namely the Orange Free State and the Transvaal. The Trekkers splintered into several small groups, expanding and occupying more land, while internal contradictions within the Trekkers threatened political stability (Omer-Cooper, 1988: 71). The 1870s and 1880s saw an ascendance in Afrikaner nationalism which threatened republican power and the independence of the Boer Republics which led to conflict with the British (Pampallis, 1991: 46). Following a short conflict in 1881, known as the First Anglo-Boer War, the Second Anglo-Boer War began in 1899 and ended on 31 May 1902 with the signing of the Treaty of Vereeniging which sealed the foreign domination and exploitation of South Africa (Pampallis, 1991: 46).

2.2.3 The 1910 Union

Between 1908 and 1909 representatives of the four colonies, Cape, Natal, Transvaal and Orange Free State, negotiated The Union of South Africa, under which the colonies became provinces. Political power was concentrated in white hands — only whites could serve as members of parliament and only whites could vote in the Transvaal, the Orange Free State and Natal. In the Cape, existing qualified franchise remained, allowing only a few property-owning blacks to vote, but only for white candidates. However,

black voters in the Cape could be elected to serve in the provincial council (Pampillas, 1991: 49). Following resistance and opposition from other provinces, in 1910, Parliament assigned a selected committee chaired by the Minister of Native Affairs, Henry Burton, to look into the question of African land settlement with specific reference to the "squatting" problem. The committee recommended a uniform policy for the Union to regulate the settlement of Africans on private property and, where such settlement existed or was permitted, to ensure levers of power and control with the owners of such property and by the government (Barker, Bell, Duggan, Horler, Leroux, Maurice, Reynierse, & Schafer, 1988: 511).

In the late 1930s and 1940s, the Betterment schemes were applied, imposing exacting land-use measures over rural communities, particularly those on trust land. The Betterment schemes-imposed restrictions on ploughing, regulated the culling of cattle through the Stock Limitation Act of 1950, divided arable and grazing land, and reduced field sizes (Delius, 1993). This led to the escalation of the role of both the Native Commissioners and Agricultural Officers (ibid). Boucher (1991), Van Aswegen (1989) and Van Onselen (1996) describe the extent to which the Union government-controlled access to and ownership of land. The Union systematically shaped land relations and farm practices between white and black farms. The Union's measures, in its national policy, framed the construction of an exclusionary dualistic and racially categorised system of farm ownership and the implementation of discriminatory measures in each part of the system (Barker, 1988; Natrass, 1993).

2.2.4 The Natives Land Act of 1913: Black Land Alienation

In terms of the 1913 Natives Land Act (Act 27 of 1913), land owned by blacks was "scheduled" for white occupation and segregation. According to this Act of 1913, "A native [black] shall not enter into any agreement or transaction for the purchase, hire, or other acquisition from a person other than a native, of any such land or of any right thereto, interest there in, or servitude there over; A person other than a native shall not enter into any agreement or transaction for the purchase, hire, or other acquisition from a native of any such land or of any right thereto, interest therein, or servitude there over. No person other than a native shall purchase, hire or in any other manner whatever acquire any land in a scheduled native area or enter into any agreement or transaction for the purchase, hire or other acquisition, direct or indirect, of any such land or of any right thereto or interest therein or servitude there over, except with the approval of the Governor General".

The Act aimed at abolishing the African franchise from the House of Assembly, clustering the surplus natives into rural areas, and effectively removing blacks from the urban areas. It would put an end to the extensive buying of land by the state for the natives — land for the natives would be strictly regulated and paid for by the natives in keeping with separated development laws. Taken as being in the best interest of all non-whites, the Act would establish separate residential areas and separate places of work. It would legislate the privileged employment of white labour in keeping with a predetermined quota for

whites and non-whites. Racially segregated areas would be institutionalised nationally. The urban flow of black labour was minimised and mainly for the mining and agricultural sectors, which created a labour shortage in these two sectors (Natrass, 1993: 43). Tatz (1961: 13) asserts there were two priorities of the Act, namely the "superior" needs of the whites against the "primitive" needs of the blacks, and the need for black labour to work on the mines in white areas, industries and farms because of the lack of white labourers in the white economy. The loss of land, due to the Act, destabilised the black peasantry and the black economy, and the rural economy and traditional mode of production could not thrive without land and access to resources (Tatz: 1962: 27). It was a legislative means to reduce competition in white areas by black peasant producers.

2.2.5 The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act

The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act established the South African Native Trust (later re-named the Development Trust) as a state agency with wide-ranging powers to acquire and administer further land for African occupancy (Feinberg, 1993). The 1936 Native Trust and Land Act augmented the 1913 Natives Land Act on the separation of land for whites and blacks. The Native Trust was authoritarian. It established designated ethnic-based Bantu “homelands” where blacks could hold land, exercise their political rights, and determine their own economic development. According to the Native Trust and Land Act, Bantu reserves were extended from 7.3% to almost 13% of land (Lapping 1986: 204). The Native Trust was to acquire land for settlement of blacks, develop the land, and promote agriculture in native reserves. The Trust would acquire such funds necessary for the land purchases from taxes paid by blacks under the Natives Taxation and Development Act of 1925 (commonly known as "Local Tax"), and from fines paid by blacks for various offences. Notably, the 1936 land act "reformed" the land tenure system of the blacks on white farms, restricting the number of labour tenants that a white farmer might have at any particular time.

The 1913 and 1936 land acts were the decisive legislation warranting the transfer of African land to white hands, building on existing legislation but by means of much more drastic measures to eradicate all forms of black land ownership and independent black tenancy, and to reduce the number of black tenants (Wildschut & Hulbert, 1998; Deininger, 1999; Wegerif, 2005; Louw, 2013; Lahiff, 2019). The Acts gave whites substantive control of the land, forbade sharecropping on white-owned farms, limited the number of labouring families per farm to five, and laid down that all black tenants on white farms be defined as servants (Lahiff, 2019). In addition, the acts specified ‘‘scheduled’’ areas, where Africans could still buy land (Cousins & Scoones, 2010). Black South Africans in rural areas, representing about 30% of the national population, had access to less than 15% of all farmlands typically held under informal or insecure tenure in racially segregated “homelands” (Lahiff, 2010).

2.2.6 The Apartheid era of 1948

The ultimate solution to the "Native Problem" was total separation of the races (Tatz, 1961: 148). Different bantu homelands were created for the ten African ethnic groups (Butler, Rotberg, &, Adams, 1977: 7). A plethora of laws were enacted to legislate on separate development, like the Population Registration Act (1950), the Group Areas Act (1950), the Bantu Authorities Act (1951) and the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (1953). The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act (Act No. 46 of 1959, renamed the Promotion of Black Self-government Act, 1959, and afterwards the Representation between the Republic of South Africa and the Self-governing Territories Act, 1959) created a grouping of various Bantustans to serve the political aspirations of self-determination for the black population. The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951 promulgated the establishment of local African governments in the bantu homelands based upon existing traditional systems (Kotze, 1978: 117).

The 1948 apartheid laws were generally aimed against African urbanisation and related threats of black urban squatting (Posal, 1991: 61). The Apartheid policy consolidated the advancement of the bantu reserves areas, with each ethnic minority group required to live in a designated reserve area (Jooste, 1972: 375). The Group Areas Act of 1950 (re-enacted in 1957 and 1966) separated urban areas into "group areas" in which ownership and residence were restricted to certain population groups and the Rural Coloured Areas Act of 1963 established "reserve" areas for coloured people in rural areas. To control urbanisation, the apartheid government passed the Native Laws Amendment Act in 1952. The Act restricted black urban migration and extended the pass system to black women (initially only men were required to carry identity documents). Foreigners in their own land, blacks where allowed a prescribed time within which to return to their identified areas, otherwise local authorities were given the power to forcibly remove them (Joyce, 1990: 16). Ndlovu (2017) assert that the two key mechanisms through which the apartheid state perpetuated separate development were the homelands and control of black urban migration combined with racial segregation of urban settlements. The apartheid state subsequently strengthened the patterns of ownerships, control and practices, at the same time restricted black farmers to marginal farmer land in the ‘‘homelands” areas specifically created for black people’s aspirations. Cousins (see 2013a, 2014) argues that the bantu reserves have kept black farmers in a state of unwitting perpetual collusion with white power structures. Bernstein (2013) contends through apartheid structures, at different historical periods, black farmers were vulnerable to the project of apartheid, prescriptions estranged from their own experience because their farming practices were constrained (also see Aliber, 2009; Hall, 2009).

The outcome was that agricultural production in the homelands was constrained by reduced access to land, markets and services. Thus, agriculture contributed a small percentage of income to the family subsistence. Farming practices in the homelands shows that agricultural institutions had a critical role in perpetuating and entrenching the models of farming already apparent in a segregated society. Poor land

and farming practices contributed to poverty, overpopulation and a lack of sufficient facilities such as transport, marketing and finance (Van der Walt & Pienaar, 1997: 453). White agriculture, by contrast, had abundant land, black labour and state subsidies; farm labour was coerced from black rural workers who had been transformed from sharecropping peasants into labour tenants and wage labourers (see Wegerif, 2005). As a result of the dual and unequal system of land ownership, a minority of white farmers acquired enormous tracts of agricultural land at the expense of black South Africans who were displaced and forcibly re-settled between 1913 and 1990.

2.2.7 Impacts of Settler Colonial Acts on Agrarian Structures

South Africa's binary agricultural system manifested during the many years of colonial and settler-colonial construction of the sector with the dualism led by land dispossession, oppression and exploitation of black people. Since settler colonialism, and even before, South Africa's agrarian structures and agrarian relations had been constructed in terms of race and racism via discriminatory legislative, policy and administrative measures that instituted racial segregation and discrimination in land ownership and use (see the land acts of 1913 and 1936). Black families who owned land under freehold tenure outside the reserves before 1913 were at first relieved from the conditions of the Natives Land Act. The consequence was the emergence of a number of so-called ''black-spot'' communities in farming areas inhabited by whites. These black people were the priority of a second wave of forced removals from the 1950s through to the 1980s. Under the provisions of the Native Trust and Land Act, 1936, black people lost the basic right to purchase land in the reserves and were obliged to utilise land administered by tribal authorities appointed by the government. The Black Administration Act, Act No. 38 of 1927, the Development Trust and Land Act, 1936, the Group Areas Act, 1950, 1957 and 1966, the Community Development Act, 1996, and the Black Resettlement Act, 1954, were used to relocate, evict and expropriate ''black spot'' communities, unregistered and deregistered labour tenants and disqualified urban dwellers. Under a swath of racially based laws, millions of black people were forced to vacate their ancestral lands and resettle in what became over-crowded and environmentally degraded reserves – pools of cheap migrant labour for white-owned farms and mines. In apartheid policies and practices, the theory of white supremacy was entrenched, and the ideology institutionalised through racial social relations and categories (see the Group Areas Act, 1950, and the Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, 1953). Through apartheid's policies of separate development, the majority of black South Africans were systematically and structurally, often brutally and forcibly, removed as surplus people from their arable ancestral land and resources (in terms of the Population Registration Act, 1950). Black people had no development status and economic power outside their allocated ''homelands'' (in terms of the Homelands Development Corporations Act, 1965). The apartheid development paradigm disenfranchised black people and caused the impracticality of black land ownership in most of the economically productive areas (in terms of the Bantu Self-Government Act of 1950, the Bantu Authorities Act of 1951,

the Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act, 1959 and the Bantu Homelands Constitution Act of 1971). By these laws and measures the majority of black people were alienated from their land by white supremacist policy measures, made foreigners and forced into unequal ''minority'' ethnic states through balkanisation of the country (in terms of the Pass Laws Act of 1952, the Public Safety Act of 1953 and the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1953).

2.3. Synopsis: Post 1994 Land and Agrarian Reforms

At the end of the extensive Convention for a Democratic South Africa negotiations to end apartheid, the multiparty negotiations agreed on an Interim Constitution on 17 November 1993. Following South Africa's first democratic, non-racial elections in 1994, the Government of National Unity passed key land legislation and policies to address the highly inequitable land regime the country had been left with after centuries of colonialism and more than forty years of apartheid. These land reform efforts are elaborated below.

2.3.1. The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, as amended

In order to address pre-existing land-based injustices and inequalities as a result of apartheid, the South African Constitution states that:

- A person or community dispossessed of property after 19 June 1913, as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices, is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to restitution of that property, or to equitable redress.
- The state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis.
- A person or community whose tenure of land is legally insecure, as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices, is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure, or to comparable redress.

Section 25 of the Constitution, as amended, concerns itself with the right of access to land. Section 25(5) deals with equitable access to land, section 25(6) addresses restitution; section 25(7) concerns security of tenure; and 25(8) identifies land, water and related reforms. Section 25 on property (the 'Property Clause') in the Bill of Rights sets out a wide-ranging mandate to the state to enact land reforms and other related measures.

South Africa's land reform mandate is to thus to provide equitable access to land, security of tenure and opportunities for land restitution. In addition, section 27 (2) "[t]he state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis". "No provision of this section may impede the state from taking legislative and other measures to achieve land, water and related reform, in order to redress the results

of past racial discrimination". Section 25(1) states that "no one may be deprived of property except in terms of law of general application, and no law may permit arbitrary deprivation of property". Section 25(2)(a) requires that property only be expropriated in terms of a law of general application for a "public purpose" or in the "public interest." Section 25(4)(a) specifically provides that the "public interest" includes land reform. It is therefore clear from the reading of section 25(2)(a), together with section 25(4)(a), that land reform is considered in the Constitution to be a justifiable ground for interference with property rights. However, section 25(l)(b) requires that where expropriation occurs, there must be compensation. Section 25(3) specifically deals with the nature of compensation and includes the determination of the value of compensation. Section 25(2) of the Constitution allows for property to be expropriated 'in the public interest' and section 25(3) requires that "just and equitable" compensation be determined "having regard to all relevant circumstances".

2.3.2. The three main pillars of land reform

The Constitution sets out the three main pillars of land reform that are given expression in various pieces of legislation and programmes. The three pillars are: redistribution to create greater equity in land holding (s25(4) of the Constitution); tenure reform to give legally secure rights in land (s25(6)); and restitution, to allow those who lost land due to racial discrimination to be able to claim it back or get alternative redress (s25(6)). Some key pieces of land reform legislation regarding the three pillars are:

Firstly, in terms of redistribution, the Constitution, in s25(5) of the Bill of Rights on ''equitable access'', states that "[t]he state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to foster conditions which enable citizens to gain access to land on an equitable basis". Secondly, the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act No.3 of 1996 covers the Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act of 1991, the Upgrading of Land Tenure Rights Act of 1991, and the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act of 1996 and The Extension of Security of Tenure Act of 1997.Thirdly, the Restitution of Land Rights Act (Act 22 of 1994) was the first law passed by the democratically elected government in 1994. Section 8 (the Equality Clause) and Sections 121–123 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act, No. 200 of 1993 (the Interim Constitution Act) provided for the setting up of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights for this purpose. This Act and the subsequent Land Restitution and Reform Laws Amendment Act, 1997, set out the details for making a submission to the Land Commission.

2.3.3. South Africa's White Paper on Land Policy, 1997

The White Paper on Land Policy, finalised in 1997, adopted market-based land reforms (World Bank, 1994; Williams, 1996; Affairs, 1997; Hall, Jacobs, & Lahiff, 2003; Hall, 2011). Based on the WSWB principle, the markets produce optimal outcomes and any interference by government is almost certain to be injurious. Meanwhile, land access, control and ownership remain highly disproportionate and successive

researchers indicate minimal positive changes in land ownership (Hall, 2010; Cousins, 2011; Lahiff, 2011). Landholdings remain highly unequal and racially skewed between the rich and poor, mainly between white farmers and black farmers.

2.3.4. South Africa's White Paper on Land Reforms, 2010

The White Paper on Land Reforms (2010) states that land, its ownership and use had a significant role in modelling the political, economic and social processes in South Africa (White Paper, 2010). Before the advent of multiracial democracy, land policies were a cause of insecurity, landlessness, homelessness and poverty in the country (Hall, Jacobs, & Lahiff, 2003; Hall, 2011). The apartheid policies caused inefficient urban and rural land use patterns which severely constrained effective resource use and development. The White Paper states the vision of a land policy and land reform programme which advances reconciliation, stability, growth, and development in an equitable and sustainable manner. It proffers a land market supported by an effective and accessible institutional framework. In urban areas, the poor should have secure access to well-located land for the provision of shelter. The land reform programme's poverty effort is intended at realising a better quality of life for the most disadvantaged people.

2.3.5. South Africa's Green Paper on Land Reform, 2011

The DRDLR's Green Paper on Land Reform (2011) aims to transform agriculture production into a globally competitive agro-industry (DRDDLR, 2011). The fundamental principles inspiring land reform, as set out in the 2011 Green Paper, support specific objectives: de-racialisation of the rural economy, equitable land allocation and use across race, gender and class; ongoing and enhanced production regulation to foster social cohesion, food security, shared economic growth, and sustainable development. In addition, the Green Paper outlines the strategic objectives of land reform as twofold: to strive that land reform farms are 100% productive; and to reignite the class of black commercial farmers that was purposely and systematically obliterated by the 1913 Natives Land Act and other successive legislation. The Green Paper stresses that land management and administration should not be implemented separately from rural/urban development strategies including governance and socio-economic investment elements. Greenberg (2010) argues that the initial step is to expedite the transfer of land while the second step is to then support the productive use of the transferred land. The matter of the value of state support is not merely one of historical significance but of great contemporary importance to the desegregation of South Africa's agriculture (see Aliber & Hall, 2009; Greenberg, 2010; Bernstein 2013; Cousins, 2013). Programmes are to be housed in the CRDP for better cooperation and coordination within and between departments and agencies.

2.3.6. National Development Plan 2030 (2010)

The NDP 2030, aims to eliminate poverty and reduce inequality by 2030, targets to fast-track land reform to improve communal tenure, provide financial and technical support to farmers, and roll out the delivery

of social and physical infrastructure for successful implementation (NDP, 2030). The development plan is aimed at rural areas throughout local municipal, district municipal, provincial and regional boundaries to support economic growth, food security and employment through agrarian transformation and infrastructure development programmes. It commits to facilitating capacity building to support state institutions and private industries to implement state interventions. Area based and differentiated rural development plans will be executed through better coordination and integration in the planning and implementation of land reforms. The development plan envisages that by 2030, agriculture will have generated near to one million new jobs, contributing appreciably to cutting overall unemployment.

2.3.7. New Growth Path, 2010

In 2010, the government adopted the NGP to achieve inclusive economic growth and eliminate rural poverty and inequality. The NGP aims to create 300,000 opportunities for agricultural smallholder schemes and 145,000 jobs in agro-processing by 2020, as well as to upgrade conditions for 660,000 farmworkers. The agro-processing industry is recognised by the NDP and IPAP2 for its potential to stimulate growth and create jobs. Based on backward linkage with the primary sector and input suppliers as well as forward linkages to income generated in agriculture, forestry and fisheries that stimulate demand for manufactured goods. Agro-processing is part of the manufacturing sector, especially in food and beverages. It includes, among others, meat processing; dairy products; food packaging; preservation of food and vegetables; and preserving fish. Agro-processing often produced secondary products, such as fruit juice produced from raw fruits, that can have a longer shelf life and appeal to a wider market. Through the agricultural value chain, it aims to grow employment by five million jobs, ensure the employment of half of the working-age population and reduce unemployment from 25% to 15%. The Industrial Development Corporation funds programmes such as the CRDP, the Expanded Public Works Programme and Community Works Programmes to support job creation (Meyer, 2011).

The NGP policy on rural development presented key priorities for the State of the Nation Address of 2011 including job creation, rural development, improved health facilities, better standard of education, and an improvement in the safety and security of the country as a whole. However, the NGP was subject to criticism for its dependence on government for the implementation of the plan (Prinsloo, 2011: 1). Furthermore, it aims to align co-ordination, planning, and implementation of economic policies in the three spheres of government (provincial, district, and local), improve skills development and nation building and ensure increased focus on spatial planning and integration of communities. Critics pointed out that partnerships and capabilities were basic elements for an effective South African development path (Development Bank of South Africa, 2011).

2.3.8. Limited land reform progress

Scholars argue that post-apartheid land reform legislation and policy interventions have failed to deliver just and equitable land redistribution and improved lives for the black majority (Deininger & May, 2000; Mayson, 2003; Kleinbooi, Lahiff, & Boyce, 2006; Lahiff, 2009; Hebinck, 2010). Scholars argue that Changes in South Africa's agrarian structure since 1994 have failed to correct the historic imbalances (Lahiff, 2007; Hall, 2009; Cousins, 2013). By 2018 only 4.8 million hectares of land had been acquired through the land redistribution programme (DRDLR, 2018). This is just 4.32% of the total of 111 million hectares of registered farm land and agricultural holdings in the country. There are limitations on the data available, but on the private land where the government can identify the race of the owner, 72% of all land is white owned and just 4% is African owned (DRDLR, 2017a). The concentration of production is even greater with it being estimated that by 2014 just 7,000 farmers accounted for around 80% of the value of all agricultural production. In line with global trends of greater inequality, the concentration has continued in South Africa in primary production, for example the investment fund Future Growth has bought 8 major farm operations and plans to buy more. The concentration continues downstream in processing and retailing process with, for example, the largest dairy companies in South Africa being bought out by even larger global corporations (Wegerif & Anseeuw, 2020).

Land reform has faced challenges, with a huge concentration of agricultural production in the hands of a small, very productive nucleus of white capitalist farmers, only a few black farmers have entered commercial farming (Cousins, 2013b). Greenberg argues that the decision to delink land reform from agriculture at an institutional level into separate ministries is both unexpected and counter-intuitive (Greenberg, 2010). Greenberg concludes by advancing that one of the reasons for the failures of state programmes is that land reform is a national competency, whereas agriculture is a concurrent national and provincial competency. Thus, there has been a policy disjuncture between land reform and agricultural sector reform objectives and strategies.

2.4. A Summary of State Programmes

2.4.1. Land Reform: Provision of Land and Assistance Act, 126 of 1993

The Provision of Certain Land for Settlement Act (No. 126 of 1993) was amended twice. Firstly, by an amendment it became the Provision of Certain Land for Settlement Act, Act No. 26 of 1998 and secondly, by another amendment, it became the Provision of Land and Assistance Act, Act No. 58 of 2008. The Act specify the allocation of certain land; to order the subdivision of such land and the settlement of persons thereon; to provide for the acquisition, maintenance improvement and disposal of property and the provision of financial support for land reform purposes. In its diverse structures, the Act permits the designation and acquisition of land for settlement reasons and provision of financial support. Section 10 of the Provision of Certain Land for Settlement Act, Act No. 126 of 1993 (commonly known as ''Act 126'')

establishes the Minister's powers to procure land or give land purchase subsidies for the acquisition of land. The Act also allows for the widening of access to land through state land purchase while maintaining state powers of regulation over non-productive uses of land (see Kepe & Hall, 2016).

2.4.2. Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) 1994–1995

The RDP commits to implementing a fundamental land reform programme and sets out a paradigm for the government's rural land reform programme (ANC,1994). The RDP acknowledges that apartheid policies relocated millions of black South Africans into congested and impoverished reserves, homelands and townships. Furthermore, capital-intensive agricultural policies steered the large-scale eviction of farm dwellers from their land and homes. Hence, the RDP programme aims to redress the injustices of forced removals and the historical denial of access to productive land to blacks. Under the RDP 1994–1995, government piloted district-based land reform programmes in all provinces. It aimed to secure tenure for rural dwellers and farm workers through providing support services, increasing rural incomes and eliminating overcrowding. The RDP programme should be demand-driven and should aim to provide residential and productive land to the poorest of the rural population and aspirant farmers. As part of a comprehensive rural development policy, the RDP should raise rural incomes and productivity, and should inspire the use of land for agricultural purposes. The RDP strategy for land reform was that grants should be ''leveraged'', meaning that grants should catalyse contributions from local/provincial governments, non-government organisations and private sector for economic, social and infrastructural developments. Specifically, the RDP committed to the redistribution of 30% of agricultural land within five years, that is by 1999.

2.4.3 The Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant 1995–1999

Between 1995 and 1999, the Department of Land Affairs provided a Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant to help households purchase land or housing on the market (Department of Land Affairs, 1997). The White Paper on South African Land Policy, 1997, stated that households with incomes below R1 500 per month were eligible to receive a limited Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant to buy land and settle on it (Lahiff, 2009; Rugege, 2004). However, in 1999, The Minister of land affair's Review disapproved of the intentions of the grant, both for failing to meet its own aims and by implicitly continuing the idea that black people can only advance under communal and subsistence farming (see Kepe & Hall, 2016).

2.4.4. The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy, 2005–2006

In 2006, the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy was launched under then Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs. The strategy took root from 2009 under Jacob Zuma's administration. The strategy targets black people (Africans, coloureds and Indians) that live in communal areas, and people living under insecure tenure rights and with the necessary farming skills in urban areas. It is designed to benefit households with limited or no land access, small-scale commercial farmers with the potential to expand,

established black commercial farmers, and aspiring black commercial farmers with limited access to finance. The strategy permits the state, on a WSWB basis, to proactively purchase land to leasehold to selected black beneficiaries. Uniquely, the state purchases land directly from the seller without first having identified a beneficiary for the land. The strategy authorises provincial officials to negotiate purchases directly with willing landowners based on estimated land needs and then to lease this land to beneficiaries for three to five years (DRDLR, 2009). Other beneficiaries are farm workers, youth, women, and unemployed agricultural graduates (Department of Land Affairs, 2008).

2.4.5. State Land Lease and Disposal Policy, 2013

The State Land Lease and Disposal Policy of 2013, endorsed by DRDLR Minister Gugile Nkwinti in July 2013, adopts the state leasehold model and establishes the criteria and approach to implementation. It states that after 50 years of renting from the state whether a beneficiary could become the owner or not of the land (DRDLR, 2013). The policy embraces a wide range of possible beneficiaries, including households with no or limited access to land, even for survival production, small-scale farmers who are farming for subsistence purposes and selling part of their produce on local markets, medium-scale commercial farmers with the aptitude to expand but who are restrained by land and other resources, and large-scale farmers who are disadvantaged by location, size of land and other resources and the potential to grow.

2.4.6. The One-Household, One-Hectare Policy

The One-Household, One-Hectare Policy intends to offer small allotments for vegetable gardening for non-commercial purposes on state land. This programme was officially launched in October 2015. The One-Household, One-Hectare Policy approach is structured according to a proposal by the Commission on Gender Equality for a ''one-woman, one-hectare'' campaign, and is endorsed by the Rural Women's Assembly. The African Farmers' Association of South Africa criticised the policy proposal, claiming the programme will limit opportunities for farmers to become commercial at a small, medium and large scale (Kepe & Hall, 2016). The association demanded the policy be used only in communal areas and not in commercial farming areas or areas with high-value agricultural land.

2.4.7. The '50/50 Policy', 2014

The 50/50 Policy: Strengthening the Relative Rights of People Who Work the Land was announced in 2014 as a policy proposal to re-introduce equity share schemes on commercial farms. It proposes that farm owners retain 50% ownership of the farm, and cede 50% ownership to workers, the stake of which will be purchased for the beneficiaries by the state. It stipulates that long-term workers who have given ''disciplined service'' will get shareholding, thus restructuring the workforce, especially women, towards more casual and temporary forms of employment. Eligible farmworkers will acquire equity shares in the farm depending on their length of service. Although rejected by both farm workers and farm owner

representatives at the Land Tenure Summit in 2014, the DRDLR has started with its implementation but no final policy has been adopted (Kepe & Hall, 2016).

2.5. Comprehensive Rural Development Programme (CRDP)

In 2009, President Jacob Zuma, in his State of the Nation Address, announced the launch of the CRDP and set a goal that the country will be by 2035 economically prosperous and food secure. Government pronounced the CRDP in July 2009 and Cabinet approved it on 12 August 2009. The CRDP is instituted in the Green Paper on Land Reform, 2011, which addresses "tenure insecurity, food insecurity, rural underdevelopment, and inequality in the agricultural sector". The CRDP keeps a strategic continuity with the NDP, National Growth Path, The Agricultural Policy Plan and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) among other local and global protocols. With the CRDP, the President integrated land reform, fisheries and forestry under the newly established DRDLR. The articulation of the CRDP within the broader national development vision 2030 enhances coordination across government levels and aids to appraise programmes, such as food sovereignty and environment, in a systemic approach (NDP,2010). The CRDP is geared towards empowering the rural population to take control of their lives with support from various government departments. The CRDP strategic objectives are to align development programmes by decentralising and supporting a vibrant and sustainable rural population, by expanding investment zones and improving the transport links between districts and the rest of the country. The CRDP is realised through a three-pronged strategy centred on (1) establishing systematic and integrated broad-based agrarian transformation to support equality and inclusive growth, (2) fast-tracking rural development to tackle concerns of wealth distribution, and (3) improving land reform to facilitate growth (DRDLR, 2009). As stated in DRDLR (2009) the CRDP categorises five groups of land redistribution beneficiaries:

1. Landless households who seek land for subsistence purposes.
2. ''Commercial-ready subsistence producers'' who are capable of a more commercial focus but need land and support to farm, mostly on a part-time basis.
3. ''Expanding commercial smallholders'' who already farm commercially on a small-scale but are constrained by lack of land and other resources.
4. ''Well-established black commercial farmers'' who are already farming at a reasonable scale but are disadvantaged by location and other circumstances.
5. ''Financially capable, aspirant black commercial farmers'' who are black businesspeople who will mostly farm on a part-time basis.

The CRDP key focus areas are: food security, job creation and contribution to the gross domestic product (DRDLR, 2009). Regarding the SDGs, the CRDP allows tracing how agri-food policies synchronise with the structures of agro-food systems and whether these adjustments correspond with communities' livelihood reproduction. As stated in the DRDLR Rural Economy Transformation Model Draft Policy, the

CRDP will provide smallholder farmers access to secure land and local markets through developing neighbouring households and schools nearby (DRDLR, 2015). This is critical as food sovereignty is expressed as the right of peoples and nations to "healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems" (La Vía Campesina, 2009: 147).

The DRDLR envisages holistic initiatives that address agriculture and development in their community-based context. Furthermore, the DRDLR adopted The New Trajectory for Land Reform: A Changed Agenda, Strategic Plan 2011–2012, which advances that the CRDP's mandate is to spread "a vibrant, equitable sustainable rural communities' food security for all". In the "new" approach, agriculture is structurally geared into a singular but hierarchical system to deliver a holistic and long-term solution to the redistribution of social wealth and power in an integrated and complex manner. The NDP states that a highly centralised, vertically integrated agro-processing sector must co-exist and prioritise more investment to provide innovative market linkages for small-scale farmers in communal and land-reform areas (NDP, 2010). The National Policy Framework on the Development of Small and Medium Agro-Processing Enterprises fosters rural industrialisation through agro-processing industries that are closer to the production areas. Amid a rapid and sustained decline in food security, the National Food and Agricultural Policy for 2002 to 2020 urges policymakers to seriously engage with this issue. The Industrial Policy Action Plan 2013/14–2015/16 urges policymakers to adopt the practices of sustainable agricultural, agroecology to transform food and agricultural systems. The Rural Economy Transformation Model (2015) defines the CRDP strategic objective as a comprehensive rural development strategy which links land and agrarian reform and food security. At its core, the CRDP aims to establish projects at each of the provincial districts, each one based around a particular or several land-based activities. Some projects and accompanying plans are specific but most address broader themes of food security, rural development, equality, and the problems of unequal distribution of wealth and power.

The Agriparks Programme is part of government's mission to review all land reform policies as pronounced in the 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform. Agriparks is a new concept to South Africa that draws extensively from various existing models, both locally and abroad. Agriparks include experimental farms, collective farming, farmer-incubator projects, agri-clusters, eco-villages, urban-edge allotments, as well as market gardens (CSIR, 2015). An Agripark is an innovative system of agro-production, processing, logistics, marketing and training and extension services that enables a market-driven combination and integration of various agricultural activities and rural transformation services. The Agripark programme aims to industrialise agriculture, massively expand production and ultimately link it to the global networks. Critical is access to viable agricultural land, where a range of productive agri-horticultural enterprises may exist. The main pivot of the Agripark is around the processing of agricultural products, although allowing the mix of ''non-agricultural'' industries to coexist. Consideration for

Agriparks is based on locational economic comparative advantages of the area and meeting the relevant elements needed by a value chain (cluster) for a major comparative and/or product advantage; and building a solid economic basis for the advancement of rural industrialisation. Hence, the Agriparks concept charts an integrated approach of collective farming, including agri-clusters, small-scale farmer incubation, eco-villages while contributing to environmental conservation and preservation. In broad terms, the Agripark idea is similar to a conventional agricultural business park or hub model, where multiple tenants and owners mutually organise under a joint management structure and a wide gamut of enterprises can coexist.

As the responsible government department argue: "[Smallholder farmers] …are unable to successfully compete with large agribusinesses that have come to dominate national and global markets…. It is within this context that the Agri-Parks Programme has been developed by the DRDLR. International experience has shown that due to the creation of an enabling environment (in terms of expanded access to resources and markets, bolstered horizontal and vertical linkages, and supporting facilities, institutions and partnerships), Agri-Parks are an effective strategy for increasing the efficiency, reducing the costs and maximizing the value of small-scale production. This subsequently increases the productivity and competitiveness of smallholder farmers, which means higher income earnings for the rural poor, more inclusive value chains, higher participation of women and youth in commercial agriculture, and, as a result, enhanced equity in the sector and broader society" (DRDRL, 2015: 11).

An Agripark is expected to lead a vibrant social mobilisation component for the organisation and mobilisation of black farmers and agri-business entrepreneurs are expected to actively back the initiative. Moreover, the Agripark should strengthen partnerships between government, the private sector and civil society, such as fostering relationships with the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) and the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs. In this myriad of related frameworks and varying contexts, Agriparks are a distinctive programme approach. Agriparks, as networks, support market-driven efforts and integration of various agricultural activities and rural transformation services. The Agriparks comprises three basic units:

1. Farmer Production Support Units: These are units (more than one per district) of agricultural input supplies, extension support, mechanisation support, local logistics support, primary produce collection, and input to the agri-hubs.

2. Agri-Hub: An agri-hub is situated in a central location in a district municipality, preferably with appropriate physical and social infrastructure to accommodate storage, warehousing, agri-processing, packaging, logistics hubs, agricultural technology demonstration parks, accommodation for extension support training, housing and recreational facilities for labourers. Agri-hubs receive primary inputs from

Farmer Production Support Units for processing, value adding and packaging, which are channelled into the Rural-Urban Market Centres or exported directly to markets.

3. Rural-Urban Market Centres: These centres are located on the periphery of large urban areas and provide market intelligence to support farmers' research and development.

2.5.1 Agriparks: district-based development

The state support services are aimed at addressing economies of scale for subsistence and small-scale farmer producers in a particular commodity and space (DRDLR, 2010). The central objectives of the CRDP are to transform agrarian structures by spreading through Agriparks in all 44 district municipalities, as an agriculture cluster network connecting local and global agri-chains. In this respect, the Agriparks concept suggests a "radius", a link and a visible locus, an object of reference or origin, and a stable outlet from which activities originate. Occurring as it does, Agriparks are a configuration of state responses to socio-historical conditions and actual local development binaries. An Agripark, situated in a district municipality, is an interactive network of innovation methods of agro-production, processing, logistics, marketing, training, and extension services (DRDLR, 2017b). Through strategic implementation, the DRDLR coordinates the activities of the DAFF, Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, and other spheres of government. Provincially, Agriparks are very different, varying according to sector-specific structures and stimulating diverse analyses. At a district level, Agriparks adopt multidimensional approaches to development through diverse economic opportunities, PPPs, and facilitating strategic interventions. Operationally, Agriparks entail the most elementary levels of farmers sharing their opinions, problems, and potential solutions, and allow small-scale farmers to collaborate with commercial farmers and communities to take the lead on seeking change. The Agriparks strategy is to support and strengthen small-scale farmers, provide extension services, advisory support, training, storage, packaging facilities, and access to markets.

2.5.2 Agriparks: Devolution of Power and Functions

The Agriparks strategy describes the district municipalities as "impact zones", situating Agriparks within a community-based context interwoven throughout the three spheres of government. This approach, set out by the DRDLR (2009), aims to make rural development more efficient and to decentralise implementation for better coordination. District municipalities hold power, organise the planning and delivery of extension services, steer governing bodies and structures and act as enablers. The devolution of power enables market-driven combination and integration of various agricultural activities and rural transformation services. More centrally positioned in communities, Agriparks epitomise reform efforts that link development and place. DRDLR (2010) states that agriculture and rural development are essential for social change, and that Agriparks are the primary structure to bolster democracy and strong communities. In the long run, the goal of Agriparks is to improve socio-political outcomes, in addition to developing stronger rural economies.

2.5.3 Agriparks: Allocation of Power and Authority

In terms of the Constitution, land reforms are the responsibility of national government. However, all three spheres of government and traditional authorities have functions which require land administration. As mentioned in section 2.3.2, the three key elements of land reform are redistribution, restitution, and tenure. In accordance with schedule 4 of the Constitution, provincial governments carry out obligations over certain functional areas where national and provincial governments have concurrent responsibility. These functions are concerned with agriculture, environment, soil conservation, housing, regional planning, and urban and rural development. Local governments also have constitutional functions which relate to land use and planning while traditional authorities carry out land-related functions according to customary law.

2.5.4 Agriparks: Coordination and Cooperation

The Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs coordinates the functions of the different spheres of government to achieve effective governance. While schedule 4 of the Constitution defines areas of concurrent national and provincial legislative competence, section 146 of the Constitution prescribes how such occurring conflicts are to be resolved. Section 44 of the Constitution gives the national Parliament the power to legislate on certain matters within the functional areas of exclusive provincial legislative competence, while the national ''over-ride'' power occurs to maintain economic unity, to maintain necessary national standards and to set minimum standards for the provision of services. In addition, close cooperation is crucial in executing the respective functions of national, provincial and local governments to ensure the most appropriate and effective use of land. Notably, the designated Minister is authorised to allocate and/or entrust functions of the national government to provincial or local government. These measures emphasise the need for the strongest possible cooperation between the different spheres of government on land matters, to ensure successful delivery of services.

2.5.5 Agriparks Mandate

The DRDLR (2017a) reports that Agriparks aim to incorporate 300,000 smallholder farmers and start over 145 000 new agro-processing jobs, as well as acquire one million hectares of land for agriculture production. Under the Agriparks programme, the DRDLR intends to procured and distributed 834,134 hectares of land throughout the country and ensured sustained production on land provided by government. A total of 712,067 small-scale producers were supported within different initiatives including access to information, while 10,271 resource-poor, historically disadvantaged producers were supported to access water and 2 073 water-use licences were finalised, enabling the farmers to irrigate their land. A total of 33,341 small-scale producers were supported to access markets and 1,284 producer co-operatives and marketing depots were established to increase their competitiveness and benefit from market opportunities. Moreover, Agriparks aims to transform local agriculture and rural development institutions into network agri-hubs and provide a range of services for farmers, individuals and

community (DAFFnews, 2017). The AgriParks programme is underlined by the following ten guiding principles:

1. Agripark exists per district municipality.
2. Agriparks are administered and owned by small-scale farmers.
3. Agriparks are catalysts for rural industrialisation.
4. Agriparks receive government support for ten years to enable economic sustainability.
5. Agripark partnerships between the public and private sector ensure access to services of water, energy, transport and production.
6. Agriparks reinforce existing markets and create new markets to develop and expand value chains.
7. Agriparks maximise access to markets for all farmers with a bias to black farmers and communities.
8. Agriparks catalyse the use of high-value agricultural land. Too much of it lies fallow in rural areas.
9. Agriparks widen the use of existing agro-processing, bulk and logistics infrastructure, including the availability of water, energy and roads.
10. Agriparks support the revitalisation of rural towns and promote rural-urban linkages.

2.5.6 Agriparks and Land Redistribution

Integrating land reform and agriculture development is driven mainly through the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development programme in respect of land reform, and the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) in terms of agricultural support (see Aliber & Hall, 2010a; Greenberg, 2010b; Cousins, 2013b). The CRDP is premised on the basis of three interrelated pillars: rural development (infrastructure), agrarian transformation (production support) and land reform. A primary focus is on using natural resources as the basis for economic development, and on people taking control over their own fate (Ministry of Rural Development and Land Reform, 2009). It is the duty of the national government to ensure a more equitable distribution of land, and to support and to implement a programme of land tenure and land administration reform. In addition, it is the obligation of provincial governments to provide complementary development support (e.g. infrastructure and agricultural support services) to persons participating in the land reform programme. In this regard, close cooperation is required between national and provincial governments to ensure that beneficiaries of land reform have the benefit of services delivered by the provinces as envisaged by schedules 4 and 5 of the Constitution.

2.6 Supporting Legislative Framework

2.6.1. Agro-processing Strategy (2012)

The DRDLR's agro-processing strategy is aligned to the objectives of both the NDP and NGP in its quest for sectoral transformation, and it seeks to bolster inclusive agro-processing opportunities, job creation and economic growth. This is elaborated in the DAFF Integrated Growth and Development Plan (IGDP) 2012 and Strategic Plan for the DAFF (2013/14–2017/18). The objectives include rural industrialisation

through the establishment of agro-processing industries which are near production areas; local economic growth through increased trade in rural areas; and job creation with the establishment of small and medium-sized enterprises for agro-processors to improve livelihoods of both smallholder agro-processors and producers.

2.6.2. The Integrated Growth and Development Plan (2011/12–2014/15)

The DAFF IGDP sets out an inter-departmental vision to promote equity, productivity, competitiveness, and sustainability. The IGDP strategy includes statutory and non-statutory agencies. The Department of Trade and Industry outlines a restructured economy and agro-processing with more value-adding, labour intensive, and environmentally sustainable industrial activities. The Agricultural Research Council collaborates with various partners to run incubation programmes, meeting a number of South Africa's agricultural economic needs. Building Agriparks for agricultural development, between 2014 and 2015 the Agricultural Research Council supported large-scale agricultural development in 14 of the poorest municipalities. It established community gardens, fruit and vegetable markets, processing facilities and nurseries to stimulate agriculture-based economic development (Agricultural Research Council 2014/2015). These programmes are specifically focused on helping smallholder farmers succeed.

2.6.3. Strategy for the Development of Small and Medium Agro-Processing Enterprises in the Republic of South Africa (2014–2019)

The Strategy for the Development of Small and Medium Agro-processing Enterprises was designed to support increased participation of small-and-medium-scale agro-processing enterprises in agro-processing. The Strategic Plan for the DAFF (2013/14–2017/18), guided by the Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission, aims to tackle the challenges of poverty, inequality, and unemployment. The plan is geared to improve and develop production by means of entrepreneurship promotion (DAFF, 2013/14–2017/18). The South African Agricultural Production Strategy indicates that agriculture important for industrialisation and development (DAFF, 2011–2025) and focuses on agriculture by targeting subsistence production, smallholder production and commercial production.

2.6.4. Agricultural Policy Action Plan (2015-2019)

The Agricultural Policy Action Plan (APAP) of 2015–2019 is premised on the NDP and NGP while the APAP strategy is to create decent employment opportunities through inclusive growth, rural development, food security and protection, as well as to stimulate general economic growth. Altogether, the interventions aim at providing employment through inclusive growth, rural development, and enrichment of environmental and rural resources. With the key job drivers identified as agriculture, infrastructure, mining, manufacturing, tourism, and the green economy. The APAP aims to transform the high-level responses offered in the DAFF IGDP into tangible and concrete efforts. The APAP aims to provide both a long-term vision and focused interventions in a five-year rolling schedule, to be updated

annually. Mostly it aims at ensuring equity, transformation, equitable growth and competitiveness, promoting import substitution and export expansion through concerted value chain/commodity strategies and reducing dependence on industrial and imported inputs.

2.6.5. Small-scale Farmers and Rural Development

The South African government's earliest flagship black farmers support programme, the Broadening Access to Agriculture Thrust, commenced a series of work processes in finance, technology and marketing. The rationale of the programme was founded on the basis that farming had to be "market-related production, thus, subsistence farming, with family income generated by non-farm activities, could not be viewed as viable farming" (Van Empel 1997: 2). Until 2003, the National Department of Agriculture, now named the DAFF provided controlled state support to emerging farmers for agricultural production. The main objective was to undo Bantustan agricultural corporations and stimulate small-scale farmers. While black farmers received land, the dismantling of agricultural development corporations and extensions meant production inputs were left to the free markets (Van Empel 1997).

2.6.6. The Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme

The government's programmes for black farmer development are the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development and the CASP (see Aliber & Hall, 2010a; Greenberg, 2010b; Cousins, 2013a). The CASP was inaugurated in 2004 with funds to distribute to farming family units (National Department of Agriculture, 2007) while the Micro Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa supports small-scale farmers' loans (Aliber & Hall, 2010a). The CASP is at the heart of state support to farmers, established after the Strauss Commission's recommendations that the state finances a ''sunrise'' suite of support to recently settled farmers. The objective of CASP is "[to] expand the provision of support services to promote and facilitate agricultural development targeting beneficiaries of the Land Reform and Agrarian Reform programmes" (NDA, 2007). CASP recognises six areas of state intervention and four groups of beneficiaries. Areas of intervention include on-farm and off-farm infrastructure; advisory and regulatory services; capacity development; and info-financial services. The CASP is intended to assist black farmers to take part in a market ordered by established producers and agribusinesses; however, it does not change the rationality of the market or production system (Greenberg, 2010b).

2.7 State Support Services

2.7.1 Support services and finance for farmers

In rural areas, government envisages a well-balanced mix of farming systems and rural enterprise (livestock, annual and perennial crops as well as farm forestry) and the land to be held under a variety of forms of tenure by individuals, companies and communities. The aim is a thriving rural landscape entailing large-, medium- and small-scale farms and enterprises developed by full-time and part-time farmers. Government further envisages a balanced allocation of land and resources, partnerships between farm

workers and farm owners contributing to increased productivity, as well as the provision of secure tenure for all rural people. The Micro-Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa, a state initiative, was introduced in 2006 to extend micro and retail agricultural financial services as well as to accelerate access to public-sector programmes. The government's liberalisation policies limit the state from direct interventions in almost all downstream activities. As such, financial and extension support for emerging farmers has been very poor. Two interwoven challenges face resource-poor emerging black farmers, namely lack of access to credit, and their inability to pay back loans. The Agricultural Sector Education and Training Authority (known as Agri SETA) was founded to offer work-based functional training in agriculture. SETAs in all sectors are funded through a skills levy on all employers. A black economic empowerment outline for agriculture was published in 2004, and a Sector Charter was gazetted in 2008. The black economic empowerment for agriculture structure does broaden to beneficiation, storage, distribution and trading of agricultural commodities (NDA, 2006).

2.7.2. State intervention in the land market and Farmers

The White Paper on Land Reforms of 2010 states that underutilised farmland should be expropriated, that there should be a ceiling on the size and number of farms that an individual owns, that a special tax should be levied on private land, and that absentee landlordism must be investigated. Consequently, various state support programmes emphasise how to strategically address empowering previously disadvantaged black farmers while simultaneously creating a non-racial agrarian structure. National and provincial government spheres must prioritise both resources and support to develop different capacities at local levels. However, economic deregulation and liberalisation have instituted the basic prospect that farmers, regardless of resources or their size, should raise both capital and production loans at market-related interest rates and be obliged to pay them back. Restructuring of the Land Bank by the government led to commercial banks becoming the primary lenders to commercial agriculture. Hence, the government attempts to improve access to credit by enabling government institutions to provide credit and urging the private sector to offer loans to resource-poor or black farmers.

2.8. The Institutional framework

The government's aim is to establish well-defined roles and responsibilities for both the private and public sector in land development, and to provide for effective public participation in the change process (White Paper, 2010). The devolution of power to lower-tier governments to tackle diversity in the land supply and demand chain, financial resources and institutional capacity will not be effective without well-functioning local institutions. The important role of local government in coordinating and enabling activities at the local level is part of the responsibilities of the DRDLR which plays an interventionist and coordinating role in development at the local level (Pienaar, 2009). The development is consistent with the assertion that there should be more active intervention by the national and provincial governments

in municipalities that require support from national government (Carrim, 2009). Main stakeholders are typically government departments and municipalities with "community organisations and leadership" (Ministry of Rural Development and Land Reform, 2009: 23). The CRDP mentions a partnership with all sectors of society and general participation by civil society, and advises using community development workers to carry out rural development plans. The CRDP encourages a council of stakeholders, involving government and civil society organisations, to oversee processes and assist with planning and needs identification.

2.9. Small-scale Farmers

This section addresses an interrelated question on three emerging discourses: (a) What are the discourses on small-scale farmers, the actual *interpretation* of farmer practices, and sustainability in the South African context? Differentiating between small-scale agricultural producers who produce only for their own use (so-called subsistence farmers) and those who are actually informal 'farm enterprises' that sell produce at markets in local towns, or even in formal markets or to formal enterprises, is problematic. Aliber *et al*. (2009, 86) note that "[e]stablishing basic facts and figures regarding smallholders is often difficult". Recognising that small-scale farmers are socially and economically differentiated is a significant necessity for understanding small-scale and informal-sector agriculture and for effective state interventions. The term ''smallholder'' is challenging. It is likely to conceal inequalities and class-based differences within the large population of households involved in agricultural production on a relatively small scale (Cousins,2011). Even among market-focused small-scale farmers, important differences are observable, and include the type of markets in which they are involved, for example ''loose'' versus ''tight'' value chains, and the uneven accessibility of finances for production inputs. Theoretical views on small-scale farmers are related to noticeable political responses (see Cousins, 2007, 2009; Hall, 2009a, 2009b, 2013).

The political, social and economic context of South African small-scale farmers is shaped by its apartheid past and the unfolding of the post-apartheid neoliberal capitalist era (Gibson, 2009; Moyo, 2010). Because of the nature of the complexities, historical perspectives of small-scale farmer practices, as well as an understanding of impacting forces are necessary. Considering Bernstein's (2010) question, "Who are the farmers today''? I am guided by questions such as: Which theories of small-scale farmer practices are being considered for analyses? What is the context from which they are drawn? The significance of these questions is to situate South African emerging black farmer practices in their historical context. The Cousins (2007: 235); Hall (2009b); Lahiff (2007); and Cousins and Scoones (2009) approaches are useful in exploring the different theoretical views and practices, especially the policy and institutional arrangements through which small-scale farmers emerge post-apartheid. The theories and practices may not be a departure from the past but rather a perpetuation of historical tendencies (Bernstein, 2007: 49; McMichael, 2008). Hall (2009b) and Lahiff (2007) present an analytical framework for understanding the

composition of South African land availability and livelihoods, as well as the institutional arrangements available. Cotula (2011) outlines government support services, subsidies, loans, and guarantees to companies in agriculture, as well as information and government-to-government ventures in facilitating private-sector land investment. Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2009) argue that challenges of land reform programmes originate from direct political restraints, reactionary antagonism or technical obstacles. More pointedly, the varied outcomes of land reform programmes result from insufficient attention to analyses of existing rural property systems, the lack of design of alternative property systems, and the lack of an empirical political theory to guide efforts in institutional analysis and design (see Cousins, 2013a, 2013b).

2.10. Emerging Black Farmers

Emerging black farmers' identity is frequently cited as proof of an existential social stratum, as the ontological and epistemological character of black farmers. Cousins (2013a) and Cousins and Genis (2013) explain that the concept of emerging black farmers has its roots in the colonial and apartheid land evictions as a problem left over from history. The descriptive use of the term emerging black farmers, rather than a definition, varies as widely as factors that contribute to its existence, indicating the complexity and the multiplicity of the levels at which these factors function. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) argue reality and knowledge are both constructed by the power within social relations. If emerging black farmers, as an exemplum of history, allow us to ask how they come into being, one significant answer lies in attending to the ontology of their existence. "Ontology is the study of being" (Crotty, 1998, p. 10) and "raises basic questions about the nature of reality and the nature of the human being in the world" (Denzin & Lincoln 2005, p. 183). Ontology calls into question what exists and how it exists (Crotty, 1998**)**. The South African emerging black farmer is from the dispossessed population, not from the landed aristocracy, and, by its ontology, is aligned to the industrial and agricultural workers, parallel to the peasant-proprietors. The constitutive mechanism of this ontology is the land. However, how this ontology resurfaces has rarely been seen in relation to the dichotomous dualism in the agriculture sector. Similarly, epistemology is key to understanding emerging black farmers' social existence, but the sector is no longer understood as ahistorical, apolitical, and aracial. Epistemology is "a way of understanding and explaining how I know what I know" (Crotty, 1998, p. 3). Regarding emerging black farmers, epistemology raises questions such as what do we know and how do we know it? The epistemology brings the stratum interpretation into discursive narratives through an empirical examination of the questions that the black farmers address and a critical look at the mode of practice and opinion that the farmers advocate. Emerging black farmers negotiate and integrate multiple marginalised identities in agriculture. New questions, paradigms, and suggestions of examining the experiences of emerging black farmers in agriculture to advance knowledge that will inform policy are considered and discussed as a future research agenda. As argued by Cousins and Genis (2013), classification does not reflect the pluralistic

nature of a democratic society or the foundations of justice and equality. Cousins (2004, 2011) describes small-scale farmers in South Africa as a progressive movement for agriculture and rural reforms. On a similar note, Cousins (2013b) maintains that as an assimilationist paradigm emerging black farmers is likely to face challenges in the current globalised and transnational economic and political system.

Indeed, since the 1940s, scholars have argued agriculture reform is set to counter what is regarded as the hegemony of a white imperialistic and capitalistic ideology (Shivji, 2003; Moyo & Yeros, 2007). Widespread focus on the importance of black farmers' existential experiences is not a new phenomenon. The confluence of social movements, academics, and research is driving its increased visibility. Wide scholarly work emphasises the importance of emerging black farmers in terms of, on the one hand, justice and equality, and, on the other hand, food security and rural development. The complexity of understanding emerging black farmers requires an interdisciplinary set of discourses in order to resist the localisation of small-scale farmers' studies within academia. From a Marxist perspective, the emerging black farmer is not a class *in itself* or for *itself*, but a social stratum. According to Marxism, there are only two antagonistic social classes: capitalists, or bourgeoisie, and workers, or proletariat (Lars-Henrik Schmidt,1997). The Marxian class theory declares that an individual's status within a class hierarchy is determined by their role in the production process. Moreover, the class theory asserts that political and ideological consciousness is determined by the class position, and the structure of the production process forms the basis of class construction. The Marxist theory distinguishes one class from another on the basis of two criteria: the ownership of the means of production and control of the labour power of others. From this perspective, Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other (Lars-Henrik Schmidt,1997). A class constitutes those who share mutual economic interests, are conscious of those interests, and engage in collective action which aims to further those interests.

What sort of epistemology might work with scholarly discursive narratives, as South Africa emerges from its apartheid past? Hence, problematising the experiences of black emerging farmers, their practices, and underrepresentation in the agribusiness pipeline is imperative as is acknowledging racism, sexism, and other structural inequalities that affect emerging black farmers' lives. It is not my intention to theorise about an alternative interpretation of the black farmer, although the probe suggests some basics of what a more structural interpretation could include. My explanation is based on how the (un)official term, emerging black farmer, is commonly understood: rural and poor (the official DRDLR designation was and perhaps still is small-scale farmers). More specifically, the term emerging black farmers is used within the Agriparks programme's context. Agriparks provide a real model of exploring state interventions that can be disentangled sufficiently from the various other support processes, sketching a "methodology of the emerging".

2.11. Framing Farmer Practices

The term agricultural sector is used in this context as extended agriculture, comprising forward linkages to food and non-food agro-industries (see Galvez-Nogales, 2010). Farming practices signify particular methods of agriculture, the type of use and ownership of land. Various alternative methods and techniques of farming practices have been developed in different situations (see Adams & Howell, 2001; Cousins, 2014). Agriculture here means both crop and livestock production and includes producers in both rural and urban areas. The inclusion of livestock is critical and its significance is often undervalued (Ainslie, 2002; Shackleton *et al*., 2005). Agriculture includes a mixture of farm enterprises like cropping systems, horticulture and livestock, as well as the means available to the farmer to improve them to intensify productivity and profitability.

The type of farming practice adopted by a farmer depends on various resources, environmental conditions, social structure, government policy, and different agro-climatic zones of the state. The idea of "farming practices" refers to an arrangement of farming initiatives that are overseen in respect of the physical and socio-economic environment, and farmers' goals, preferences and resources (Cousins &Scoones, 2010; Bernstein, 2013; Cousins, 2013b). In addition, it is defined by its structure and functioning farming activities. Farming practices comprise an array of functions, such as management and allocation of resources and various activities, within an operational farm unit or a combination of such units, which result in agricultural production. In addition, it includes processing and marketing of the products. Despite the various type of farming and conditions, emerging black farmers need government to provide a more effective system of labour inspectors and provide effective support for farm workers' and dwellers' land tenure rights, including the provision of alternative land for settlement and production (Visser & Ferrer, 2015).

2.12. Racism and Discriminatory Practices

Bromerger and Hughes (1988) note cogently, "in the Republic of South Africa, like in the Union before, in the white minority view, South Africa would forever be a ''White Man's Country'' by right of conquest and settlement". Hirsch (1986) notes the Natives Land Act of 1913 and the Natives Trust and Land Act of 1936 as the basis of controlling the indigenous African majority. The Acts confined the status of the African people to the Bantustan and the agrarian economy was divided into two racial sectors with separate and different functions. In South Africa, the socio-political power structures of race played a major role in the comprehensive reengineering and maintaining of inequitable societal relationships, as succinctly argued by Mamdani (1996); Hall (2011, 2012) and Moyo (2012). Being white played a role in determining land alienation and displacement of black people, as well as in the expansion of imperial capitalism (Moyo, 2012; Cousins, 2013b; Bernstein, 2013). Also, race as hegemony was hugely instrumental in the organisation of social relations, including agriculture and farming practices (Kotze,

1978; Platzky & Walker, 1985; Hirsch, 1986; Unterhalter, 1986; Bromberger & Hughes, 1987; Letsoalo, 1987; Omer-Cooper, 1988; Posal, 1991). White, commercial agriculture held the bulk of prime agricultural land, and received state support, private and state services and surplus labour from migrant black labour (Hirsch, 1986). With black agriculture predominantly being subsistence, black farmers were treated as not legitimate or important to deserve provision and substantial investment. Hirsch argues that there is a pervasive social conception that black South Africans, as subsistence farmers, are unable to transition institutionally and culturally for their own developmental interests (Hirsch, 1986). This common perspective holds that black farmers ‘‘lack’’ the social and cultural capital required for social mobility.

Colonialism, with its intersection with other forms of racial subordination, shaped the experiences of racialised capitalist development (Bernstein, 2013). Regarding colonial and post-colonial relations, scholars stress the centrality of land to those relations, and underline the politics of racialised exclusion at their core (Mamdani, 1996; Hall, 2011, 2012; Harvey, Moyo & Yeros, 2012). Scholars critique black land dispossessions and black evictions (Wegerif et al., 2005; Cousins, 2007, 2013a; Bernstein, 2013; Lahiff; 2017). and the slow pace and unrealised promise of the redistribution of productive agriculture farms; many of the critiques are voiced in racial characterisation (Walker, 2008; Aliber *et al.,* 2009; Vink & Van Rooyen, 2009). Bernstein (1996) explains how the former white South African Agricultural Union, ‘organised’ in the relations between ‘organised agriculture’ and the apartheid state, subsequently rebranded itself in 1999 as colour-blind Agri South Africa for the new conditions of the ‘‘rainbow nation’’. White farmers that Hall (2011b, p.15) refers to as ‘‘what has been called the “white tribe of Africa” – predominantly white (male) Afrikaner farmers … who see the expressed demand for their skills as affirming their “African-ness” and their place and role in the future of Africa as a whole’’, expounded land grabs, corporate take-over of prime land, and expansion of agribusiness and their modes of organising commodity chains.

If redistributing some of the big holders’ massive tracts of land is one way to regain some justice, the other is to rein in some of the industry’s agribusiness chains. Land grabs and the support of agribusiness chains for profit are the two biggest causes of disparities (Hall, 2011a). Racial power of land grabs and extractives through accumulation by dispossession derails socio-economic justice in agriculture, and institutions hesitate to see, engage or address the obviously visible inequalities (Bernstein, 2013; Hall, 2011). Although setting critical backdrops, scholarly efforts do not systematically establish race as an analytical framework more widely. Founded on colonialism and settler colonialism, institutional and structural racism remains embedded in South Africa’s agrarian structure; entrenched and pervasive (Moyo, 2010) racism has an inhumane material structure. As Fanon (1963) notes, “South Africa’s economic structure … is a racist structure”. He summarises that the problem “is not just about blacks living among whites, but about blacks exploited, enslaved, and despised by a colonialist and capitalist society that happens to be white.” Research findings show that despite desegregation efforts, farming

and agriculture systems have never truly integrated (Deininger & May, 2000; Mayson, 2003; Kleinbooi, Hall, 2004, 2007, 2009; Lahiff, 2001, 2009; Lahiff, & Boyce, 2006). I offer that the reason behind the ongoing unequal binary structure is the ultimate powerlessness of the small-scale black farmer in the fetters of unregulated capitalism – an urgent reminder that even post-apartheid reforms are not immune to capitalism's more malign and rapacious forces.

A CRT of agrarian reform questions the agrarian compact, its institutions, labour market, governance structures, and competitive structures. Based on principles of non-racialism and non-sexism, the transition from the post-colonial model to a decolonised model would be revolutionary in content but evolutionary in form constructed on a unitary national vision. It would give workers of the land more protection, it would involve society much more in policymaking, and would put long-term advancement of society before short-term gains for a few. Examining the ambiguities and limitations in the conceptual tools to analyse race in agrarian reforms, I problematically posit a CRT of agrarian reform*,* constructed on the substance of critical race theorists such as Asante (1987), Barnes (1990) and Anzaldúa (2002). It is "critical" for typical agrarian studies that favour to be state-centric. Crenshaw (2002, p. 19) argues that CRT is about "looking for both a critical space in which race was foregrounded and a race space where critical themes were central". CRT as a framework is used to theorise, explore and contest the ways race and racism implicitly and explicitly impact social structures, practices and discourses. The predominant, most basic premise of CRT is that race matters (Barnes, 1990). I argue that racism is a significant and permanent factor in society and consequently in South Africa's agriculture**.**

In explaining the importance of theory, Anzaldúa (1990) calls for the generation of theories based on those whose pieces of knowledge are traditionally excluded from and silenced by academic research. In addition, she asserts that beyond creating theories, "we need to find a practical application for those theories. We need to de-academise theory and to connect the community to the academy" (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xxvi). Anzaldúa (2002, p. 574) also notes that "Change requires more than words on a page—it takes perseverance, creative ingenuity and acts of love". This assertion emphasises the point that "If we have been gagged and disempowered by theories, we can also be loosened and empowered by theories" (Anzaldúa, 1990, p. xxvi). Hence, the significance of positioning race at the core of social analysis to address the vestiges of desegregation becomes illuminated. I express the vestiges of desegregation, which further undermine the opportunities and experiences of the Agriparks' desegregation efforts. The exploration involves a number of aspects, most notably, farmer experiences, procedures, and practices that continue to generate separate and unequal conditions for black farmers. I put forward that this view is particularly necessary when analysing the agrarian and agriculture structure which operates in racialised space and reinforces white agriculture monopoly. The inability to dismantle the legacy of separate and unequal agriculture in South Africa illustrates the complex and intractable reproduction of systemic racial inequality in agriculture and society.

Adele (1986) posits that the purpose of colonialism, indeed the essence of the colonial situation, is the perpetuation of the condition of social injustice. This structure of systemic, enduring separation within the colonial world is still prevalent throughout the western and developing nations. CRT acknowledges the struggles of eliminating racial oppression as part of a broader goal of ending all forms of discrimination (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006). Other scholars use CRT in fields such as gender and education to investigate racism (Ladson-Billings 1999; Sleeter 2001). Leonardo (2013) writes about a theory of race that enlightens how the structures and processes involved with capital either maintain or interrupt the racial status quo. In arguing for a post-race theory, Leonardo (2013) states that post-race discourse makes race visible and maps its operations. Race does exist but only because humans create and consume race through social practice. Thus, race should be defined as consequential discourse (Gee, 1990; Inda, 2000; Mirón & Pascale, 2008; Happe, 2013). In the discussions on emerging black farmers**,** section 2.10, I discuss an epistemology of black farmers (a controversial and contested concept), and how I approach the problem of a CRT of agrarian change, against the monolith monopoly of the agrarian supply chain, globally and nationally.

While studies and research exploring race in agrarian and agriculture reform exist, these are undermined by the lack of effective analytical tools to sustain empirical and theoretical narratives on race. Researchers and practitioners require the necessary tools to effectively analyse and challenge the impact of race and racism in South Africa's agrarian relations. The advocated CRT of agrarian change involves a commitment to acknowledge the multiple strengths of practices in order to serve a larger purpose of struggle toward social and racial justice. For the purpose of agrarian studies, I advocate for the development of tenets of CRT in relation to agrarian reform that inform theory, research, pedagogy, and policy in the field. As derived from theoretical insights of Allen and Solórzano (2001), Asante (1987) and Anzaldúa (2002), race is a normative historical construct used as an instrument of power. A transition from racial agrarian relations to more egalitarian relations involves a transition in the racialised cultural and power mechanisms as well as collaboration between civil society and the state. I am of the view that race in post-apartheid agrarian discourses, like in many other instances, is under-theorised, not under-researched – there is a deficit of coherent conceptual and analytical tools.

An agrarian race theory cultivates and facilitates a discursive praxis dedicated to the eradication of racialised inequality, global imperialism, subjugation of developing nations and indigenous groups. This perspective structures the complex socio-political and economic milieu in which social change is expected to occur. The structure also identifies racism as a socio-political and economic hegemonic trajectory that operates both globally and nationally (Shivji, 2003). I consider the agrarian and decolonial studies as they recognise the crucial role of race politics in moulding agrarian social arrangement, providing a frame to fathom the pervasive nature of racism (Moyo & Yeros, 2007). Additionally, Marxism explains race as a "class antagonism found within capitalism" but is limited with regard to offering a race-centred or

intersectional theory (see Leonardo, 2003). Lenin (1914) views race as a primary source of disempowering divisions within the international working class. In his 1914 pamphlet, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*, he argues for the right of nations to secede from "oppressor nations." "Herrenvolk democracy" serves as the basis of white supremacy in settler colonial societies Losurdo,2007, Lenin criticises liberal democracy and "cultural autonomy" schemes especially those plotted by intellectuals or elites within the oppressor nation. Karl Marx and Vladimir Lenin both deal with what Engels called the "peasant question" to describe ongoing debates regarding the fate of the peasantry under capitalism (McMichael, 2009). The arguments above prompt the question of whether an agrarian society that encompasses wider cultural, political, economic, and societal diversity and their interaction may be more appropriate, or feasible.

2.13. Conclusion

South Africa's success land reform policies and programmes have thus far failed to redress past injustices and inequalities in productive agriculture land ownership and control. This chapter briefly examines colonial and settler colonial land dispossession, the various apartheid laws and practices, and how these impact black farmers and their development. The chapter focuses on post-apartheid land reforms, the constitutional mandate, various government policies and programmes and how they impact black farmers. It investigates institutional racism as a vestige of the past that continues to disadvantage the majority of emerging black farmers and then discusses the CRDP's Agriparks intervention to improve small-scale farmer development and livelihoods.

Chapter 3: Methodological and Theoretical Foci

3.1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the research process by answering the following questions:

a) What methods or techniques were used to gather data to answer the research questions?

b) What methodology or research design informed the choice and use of the methods or techniques of data collection?

c) What philosophical viewpoint primed the methodology and provided the basis for its logic and norms?

d) What epistemology was established in the study's philosophical stance, thus, driving the methodology? Here, epistemology clarifies my beliefs on knowledge, and the theory of knowledge embedded in the philosophical stance and reflected in the methodology: how we know what we know.

This study explores the CRDP through the district-based Agriparks programme, emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them according to their unique context. The main research question of the study is: What can we learn about the nature and effectives of the South African government's Agriparks programme as a vehicle for promoting the development of emerging black farmers? As established by the main research question, the study adopts an exploratory approach examining emerging black farmers' practices, and the role of the state in supporting their practices. This study explores the experiences that farmers have of state support. These experiences are teased out by qualitative methods.

I made 28 field trips to three Agriparks located in three different provinces and explored contextually experienced events. For this study, As explained further in section 5.5.6, I interviewed a total of 93 research participants: 81 farmers and 12 key informants. The 81 farmers are made up of: 30 in John Taolo Gaetsewe district municipality (JTGDM) (Northern Cape); 20 on the Levubu Tshakhuma Barotta UICG Farms (Limpopo); 20 in Westonaria (Gauteng); and 11 in Sedibeng and Rooiwaal (Gauteng). I did interviews both in Sedibeng and Rooiwaal Agriparks, which were not part of the initial plan, because of their proximity to me and to get a large sample. Of the 81 farmers interviewed 50 were beneficiaries, namely emerging black farmers operating on-site in the Agriparks programme, and 31 were non-beneficiaries, namely emerging black farmers off-site not operating in Agriparks. The 12 Key Informants include, 6 government officials, 3 student interns, and 3 academic experts.

I observed what emerging black farmers do and how they do it, what their farming practices are, what they produce, where they sell it, and what support they receive from various sources. I analysed policies of land and agricultural reform, undertook literature reviews and used ethnography approaches and interpretive tools to examine the variable terrain of farming practices. Epistemologically, this study takes

a constitutive logic approach – a pursuit for explanatory information to build insights of a behaviour – rather than a causal logic, which attributes particular effects to particular causes.

The ontological pillar of the study is social constructivism. As explained by Wendt (1999, p. 370), ontologies inevitably influence the content of our substantive theories. Crotty (1998, p. 9) states that constructionism is the epistemological idea that humans *create meaning* as they interact with objects and the world; the subject and object are partners in the generation of meaning. Constructivism, in its ontological assumptions, posits that reality about a particular social phenomenon is multifaceted and constructed. Constructivism asserts there is no single objective reality about a particular phenomenon; instead, there are multiple realities constructed in the minds of people. In its epistemological assumptions, the constructivist paradigm asserts that the researcher and respondent co-create understandings. As such, when itemising their findings, researchers need to acknowledge their subjectivity. Researchers are apt to admit that they themselves influence the research process and, for this reason, in their writing, they also respond to their own roles (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Due to this study's qualitative nature, it is important to underline its "unfolding" character. The need to "preserve flexibility" and to "follow a path of discovery" is important to the success of the project (Punch, 2000: 42).

3.2. Methodological Research Design

Finding a balance between theory, praxis, structure and agency requires a research design that captures data as well as socio-economic and political factors. There are numerous considerations when deciding to adopt a qualitative research methodology. Strauss and Corbin (1990) claim that qualitative methods can be used to better understand any phenomenon about which little is yet known. Qualitative methods emphasise constructive processes which build up a detailed or "thick description" (Punch, 1998) of that which is being observed. Given that the study topic involves an issue of social transformation, it is not merely about social issues but about human beings. Qualitative research methods interpret various human phenomena through the words of selected individuals in a context-specific setting (Yin, 2013).

A qualitative method is suited for this study as it takes an inclusive and holistic approach concerning a social phenomenon (Creswell, 2003; Wolcott, 2003 Denzin & Lincoln, 2006). A key characteristic of qualitative research is its emergent or iterative rather than preconceived quality (Creswell, 2003; Wolcott, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2006). It is important for this study that the reasoning processes during qualitative research and data analysis are both inductive and deductive, a back and forth process from data collection and analysis to problem reformulation and back (Creswell, 2003, p. 183). With semi-structured interviews, I interviewed each interviewee individually using the questions I had prepared. Together with exploratory supplementary questions and observation, the semi-structured interviews facilitate reaching more vivid and more elaborative results.

In qualitative methods, collection, analysis, and writing are done simultaneously, then analysis is completed, and conclusions formulated when data collection is complete (Creswell, 2003). Qualitative research is not an alternative to quantitative research but may as well be a preference for an inquiry which requires meaningful and detailed data for interpretation and for transferability. Yet, the use of qualitative methods is broadly criticised for its lack of validity, reliability and generalisability, and by contentions that qualitative data, from interviews, should be considered as opinion rather than fact. Notwithstanding the criticism, Rathbun (2008) argues that social inquiries are best pursued by allowing the respondent to talk. As indicated below, I use various measures and tools to address the criticism to improve reliability and credibility of the study.

3.3. Philosophical Stance

Crotty (1998) uses the phrases philosophical stance and theoretical perspective reciprocally. The phrases concern the questions: What assumptions does the researcher carry to the research process? How does the researcher explain affairs in the world? In this case, I believe that humans co-construct meaning and thus I take an interpretive stance in my philosophy. Interpretivism related with my quest to explore emerging black farmer practices and state support logically steered me towards ethnography as an appropriate methodology. My research questions guided me to find the appropriate methods or tools for data collection within the ethnographic design, namely participant observation, interviews, and go-along interviews (walk-alongs). My reasoning for using qualitative methodology and specific methods such as walk-alongs are explained below. Analytically, this study draws on the method of an integrative review (Torraco, 2005). An integrative review is "a form of research that reviews, critiques, and synthesizes representative literature on a topic in an integrative way such that new frameworks and perspectives on the topic are generated" (Torraco., p. 356). A key objective of integrative review is to re-conceptualise the synthesised knowledge with the purpose of obtaining a diversified knowledge base on the topic in question (Torraco, 2005; Whittemore & Knafl, 2014). As such, integrative reviews build a logical conceptual restructuring of the topic and show how different "streams of research [come] together to construct a new formulation of the topic" (Torraco, 2005, p. 362). Within this framework, Agriparks, with a focus on emerging black farmer practices, can be rallying sites for social mobilisation and can expedite linkages between the ''national'' and ''global'' social movements, the democratic state, rural movements and their civil society allies.

3.4. Design Framing: Qualitative Research Approaches

3.4.1. Grounded Theory, Constructivism and Interpretivism

The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory by Bryant and Charmaz (2007) constitutes the basis for the structure and grounded theory methodology used in this study. It stipulates precepts like coding, generating memos, analysing data and selecting core categories from coding – critical steps to emulate

for this study. The practical steps used in grounded theory methodology aid in continually seeing the data through a fresh analytical lens (Charmaz, 2006). The grounded theory mode of analysis has been used flexibly in other substantive research, it is a general design of research, not at all limited in arrays of analysing data. Charmaz (2006, p. 127) elaborates that "grounded theory holds both positivist and constructivist inclinations". The positivist locus derives from human experiences with the understanding that human perception is imperfect, and the constructivist locus derives from human experience relative to their paradigm, influenced by society, culture, and other external influences (Birks, *et al.,* 2011). This study used grounded theory within a constructivist frame to explore nuanced experiences. The constructivist paradigm aims to "conceptualize the studied phenomenon to understand it in abstract terms, articulate theoretical claims, acknowledge subjectivity in theorizing, and offer an imaginative interpretation" (Charmaz, 2006, p. 127). In this study, I conceptualise a participant's experience, understand it and build, by coding, a narrative based on the interpretation of shared experiences. Interpretive grounded theory is about the researcher's interpretation of the collected data, consistent with constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006).

An interpretive paradigm exposes how meaning-making develops from stakeholders' values and feelings: "Each time we engage, invoke, or use [a policy] artifact, we reinforce, maintain, or change its underlying meaning(s)" (Yanow, 2000, p. 15). In interpretivism, the researcher is the principal data collection instrument; personal experiences, attitudes, and the macro context of politics and history act as a sieve through which all data collected passes (Wolcott, 1994; Creswell, 2003; Wolcott, 2003). An interpretive approach also has potential to reveal whose voices are or are not represented in the decision-making process (Rochefort & Cobb, 1994). An interpretivist paradigm posits that reality is socially constructed and situated and is therefore relative to a specific context. It considers understanding perspectives and meanings that people individually construct about their own situations (Willis, 2007). It also allows the researcher to learn about individuals' experiences and their perceptions about their individual experiences of their participation in a programme. This was achieved using semi-structured interviews and discussions. In terms of interpretivism as a paradigm, Creswell (2013, p. 15, p. 216) offers that "[w]hether we are aware of it or not, we always bring certain beliefs and philosophical assumptions to our research" and that "[q]ualitative researchers need to ''position'' themselves in their writing". As Richardson (2000, p. 154) notes: "We are always present in our texts, no matter how we try to suppress ourselves".

3.4.2 Ethnography

Ethnographic qualitative research is carried out in natural locations (Creswell, 2003; Wolcott, 2003Denzin & Lincoln, 2006). As such, data collection methods in natural locations entail human interaction, mostly in the form of participant observation and interviews (Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2006; Wolcott, 2003). I use ethnography as a framework which is capable of showing local informants' experiences while

allowing documenting and analysing the impacts of support services on target populations (see Wolcott, 2008). As noted by Wolcott (2008), ethnography is well-matched for studying small-scale, isolated and tribal cultures, and emphasises cultural particularism and local context (Wolcott, 2008, p. 28). Ethnography answers questions such as "what is going on here"? and "what does it mean to be a member of this group?", which are important for this study (Jeffrey, 2008; Walford, 2008). Since each Agripark has its own local challenges and beliefs about practices, each contextual profile is unique. I observed some elements of culture (Bate, 1997; Jeffrey, 2008; Walford, 2008; Wolcott, 2003, 2008), took note of language used and the rituals, relationships, and artifacts that are created within a culture (noting the meanings that are generated), as well as gestures and facial expressions (Geertz, 1973; Miles & Huberman, 1994; LeCompte & Schensul, 1999; Walford, 2008; Wolcott, 2008).

Within the ethnographic approach, are three main ways of discovery: *experiencing, enquiring, and examining* (Wolcott, 2008). *Experiencing* stresses, the actual familiarity of the researcher by describing what is discovered through the senses while conducting observations; e*nquiring* is about actively asking questions during conversations or interviews, and *examining* refers to collecting and probing cultural artifacts such as newsletters, policy documents and newspaper articles available from online and traditional archives. The observations, semi-structured interviews, case studies, and primary and secondary sources outline the exploratory process that was used for this study. Given the myriad of issues to cover in a study, the researcher's limitation of funds and time to conduct extensive ethnography, Walford (2008, p. 10) counsels the ethnographer "to hang around and pick things up long enough to make human connection and get to know the ways of a culture".

3.5. Case Study

The study explores three case studies in their social contexts. This grounded theory approach is justified by the nature of the phenomenon that is being observed. As Punch (1998, p.161) highlights, "to understand any group, or any culturally significant act, event, or process it is necessary to study the behaviour in its natural setting". As institutions determine human behaviour by establishing prearranged systems (Ferguson, 1984), it is important to examine the settings under which emerging farmers operate. The factors affecting farmers' practices are not only limited to resources and interest, but they also include extension services and support in the form of mentoring and farming advice. As Stake (1995, p. 1) explains, researchers choose to use the case study approach because the researchers can then emphasise the "uniqueness and commonality" of each case. Choosing multiple cases permits an investigator to maximise the learnings from a given process, issue, or concern. Every case presents a distinctive narrative, but case commonalities also foster the growth of knowledge learned. I focused on how emerging black farmers were receiving and interpreting state support, so this qualitative approach was deemed the most appropriate for this inquiry. Merriam (2009, p. 5) suggests that qualitative

researchers focus on “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their words, and what meaning they attribute to their experiences”.

A qualitative multiple case study approach permitted me to concentrate on collecting multiple perspectives within and between circumscribed situations (Agriparks) so as to assist me to examine the uniqueness of support interventions. The case study is used to explore the practices of emerging black farmers in the study sites and how these are supported by the state. This was achieved through interviews and on-site observation. Yin (2003, p.13) argues that “case studies produce material for a discussion about a real challenge”. The constructivist methodological assumptions believe that a phenomenon should be studied in the field where it happens, so as to understand the cultural practices of the people and the meanings they bring to them (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000: 21). The focus is also on two key ethnographic techniques, namely unobtrusive observation, which were used to collect the data. For this purpose, the design included strategies that promote data credibility to enhance overall credibility, validity and trustworthiness.

Stake (2005, p. 438) separates a case study from methodology by stating, “Case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied”. The researcher uses the case study to explore a real-life situation and uses multiple case studies to paint a distinctive picture of several real-life situations. In addition, case studies are also open ended and often used in those situations where it is tough to find a specific solution. A multiple case study is when a study includes more than one single case (Yin, 2003). Russell, Gregory, Ploeg, DiCenso and Guyatt (2005) proffer case study research design principles: (a) the research question is clearly written, and the question is substantiated; (b) the case study design is suitable for the research question; (c) purposeful sampling strategies that are appropriate for the case study have been used; (d) data is collected and managed systematically; and (e) the data is correctly analysed. Another important factor to take into consideration is the context (Yin, 2003).

The provincial context and multiple-case sampling allowed the study to be ‘’theoretically diverse’’, to ‘’capture enough variation’’ and to “encourage transfer of findings” (Punch, 1998, p.261). This type of multiple-case study is used to explore those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear, single set of outcomes (Yin, 2003, 2014). Notably, case study research does not seek universal generalisability in the positivist sense (Guba & Lincoln, 1981; Donmoyer, 1990). Punch (1998, p.261) states that “the concept of transferability is often preferred to generalisability in qualitative writing” though the study does not intend to be generalisable it will allow for the research to be “thickly described, the reader can consider the transferability of findings to other situations”, and the research will be “at a sufficient level of abstraction to permit their application to other settings”. A basic aim of this study is to provide a rich and holistic account of emerging farmer processes in order to understand what may affect and perhaps even improve practice. The multiple-case strategy and cross-context approach are not used

to obtain contrasting contexts, but rather to *interpret and relate* them so as to emphasise situatedness and interpretations and amplify wider experiences within Agriparks.

Ethnographic observations of particular cases (moments, practices) can be brought together in ways that maintain attention to the meaning within the individual cases while also examining "patterns of similarities and differences across them" (Rogoff & Angelillo, 2002, p.221). The study seeks to develop propositions "which link concepts or factors within the case" (Punch, 1998, p.154). As proffered by Punch (1998, p.154), "these [propositions] can then be assessed for their applicability and transferability to other situations". Evolving propositions is a way in which a case study can produce generalisable results (Punch, 1998). When the cases are analysed, this study will provide important perspectives on the differences and similarities (Vannoni, 2014). Case study researchers are often venerated for their capacity to introduce "nuance and complexity into the understanding of a given topic" (Collier & Mahoney, 1996, p. 13). Importantly, the evidence generated from a multiple-case study is considered strong and reliable (Flyvbjerg, 2001).

3.5.1. Study Sites

For the purpose of selecting the case studies, I read various parliamentary reports, workshop reports, working papers and business plans of the various provinces, as well as progress reports, where available. In my research, I looked at (a) what are the objectives of each case study and why are they prioritised? (b) how did a set of local development purposes and goals become an actual Agriparks support programme? (c) were local stakeholders consulted on setting the project and identifying objectives, for example, civil society organisations and farmer unions? (d) what are the geographic and societal context, for example is it an urban or rural area? (e) what is the involvement of the private sector in the Agripark?

I was also mindful of the limited study period of three years, and the limited funds available to conduct the study, with the long-distance travel and associated costs involved. I adopted ''purposeful sampling'', which is "based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, 1998). There are currently 44 districts in South Africa, where each Agripark is located, operated by the district municipalities, at various levels of development or underdevelopment. The cross-cultural approach and multiple-case sampling allow the study to be ''theoretically diverse'', to ''capture enough variation'', and to ''encourage transfer of findings'' (Punch, 1998, p.261). The study could also develop theoretical propositions "which link concepts or factors within the case" (Punch, 1998, p.154). The three study sites are described below.

3.5.2. Northern Cape province: John Taolo Gaetsewe Agripark

In Kuruman in the Northern Cape province, President Jacob Zuma launched the Agripark as part of the Fetsa Tlala (End Poverty) programme in October 2013. As an integrated government initiative, the

programme is meant to promote food security and end structural causes of food insecurity that continue to perpetuate socio-economic inequality. I was raised in the Northern Cape and, in a way, it was obvious that the province would be among the ones selected as I am familiar with the politics and the economic and social dynamics of the province. In addition, I have worked in Kuruman where the Agripark is located as director of the Association for Northern Cape Rural Advancement (ANCRA) for a period of about five years. ANCRA was a land service organisation supporting land claimants and rural development projects. During this time, I interacted with the local chiefs, councillors, government officials, extension officers, local farmers and businesspeople. I am familiar with the specific area of the project as well as the chief, the community and the extension officer involved.

JTGDM differs from the other two case study areas in that the land is communally held under the local chief, and the Agriparks farms with livestock and related industries. Commercial livestock farms are mainly located in the area comprising the western half of the Joe Morolong local municipality and the Ga-Segonyana local municipality. The Northern Cape is predominantly rural. The JTGDM was the richest mining region in the Northern Cape until a decline in mining employment and the near closure of the asbestos mining industries in the 1980s. Today, mined minerals include manganese, iron ore and tiger's eye. However, the entire JTGDM is considered to be non-arable and without any high potential agricultural land or soil. JTGDM is faced with severe poverty due to inadequate basic infrastructure and low levels of education and skills employment, with a resultant high rate of unemployment, especially among women and youth.

This 50ha Agripark site, the Agripark has not taken off, is located along the N14 towards Vryburg next to the Eldorado Hotel. The Agripark targets support to both large and small commercial livestock farms that are located in the western half of the Joe Morolong local municipality and the Ga-Segonyana local municipality. The JTGDM Agripark seeks to address the following:

- To build production capability by focusing on the production of large stock (beef), small stock (sheep), vegetables, abattoir and butchery;
- To contribute to community development through income generation which will boost the economy of the municipality;
- To create meaningful partnerships with government departments to develop critical essentials like roads and water that support the value chain; and
- To aid in creating investment opportunities for private farmers.

3.5.3. Gauteng province: Westonaria Agripark

In 2017, President Jacob Zuma, accompanied by Mr Senzeni Zokwana, Minister of DAFF, and Mr Gugile Nkwinti, Minister of DRDLR, officially launched the Westonaria Agripark. I moved to Johannesburg,

Gauteng in the mid-1990s to work for the National Land Committee, a land service organisation with affiliates in all nine provinces. Over the years, more and more rural people moved into the Gauteng province, an example of depeasantisation, in search of better means and repatriated remittance to the villages. My work with the National Land Committee brought an urban perspective to an initially rural outlook and I encountered urban landlessness, urban farming and food insecurity. My work relationship within the South African Non-Governmental Organisation Coalition consolidated the urban–rural linkages and highlighted the linkages between geographical location and development opportunities. I became more involved with social movements, both globally and nationally. A brief period with the World Summit on Sustainable Development, as director, exposed me to broader global dialogues on development, just as much as my work with the World Conservation Union introduced me to environmental issues. My present-day residence in Gauteng and exposure to the urban poor as well as practical and financial constraints informed the Gauteng case studies.

In preparation, I read reports and business plans of the Agriparks in Gauteng before deciding on Westonaria, west of Johannesburg. I decided on Westonaria because it best reflected the intended best practice model of an inclusive Agripark. Other factors were:

a) The Westonaria Agripark brings together the public and private sectors, mostly the adjacent gold mines, and community, as well as other interest groups such as retailers;

b) The West Rand district municipality, within which Westonaria falls, has high-value horticulture and aquaculture potential and focuses on agri-business and agro-processing;

c) The Agripark uses technology, vertical farming and irrigated tunnels;

d) Most of the farmers are immigrant workers from former homelands and from other neighbouring states. The majority of the farmers are redundant former mine workers and unemployed women and youth.

An interesting feature of Westonaria Agripark is its support for PPPs. The business plans were designed in collaboration with stakeholders with differentiated indicators for Agriparks and with clear goals. The Gauteng provincial government implemented seed funding for over nine years. The Westonaria Agripark is located in the peri-urban Westonaria local municipality along the R28 and covers 66ha. Westonaria Local Municipality merged with Randfontein Local Municipality to establish Rand West City Local Municipality on 3 August 2016. Located on municipal land, the Westonaria Agriparks is arranged in line with the Gauteng province's objectives of transformation, modernisation and re-industrialisation, also linked to the Township Economic Revitalisation Programme. The Agripark allows access to and participation of small-scale farmers in the agriculture value chains. The objective it is to grow high-value crops, with a possibility of value-added agriculture to expand the economic value. The crops include baby spinach, green pepper, tomato and cabbage. At the time of writing, there were approximately 27 farmers

who came from a radius of 20 km in the area, especially Bekkersdal. The Agripark has a high-tech vertical chamber, 20 hydroponic tunnels, of which 600m2 have irrigation systems, shade-net infrastructure of 500m^2, ablution facilities, storage facilities and offices.

3.5.4. Limpopo province: Levubu

Despite the high levels of poverty, hunger and unemployment in the Limpopo province, as well as the fact that it is a former homeland, I was amazed by its many provincial policies, programmes and projects. Most of the policies focus on agriculture growth and rural development. I was keen to understand the status of the black small-scale farmer, especially amidst the myriad of development policy initiatives. The question was where to start in the province. I was looking for a mainly rural area with a high concentration of black farmer activities. Coincidentally, during a food security event in DiepKloof, Soweto I had visited a fruit stall from Levubu in the Vhembe district municipality. I had spoken to the stall attendant and thus was familiarised with the Tshakhuma Barotta UIGC Farms in Levubu. My mind was made up. Importantly, Levubu contrasted with the other two case study areas in that it was part of a restitution claim under a communal property association chaired by the local chief. Limpopo, unlike Gauteng and Northern Cape provinces, embraces restitution case farms and the recipients of a post-settlement grant. The government's post-settlement grant in restitution cases has attracted the attention of policymakers and researchers nationwide because it had been carefully designed and seemed likely to secure land recipients.

The Levubu farms are co-owned by Univen (University of Venda) Innovative Growth Company PTY Ltd (UIGC), which holds 45% of the shares, and the Tshakhuma Community Trust, which includes the local community, and which holds 55% of the shares. The commercial farms overlay more than 200 ha of agriculturally productive land. The Levubu farms provide internship opportunities for students studying agriculture at the University of Venda and Tshakhuma Agriculture College. It also provides employment to local people to help them develop skills and create opportunities. The Limpopo Development Plan (2015 – 2019) consolidates various strategies and plans and focuses on the ongoing challenges to eliminate poverty, reduce inequality, and improve the quality of life. The Limpopo Agro-processing Strategy (2012) identifies the key agro-processing opportunities based on commodity production data. The Limpopo Department of Agriculture Strategic Plan 2015/2016 – 2019/2020 weighs the various opportunities and challenges faced by agriculture and outlines strategies and objectives for the future. Another provincial policy document is Mapping of Agricultural Commodity Production in the Limpopo Province, it explains the agricultural produce in the province.

The Vhembe district municipality is situated in the northern part of Limpopo and is the largest district in the province. The district municipality shares borders with Zimbabwe and Botswana in the north-west and with Mozambique in the south-east next to the Kruger National Park. The Limpopo River valley forms the border between the district and its neighbouring states. It comprises four local municipalities:

- Musina local municipality. The main employing sectors are mining and quarrying (36%), agriculture (26%), and transport, storage and communication (8%).
- Mutale local municipality. The major employer is the mining and quarrying sector (30%), while the catering and accommodation sector has an employment figure of 9%.
- Thulamela local municipality. The main employers are the food and beverage sector (59%) and the government sector (52%).
- Makhado local municipality. The main employment sectors are agriculture (48%) and construction (47%).

I reviewed the following Vhembe district municipality policy documents:

1. Vhembe District Municipality Local Economic Development (2006)

2. Vhembe Integrated Development Plan (2013/14)

3. Nwanedi Agriculture Development Infrastructure Master Plan (2013)

3.5.5. Selection of Participants

In terms of selecting participants, I purposefully invited all farmers involved in the Agriparks to participate in the study (Bernard, 2002; Patton, 2002; Cresswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Purposeful sampling was used to identify information-rich participants related to the phenomenon of interest, and to select participants who met the inclusion criteria (Palinkas et al., 2015). Given that all farmers had the necessary information required, I invited them to participate, thereby increasing the rigour of the study and the reliability of the data and results. The selection became convenience sampling when those who were invited to attend, turned up and suggested names of others who were from a different sphere of influence (Dörnyei, 2007; Henry, 1990; Mangal, 2002; Taylor, 2005). Taylor (2005) labels a sample as a subset of a population or universe. I identified beneficiaries within the Agriparks as black farmers who visited the Agriparks for various reasons and non-beneficiaries as experts who had researched small-scale farmers and Agriparks. People who come forward to be interviewed or who display an openness to participate upon invitation, are considered legitimate actors in the research process (Henry, 1990). In all my visits and interaction with participants, on and off farms, I was referred to other potential informants through snowballing with each participant referring me to another (Denscombe, 2010; Mertens *et al.,* 2012). For the key informants such as academics, activists, researchers and policymakers, I relied on my networks from my previous involvement in the development sector. I also participated in social events with potential key informants. I interviewed 12 key informants, most of whom were ex-colleagues I still had contact with at the time of writing.

At all the Agriparks, the management teams would provide me with background information and would give an update on what was ensuing on site at the time. Westonaria had 20 farmers but the number of farmers that participated in the study varied as some of them would abscond, leaving the plots

unattended. The manager introduced me to the first three groups of farmers. I visited the Westonaria farm on 11 occasions, both for conducting interviews or to participate in go-alongs at the farms, and he continued to talk to farmers over the phone. The same process of planning followed in Sedibeng and Rooiwal, both in Gauteng, where I had 11 interviews. I came to know about these two Agriparks from reading reports and conversation with participants in Gauteng. In Levubu, I initially spoke to the contact previously identified in Soweto (see section 3.4.4). On my first visit, the contact showed me around the farms, explained the farmers' practices and introduced me to the manager, chief and the beneficiaries. All the Levubu farmers are restitution claimants and of the Community Trust. The number of beneficiary workers at any given time varies according to the season and work demand. I had 20 interviews before reaching what I considered saturation, where the data no longer changed or changed only slightly. It soon became different names of the participants rather than substances of the information, because of their shared experience the story line soon became similar. This is mainly because the community members share the same history and familial links and heritage and form a ''big extended family'' based on trust and mutuality. I had four visits to the farms and kept contact with the farm managers.

In JTGDM, I initially contacted a former staff member of ANCRA to discuss my study, then an official of the Northern Cape provincial Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, an Agripark committee member and a local farmer on the beneficiaries' waiting list. I interviewed members of the Agripark committee, extension officers, would-be beneficiary farmers who had applied to participate in the Agripark but were still waiting for confirmation, community members and businesspeople. This round-about approach of meetings was justified because the Agripark had never taken off despite detailed plans and infrastructure on the site. I had 30 interviews, visited the area on nine occasions and continued to have contact with farmers. In all instances of communication, including with key informants, I explained my study and asked to set up appointments. All participants agreed to talk to me. In all instances, I went over the code of ethics, explained the details of the study and how questions would be asked. All agreed to continue and signed the consent form. Only on one occasion did an informant decline to sign, for unspecified reasons, but continued with the interview. I explained that I would take notes and would record the proceedings.

For the period of visits to the case study sites, I met the tillers of the land whose lives and livelihoods were dependent on the soil. I encountered both youth and women who were willing to explore agriculture pathways to escape the grinding hardships of poverty and hunger. Most had not gone beyond Grade 12 of school education. In all instances I had to explain the reasons for my study. Most appreciated this while others protested saying many people came asking "research questions" without explaining the purpose of the research. Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (2002, p. 137) assert traditionalists advocate that researchers keep the stand of disinterested observer but revisionists argue that authoritative distance [is] disrespectful and diminishing of research subjects, minimising their authority and potentially masking

their knowledge. Revisionists advocate for research relationships that are more nuanced and reciprocal. Besides being more ethical, they provide meaningful empirical data. Young and Skrla (2003) stress the importance of *reciprocity* and I support this assertion. I continuously engaged with the participants, acknowledged their contribution, thanked them and have stayed in touch to date. However, despite my empathy and mutuality, as the researcher, I was mindful of the ethics code, and participants used pseudonyms and proposed their preferred aliases.

3.5.6. Interviews

Setting up appointments with research participants was a matter of mutual suitability. I interviewed beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries at the Agriparks using an interview guide (Annexes A and B). I met with other primary participants at local cafes, where it was the most convenient for them. Some key informants were available on Zoom, although I interviewed some of them at the Agriparks also using an interview guide (Annex C). Only two were interviewed over the phone, although I had subsequent in-person interviews. Except for interviews that happened in cafés or online, I conducted most interviews on the land meaning that both the participant and I were on foot. I always explained the reason for the interview, the ethical code, language preference, the right to ask questions and to withdraw if and when necessary. Only in Levubu did I require the use of an interpreter. I speak isiZulu and the farmers speak TshiVenda (though they have a basic understanding of English). I would ask if they were comfortable with the use of an interpreter and, if so, to appoint a person of their choice. All participants who required an interpreter selected a co-worker with whom I communicated in English.

The interviews were scheduled for 45 minutes and I explained why this amount of time was needed. However, the interviews often went beyond that with the participant's permission. I requested to record the proceedings and take notes explaining that no reference would be made to the identity of the informant. All participants agreed to the recording and note taking. In the Northern Cape, participants were least likely to agree to being recorded. Participants who were reluctant to be recorded offered no reasons for their discomfort. In some instances where, whether wrongly or rightly, I sensed discomfort I would switch off the recording and would stop taking notes. This proved to be helpful, especially when the participants seemed anxious. For instance, JTGDM participants suspected the municipal officials of siphoning off project funds. Westonaria participants complained of a lethargic management who did deliver seeds on time and had barricaded the area to draw the attention of senior management, and in Levubu informants commented on poor infrastructure and facilities. For example, in Levubu storage facilities had not cooler systems and the fridges were not working.

I led preliminary discussions with participants to enhance the quality of the interview. Burns (1997) and Berg (1998) support the use of a pilot interview with a respondent to prepare and acquaint the researcher with the procedure, and to predict any hitches. It is necessary to provide the opportunity for a discourse between interviewer and interviewee which "moves beyond surface talk to a rich discussion of thoughts

and feelings" (Maycult & Morehouse, 1994, p80). From this perspective, discussions about farmers' families and livelihood came up in the interviews. For example, interviews provided insights about spouses who were migrant workers. As such, remittances from their spouses contributed to their domestic incomes. Their life experiences brought context to understand their agricultural practices and the meaning of agriculture for the sustainability of their livelihoods. I used semi-structured questionnaires. Some questions related to the practices of emerging farmers and other questions related to particular experiences and interests. The nature of the questions promoted the shared and friendly context of the interviews. The semi-structured questionnaires provided the necessary structure to the interview to establish the respondent's opinions and interpretation of particular decisions and events, also with regard to gaps, like access to capital, identified during the document analysis. In addition, respondents felt comfortable enough to talk freely about the support from the Agripark and the significance of the intervention, and about their understanding of practices and developments.

Interviewers seek to obtain a maximum of *self-revelatory reports of how the situation under review was experienced* (Merton, *et al.,* 1990, p. 95, author's emphasis). As recommended by Fiske and Kendall (1990), I maintained a line of interviews that held an open but focused structure that drew on the personal experiences of people. Prompting subjective experiences was a goal and not a problem to be resolved (Merton, Fiske & Kendall, 1990). I followed an interview guide, posing reformulated questions intended to draw insights concerning how respondents understood challenges and created meaning from their specific benefit or non-benefit from the programme. This shows I was aware that people's personal knowledge and ways of knowing were critical to social interaction and social analysis (Campbell, 2004). Interviews were formally organised, beginning with me explaining the research purpose, going through the consent form, then allowing time for respondents' questions, responding to interview questions from respondents, and finally closing the interview.

3.5.7. Participatory Observation and Go-alongs

Wolcott (2008) explains the stage of establishing breadth to the ethnographic project as ethnographic reconnaissance. I undertook scoping visits as an exploratory phase to build bridges of trust and collaborative mandate. It was useful for gaining an overall grasp of the setting, generating a sense of the scope of the undertaking, and gaining familiarity with the subjects and their ways (Bate, 1997, p. 1163). As Emerson et al. (1995, p. 10) explain, the spirit of fieldwork is to apprehend and realise action from the perspective of participants, and to participate in a cross-section of their everyday activities over an extended period of time. I went to the farming fields, observing farmers, interns at Levubu and Westonaria as well as traders who came to buy fresh produce. I developed a healthy rapport with the interns and they became an important part of discussions on what was going on. The scheduled observations consisted of a variety of visit types, such as go-alongs or drop-ins in Gauteng arriving at short notice, of visits of about 30 to 90 minutes that included conversations and note taking. Such

participant observation and go-alongs are commonly linked with ethnographic research in anthropology. As part of qualitative data collection, it involves the immersion of researchers into the environment of their subjects for a period of time. In active participant observation, the researchers converse with the subjects and take part in the daily life of the groups under study, including their activities, customs, rituals and routines. I engaged beyond the interviews through activities such as accompanying the participants during go-alongs. Go-alongs are systematic and outcome-based adaptations of ''hanging out'' with key informants, combined with the strengths of ethnographic observation and interviewing. Go-alongs explore key aspects of everyday lived experience (Kusenbach, 2003). In this study, go-alongs involved walking to the storage area to collect seeds, fertilisers and other implements and back to the farming lots. The most common and practical modes of go-alongs are 'go- alongs on foot' and 'ride-alongs' where research participants use forms of transport for journeys and the researcher joins them on these journeys (Wegerif, 2019). The go-alongs provide a tool for transparent and reproducible research synthesis, offering greater clarity, internal validity, and audibility (Booth *et al.,* 2011). As a hybrid between participant observation and interviewing, go-alongs carry clear gains when it comes to exploring the everyday lived experience. Observing, interviewing, and taking up-to-date notes informed the crucial goal of documenting the practices of emerging black farmers and the relationships among farmers and with officials and traders as well as other contextual occurrences (see Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 2002). By joining individual informants on their 'natural' outings, and through asking questions, listening and observing, I actively explored the flow of experiences and practices as the informants moved and intermingled with their physical and social environment. Go-alongs oblige the researcher to take a more active stand towards capturing their informants' actions and interpretations. It also permits the obtainment of contextualised data as the participant acts as the guide of the site exploration and offers a contextualised perspective of it (Garcia *et al.,* 2012; Wegerif, 2019). The advantage of the go-along technique is that the researcher is able to observe the informants' spatial practices in situ while accessing their experiences and interpretations at the same time. By means of in situ observation, the researcher gathers data from and about the site through observations and immerses him/herself in a lived experience of the site (Kusenbach, 2003).

3.5.8. Review of Documents

The sources of evidence for this study included documentary information, physical artifacts, such as products and machinery, and archival records (Wolcott, 2008). Based on the study topic and main research questions, I searched literature and documents on the internet using keywords such as agrarian reforms, land reform, small-scale farmer development, Agriparks, globalisation, markets and land grabs. I then separated themes related to the South African agrarian context, such as transformation, justice, equality, nation building, nation state and food sovereignty. Documented information played an important role in the collection of data. In each case, I chose documents on the basis of knowledge

gleaned from literature reviews and document analysis that determined which documents were most relevant. Using documents enabled me to achieve the goals of "look(ing) at something holistically and comprehensively, to study it in its complexity, and to study it in its context" (Punch, 1998, p. 192). In some instances, interview respondents pointed me towards documents and in other cases a respondent provided documents.

Documents are an important source of data and ensure "data rich in description" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998, p. 58) or ''thick description'' (Punch, 1998). The documents were also important in analysing and understanding the main discourses that influence the process, and they were the key focus of the discourse analysis used in the research (Gee, 1998, Olssen *et al.,* 2004). I incorporated publicly available flyers and handouts related to support services, such as calls for proposals from emerging farmers. An analysis of the appropriate documents before the interviews directed the course and nature of the interviews. In particular, the documents elicited important data for the levels within the programme trajectory, namely national and district municipal level. In the case of expert interviews, some experts had co-authored some of the documents, or had sat on committees or workshops and the minutes of these sessions were significant sources of data. I was allowed to read but not copy or remove meeting minutes as they had personal details.

In exploring the early periods of the CRDP, documents provided more reliable and higher quality data, and gave a more detailed picture of the policy process, than data provided by interview respondents. An understanding of the documents formed part of the interview process. Importantly, the data from documents constituted the process of triangulation within the data analysis, which consolidated the quality of the study. The following policy documents were considered for their relevance to the CRDP:

- DAFF: IGDP (2012).
- DAFF: APAP (2015 – 2019).
- DAFF Agro-processing Strategy (2012).
- Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (2011/12 – 2014/15).
- NGP (2010).
- NDP 2030 (2010).
- Industrial Policy Action Plan (2013/14 – 2015/16).
- Strategy for the Development of Small and Medium Agro-Processing Enterprises in the Republic of South Africa (2014 – 2019).
- State of the Nation Addresses (2009 – 2015).

3.5.9. Field Notes

I kept separate notebooks for each province to avoid possible confusion or conflation of events and issues. Given the difficulty of taking notes while walking, I decided beforehand to note issues relating to what the emerging farmers produce, how they produce it, where they sell it and what support they receive from stakeholders. However, I was not blind to issues beyond what was happening during an interview, for instance a farmer who had to walk 15km every day each way to the Agripark. I would ask questions to double check my notes or would later go back to the particular individual for clarity. Before taking notes, I would inform the participant of exactly what would be noted. Wolf (1992, p. 86-87) indicates that field notes are the first sacred text in the preparation of ethnography – the first summary of behaviour, the opening endowment of it with meaning, and they operate as an indispensable remedial to memory and variable opinions. Wolf (1992) concedes that it is impossible for field notes to be impeccable descriptions, no matter who takes them. As soon as a researcher selects one thing over another to express in field notes, that piece of information is an initial step in data analysis; "fieldnotes are the first collation of what we know" (Wolf, 1992, p. 91). In taking field notes, I heeded the recommendation of Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw (1995) to focus on what those in the field reacted to as being important and what initial impressions and key events or incidents they urged me to observe and take note of; also, to guard against making value judgments about particular events or assuming that the participants shared my views. I followed Wolcott (2003) to record activities occurring in a particular context, noting the social interaction patterns. I used this strategy with caution as it was not always possible to capture all that was going on. Wolcott (2003) mentions filtering information by topic. For example, I would record data only when someone referred to state support to emerging black farmers.

3.6. Data Analysis

The challenge, and the art, of data analysis is of course to filter out and distinguish significant from trivial information (Smith, 2011). Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997) posit the overall goal is to capture the essence of a place, documenting both promise and potential and to analyse the coexistence of strengths and vulnerabilities. Hence, data collection, analysis and interpretation entail asking internal questions such as: What is going on here? What is working well? Why is it working well? Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (1997, p. 142) purport that focusing on: "what is healthy and strong, we inevitably see dark shadows of compromise, inhibition, and imperfection that distort the success and weaken the achievements". Wolcott (1994, p. 10) proposes three means for qualitative researchers to handle the amount of data that has been collected: analysis, and interpretation. Wolcott (1994) likens data analysis to data processing or data management. Analysis involves cautious scrutiny of various sources of data and indicates how much we know for sure. Data interpretation goes beyond analysis by stating claims. Interpretation says, this is how I understand and apply what I have learned. Interpretation is the researchers attempt to make meaning of the findings. Whereas analysis is clearly specific, grounded and

carefully documented, interpretation is more subjective and unbounded – an attempt at identifying universals. Alvesson and Sköldberg (2013) explain that data and facts are almost always results of interpretation.

3.7. Analytical Process

In terms of the ethnographic interpretive and multiple case study method (Merriam, 1998), choosing a narrative approach will make the analysis informative and accessible, as well as make meaning to the wider policy-making community. The in-depth analysis will provide findings of value which are amenable to various interpretation and further research efforts. I was able to converse with diverse participants including those not initially identified for the research, namely non-governmental organisations involved with agriculture practices, farmer organisations, local economic development offices in the municipalities, and traditional authorities involved with rural development. All these individuals and organisations have long-standing connections with agriculture and rural development issues and have been involved for extended periods of time.

I conducted the narrative data analysis on observations, go-alongs, primary documents and interview transcripts, which included multiple reviews of both the recordings and the transcripts. Initially, I subdivided the data into three subcategories according to its source:

- Subcategory 1 includes data from observations and go-alongs. This data is considered related because of its *natural* occurrence at the sites. The case study approach is particularly suited to narrative analysis. As Yin (2003, p.120) suggests, “in most existing case studies, explanation building has occurred in narrative form”.
- Subcategory 2 is data from conversations and interviews. Data from these two sources are related because both are based on the researcher’s prompting and interviews.
- Subcategory 3 is data from the researcher’s field notes and primary documents. These are linked because of their documented nature. Documentation often has a narrative quality, telling the story of a group's learning experiences (Project Zero, 2003, p.18).

The focus of the data collection was on the farmers’ practices and the ways state structures support black emerging farmers. Whether a beneficiary or not, the farmers were fairly familiar with the purpose of Agriparks and services provided. I asked all respondents to reflect on the measures taken and proposals to ensure future sustainability of both the programme and development. Firstly, I transcribed the data with direct quotations from participants, treating descriptive data as fact (Wolcott, 1994, p. 10). Secondly, I populated a self-made Excel spread sheet with the data based on the research questions and identified common trends. Thirdly, I created logic by means of description and analysis with interpretations that could be explained by the descriptive data, for instance the land layout and infrastructure.

In instances where I was uncertain about what the respondent had said, I followed up with the respondent or compared my notes with the recording. For example, to clarify the meanings of farmer *practices* and state *support*, I grouped all the activities undertaken by a farmer to produce food under *practices,* and *support* included access to land, water, electricity and other resources and extension services. Because farmer's *practices* were clear in the respondents' mind there was no need to have subcategories. The choice of terminology was used to confirm the farmers conviction on what support meant. I used themes and patterns when examining data collected by observation and from documents. Emerson *et al*. (1995) urge the researcher to conduct open coding or to read field notes and interview transcripts line-by-line to note consistent themes or story lines. To construct emergent themes, Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (2002, pp. 193-214) recommend noting repetitive refrains that are spoken (by participants) or that appear frequently and persistently (signs and symbols), indicating a relatively collective expression of commonly held values. In addition, researchers should be alert to finding what Lawrence-Lightfoot and Davis (2002) refer to as resonant metaphors. I populated the self-made Excel spread sheet by identifying key concepts and their interrelationships, differentiating between farming practices and support as outlined by respondents, for instance seed and fertiliser. I followed the lead of Emerson *et al.* (1995) and implemented focused coding that consisted of additional readings of the data to carefully filter initial impressions, for example on food security, environment and markets.

Wolcott (1994) expresses an ongoing process of analysis and interpretation where the researcher is constantly collecting data, making sense of it, and then revisiting the analysis of data in the light of new experiences. As explained by Emerson *et al*. (1995), I removed codes that no longer matched the main narrative and identified new themes that may not have occurred initially. Wolcott (1994) notes that description, analysis, and interpretations are not mutually exclusive, nor do they necessarily follow a particular order. A non-linear, circular process continues as a conversation between the researcher and the data, for instance on the issue of racism and discrimination against black women (Wolcott, 1994, p. 11). The final objective of the analysis is indeed to draw the themes together in order to develop a narrative or story – to ''marry'' concept approaches to story approaches (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.208). Chapters six, seven and eight expound the themes, analysis, findings and conclusions.

3.7.1 Triangulation

I achieved triangulation by criss-crossing the collected data fibres from an array of sources, using themes that presented shared and common perspectives. I triangulated across data sources by observing patterns across interviews, observations, and documents. As explained by Tindall (1994, p.146), triangulation is "collecting accounts from different participants involved in the chosen setting, from different stages in the activity of the setting and … from different sites of the setting". I considered the following:

- Method triangulation is “the use of different methods to collect information” (Tindall, 1994, p.147). Participant observation and go-alongs involved the interactions between officials, farmers and extension officers and between individuals during the processes of collecting, observing, and interpreting data. Field notes recorded my feelings, perspectives and experiences within the Agripark contexts, in order to assess how these may have influenced data collection and analysis.
- Theoretical triangulation embraces multi-theories (Tindall, 1994). The study is not tamper-proof in terms of having one theoretical tradition. The study relates insights from political economy, post-colonialism and CRT. In addition, the study interprets and integrates scholarly and practitioner theory, research and practice from diverse contexts. I realised trustworthiness by using the triangulation of interview responses, observations information, researcher field notes and journals, and related research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.8. Ethics

The letter of approval from the University of Pretoria, Faculty of Humanities Research Ethics Committee, dated 14 December 2020, stated, “Data collection may therefore commence” (Annexure D). The date of the Committee's approval letter highlights the gap between registering as a PhD candidate, June 2019, and obtaining approval. The interlude was largely to obtain DRDLR’s approval to access the case study sites. Without official authorisation from the DRDLR, the Research Ethics Committee would not have approved my research application, or, I would have had to modify my initial research proposal. The period was during the peak of government’s Covid-19 regulations and restrictions. DRDLR officials were working from home and attending mainly to emergency issues (not academic applications). After countless unanswered emails, registered mail and telephone calls, I personally visited the Pretoria DRDLR offices. During the fourth visit, I was referred to the appropriate directorate within the department. In my experience, though limited to the department, it is a challenge to get support and cooperation from officials who seem to regard researchers as intruders.

3.9. Ethical Considerations

Punch (2000, p 75) states, “all social research involves consent, access, and associated ethical issues since it is based on data from people about people”. Interviews with participants conformed to general protocols and procedures for interviewing and obtaining oral history. I ensured that participants gave informed consent, and provided them with full information about the research, including the reasons they were chosen to participate (Annexure E). Participants’ privacy, confidentiality, and anonymity are guaranteed. For the purpose of clarity, I used group categories like B for beneficiaries, NB for non-beneficiaries, and KI for key informants. I then ascribed ascending numbers to further identify the individual, for instance B1 for the first beneficiary, and B2 for the second, and so on. This was done for all the other group categories. This group categorisation helped me, especially during the findings and

analysis stages, to understand the perspectives of the various respondents. I explained consent forms and the cover letter to participants. I asked state authorities at the relevant level, especially at the case study sites, for access to the sites, for primary and archival documents useful to the study, and for permission to interviews officials.

Chapter 4 Discourses on Land and Agriculture Reforms and the State

4.1 Introduction

A literature review approach, as described by Hogg, pursues a swath of different existing and emerging discourses. Like Hogg (2011, p. 668), I use an "organic review process" in my exploration by starting with specific goals but staying open to issues that are revealed by further reading. In this section, the opening literature review focuses on the terms ''land reforms'', ''agrarian reforms'' and ''agriculture''. Rather than doing an exhaustive review of land reform literature, I purposefully selected sources on agrarian-based approaches with a particular eye on work that clarifies state support to small-scale farmers. The intention here is not to originate and propose a new theory of land reforms to the already-crowded field, but to expand on a paradigm shift already proposed by, among others, Long and Van der Ploeg (1994), and on state support for small-scale farmers (Bernstein, 2013; Cousins, 2013a). I explore perspectives of land reforms to situate the discussion of emerging black farmers within a historical legacy of apartheid, which is complexly tied to the notions of both class and race (May, 2000). The skewed agrarian structure is, on the one hand, large-scale, predominantly white, commercial and profitable and, on the other hand, predominantly black, rural and subsistence (Aliber & Hall, 2012).

Prolific and complex theoretical discourses have emerged across anthropology, the humanities, and political and development studies about the assumptions underlying agrarian social structures and agrarian relations within the global systems (Byres,1991; Moyo, 1995; Bernstein, 2005, 2010; Borras, 2005; McMichael,2008). These discourses, categorised under the banners of land, agriculture, sustainability, social equality, food sovereignty, food security, global ecology and human kind, have begun to influence sprouting fields of studies that offer fresh insights (Sachs, 1993; Weis, 2007). A swath of the literature focuses on farmer practices, poor rural people, peasants, household farmers and indigenous people using agroecology (Wezel et al., 2009; LVC, 2010; Altieri & Toledo, 2011; Rosset *et al.,* 2011;), and on varied farming, contestation, resistance, (re)configuration, and transformation of rural spaces into peasant territories in a progression characterised as repeasantisation (Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2010). Versions of these contestations are myriad and complex. They are explored so as to accent multiple discourses typified by what the Irish philosopher, Richard Kearney (2005), terms a "hospitality of narratives", accepting that an array of different informed perspectives on the same events can and do exist. Acknowledgment of this reality of coexistence of different narratives liberates scholars and practitioners from the pressure of giving verdict on or endorsing a singular unifying narrative of change. I elaborate under the headings below these main debates in the literature.

4.2. Discourses on Land Reform Trajectories

There is a pervasive spectrum of discourses on land-related reforms with topics like redistribution, tenure, which is accompanied by redistribution, peasants, food security and agriculture. In addition, the term land reform has been used in either a restricted or much broader sense relating to the agrarian power structure, depending on the context. In the restricted view, which is adopted here, land reform is the redistribution of rights with regard to land to benefit small-scale farmers and agriculture, while in a broader sense, land reform is about changes in the institution of tenure and land organisation (see Warriner, 1969). In this context of institutionalising reform, governments that institute land reforms should not only allocate land but should institute measures to facilitate farming, such as credit cooperative and extension services. As stated by the United Nations (UN), the idea of land reform programmes is an integration of measures designed to remove barriers to economic and social development resultant from flaws in the agrarian structure (UN, 1956). The conceptual framework for this literature review identifies five core themes that can guide the research, analysis and change efforts in this area: (a) the need to explicitly and directly address narratives and discourse of agrarian reforms and rural development, (b) the importance of conceiving state institutions and programmes as sites of contestation and change, (c) the importance of farmers' agency in pioneering agrarian change, (d) the paradox that strategies for improving the agricultural practices and outcomes for emerging black farmers can (only) be achieved through state support, but the outcomes of these efforts benefit the whole society, and (e) the need to explicitly affirm identities and practices of emerging black farmers, creating opportunities for the development of a strong, positive and integrated sector. The idea of redistributive land reform – state actions to take agricultural land from those who have much and give it to those who have less or none – emerged as a just restorative priority. The phrase "redistributive land reforms" is frequently used to explain state interventions that are geared at redistributive measures targeted at social equality. A traditional definition of redistributive land reforms is more qualified, relating purposely to "programmes that redistribute land ownership from large private landowners to small peasant farmers and landless agricultural workers … [and] are thus concerned with a redistribution of wealth" (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz, 2002: 280). "The redistribution of property in land is a very difficult change to carry through … it is inevitably a political question" (Warriner, 1969: xv). It is influenced by uneven social political and economic forces and fierce debates ensue between upholders of state-led redistributive land reforms on the one hand and market-led reforms on the other (Deininger 2003: 7–132). Redistributive land reforms are also a means by which democratically elected governments confront the power of multinational corporations while acting in the best interests of their citizens and in the pursuit of socio-economic justice (Bernstein, 2005; Moyo, 2010). In these instances, redistributive reform plots redistributing land more equitably, and modernises the mode of agricultural production (Lipton, 2009). Although redistributive land reforms have been implemented in many developing nations, its policy aims have often been unsuccessful. Scoones, Leach & Newell, (2015) argue that, in Africa, there is fundamental

power disjuncture between state actors and peasants, which negatively impacts the capacity of either actor to implement redistributive land reforms. This power disjuncture is constantly inherent in the exercise of change itself, often at odds with reform ambitions (Byres, 2004).

4.3. Discourses on Reforms Perspectives

Historically, land reforms are aimed at the tenure systems and land ownership rights (Tuma, 1965). Within a concrete context, land reform refers to measures taken in prevailing land ownership and tenure systems (Lipton, 2010). The 1966 World Land Reform Conference in Rome, Italy, adopted an inclusive definition of land reform that emphasises the provision of opportunities for ownership of land to promote land settlement and security of tenure (World Land Reform Conference, 1966:76). The fifth report of the UN on the progress of land reform states, among other aspects, the importance of the transformation of the agrarian structure to improve land distribution and raise the level of agricultural productivity to ensure the economic welfare of the tiller of the land, that is the peasant, the tenant and the landless labourer (UN, 1966). In 1999, La Via Campesina's Global Campaign for Agrarian Reform delivered a declaration and vision for land reform, paying attention to the extensive politicisation of land ownership. As argued by Borras (2011), land reform objectives also aim to adopt a wider macro-economic purpose of raising farm productivity and contributing to overall economic development. Reformed tenure systems are forecasted to stimulate agrarian transition (capitalist, modernised, smallholder, or collective systems). Some theorists recognise diverse definitions, expressing how different cultures and societies shape land reforms (Mellac, 2014). Others have argued that instead of becoming bogged down in definitions, scholars can interpret practices that resonate with local experiences (Ghose, 1983). In developing countries and former colonies, land reforms raise issues relevant to centuries of colonial expansion, including colonialism's intrinsic violence, and imperialism, which still shape the present relations (Tuma, 1965). States have instituted collective or communal forms of farming, state-sponsored schemes, and land tenure reforms (Griffin, Khan & Ickowitz, 2002: 279). Montgomery (1972) says land reforms have since embraced agrarian reform or the rapid improvement of the structure of ownership, including the land tenure system, the pattern of cultivation and farm organisation, scale of farm operation, institutions of rural credit, and marketing. As Montgomery (1972:62) comments, land reform is an example of "a principle which has been tested and has survived, although its effects have rarely been reported or explained".

4.4. Discourses on Development Priorities

Land is about who owns what (Bernstein, 2010). Land has always been politicised and the history of this politicisation is expansive and severe but often underestimated and misunderstood. Land, whether this is evidence of its socio-economic pliability or strength, remains a critical vector of the global hegemonic political power (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009, 2010; McMichael, 2013). It is the perennial land question that

arises when scholars, researchers, and activists debate ecosystems, food systems, and food sovereignty (Van der Ploeg, 2013; Woods, 2014). Alain de Janvry (1981: 223) asserts that land reform is dead and that the new politics of agrarian reform lies not in the rural sector but is embedded in the political economy debates of production models and social class dynamics (further elaborated in section 3.6). However, since the comprehension of land reform and agrarian structure, as well as of agricultural change, is principally geographically designated, the interpretation of these concepts is entrenched in local history (Bernstein, 2005, 2010). These perspectives unmask social constructions and through careful analysis speak to critical agrarian questions about the future of family farming, food security, and sovereignty (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009).

In post-colonial countries, land reforms are undertaken to remove the institutional vestiges of the past, such as ownership of vast tracts of productive land by settler colonialist, or to transform forms of tenure. Land reform is used to amend institutions of tenure and community configuration, such as tenure reforms, extension services, credit and inputs. In this way, land reform is considered in the context of increasing agriculture productivity and reinforcing the capitalist mode of production (Du Toit & Neves, 2007). This view fails to highlight the political imperative that underlines the land reforms. As argued by Moyo (2010), the redistribution of land, therefore of property rights, is a political process of taking land from dominant social groups, the political process impacts on production or how it can enhance production. As argued by Warriner (1969), it is possible to indicate a land reform system that is not productive, but unproductivity could be because of poor land use or poor labour issues. In the South African context, land reforms involve the redistribution of land rights to previously disadvantaged groups to largely benefit the small-scale farmer and farmworker (Cousins, 2011; 2013b). Land reform is used to advance social justice and economic equality (Aliber *et al.,* 2009).

4.5. Discourses on Reforms: Multiple Objectives

In the conventional or commonly sanctioned use of the term land reform, it includes the redistribution of property or rights in land for the benefit of small-scale farmers and agricultural labourers (Warriner, 1969, xiv). Often, the target of land reforms is to initiate or secure a solid class of viable, market-oriented and surplus-producing peasant farmers (Lipton, 2010: 192–94). Regardless of whether it is a capitalist modernised peasant economy or a collective system, the immediate task of agrarian reform is to establish the peasantry as the principal actor on the rural scene (Ghose, 1983). This is notable when various structures designed to resolve the land reform and agrarian disjuncture appear to be at best aiding the continuation of schisms, and at worst empowering and enriching landholders who have a vested interest in the discord. Deininger and Binswanger (1999), posit market-based land reforms which create two mutually reinforcing definitions of “market-assisted land reform”, “market-based land reform”, and “market-led agrarian reform” This trajectory of land reform and its functions is influenced by the so-called evolutionary theory of land rights. As of 2000, the World Bank has embraced what it calls “land

administration" approaches which do not involve express redistribution of land rights from large landowners to small-scale farmers or the landless, but aims to amend the legal, technical, and institutional structure for land ownership, with the focus of upholding "tenure security" and the functioning of land markets.

4.6. Discourses on Agrarian reforms

Agrarian reform discourses emerge amidst the acknowledgment that state institutions are embedded in inequitable power structures, processes, and relations and farmer agency has the possibility to either contest and/or reinforce uneven power relations (Boone, 1994; Evans, 1995; Kohli, 1996). Agrarian reforms, in most countries and under peculiar conditions, are not isolated affairs but are intrinsically interrelated to land reforms and agriculture development. Scholars have delineated how land reforms have morphed to influence agrarian changes under different conditions (Bernstein, 2005, 2010; Borras, 2005; Weis, 2007). Karl Kautsky (1988) defines the agrarian question as being whether, and how, capital is seizing hold of agriculture, revolutionising it, making old forms of production and property untenable and creating the necessity for new ones. As such, agrarian reform is an expansive concept comprising land tenure systems, as well as credit and marketing. In this sense, agrarian reforms feature corrective measures in the land tenure and administration systems. Agrarian reforms essentially interlock the re-organisation of the agriculture structure, entailing the transformation of rural life and activities (Warriner, 1969; Jacoby & Jacoby, 1971). The understanding of "agrarian reform", if anything at all, underlines the inadequacy of redistributive land reform by itself to bring about lasting, structural change in the rural economy and society (Jacoby & Jacoby 1971: xiv-xv). Oxfam (2015) explains that agrarian reforms incorporate agriculture structures, privatisation of state-owned land, implementation of public sector reforms, and commitment to free markets.

While diverse factors warrant agrarian reforms, commonly reforms are in response to internal and/or external pressures, either to resolve or prevent an imminent national dilemma (Bernstein, 2005, 2011; Cousins *et al.*, 2011) – internally, to evade an economic, social, or political crisis and, externally, to attract foreign investments (Borras & Franco, 2011; Peemans, 2013). Insightfully, Anna Tsing (2002) argues, in the Indonesian context, land and property rights and agrarian relations are crucial for social relationships. As such, it is the very uneven social relations that agrarian reform, in its common sense, is meant to reform. Some scholars argue that agrarian reform criticism remains politically partisan (Bernstein, 2010) and that the agrarian reform discourses remain static and unproblematised (Araghi, 2003). Grindle (1980: 3–12) attributes political compromises regarding agrarian reform to the influence of liberal-minded politicians devoted to social justice and to the growing strength of rural populist movements. Nelson (1992) argues, politically, capitalist industries have the greatest influence, with the urban poor and rural peasants striving for greater regard in policy contests. This corpus of work seeks to unearth and explicitly describe ways in which agrarian reforms could address the unique agriculture needs of countries in a

globalising world. The economic and social welfare of the tiller of the land (that is, the productivity of his/her labour and his/her income) is thus the ultimate benchmark for measuring progress in land reform (UN, 1970). Agrarian reforms aim to transform the unequal and unproductive agriculture structure, remove exploitative relations, banish patron-client relationships, and promote agriculture growth with social justice (Haque & Sirohi, 1986). It is common that forms of land ownership remain major links of the political power structure, social hierarchy, and economic relations in poor agrarian economies (Ghose, 1983).

4.7. Rural Development Reforms

Rural reform and rural development are complex, affected by multiple factors and different for every unique country context (Bryceson, 2002a, 2002b; Van der Ploeg, 2006). Bernstein (2005, 2010) uses land reforms to explore homogenous and contested narratives of rural development and the dynamics within the global systems. One of the prevalent difficulties is explaining what rural development typically is because it is led by interdependent global and local factors. Social actors have controversially debated complex processes, policies, and practices to urge land and agrarian reforms to advance rural changes (Unterhalter, 1986). Rural reform and development have expanded according to the scope of functions in which land is a factor of production, a repository of value and wealth, a status symbol, or a source of social and political influence. Woods (2007, 2014) submits persuasive insights into the various ways in which rural reforms have expanded, contracted, integrated, consolidated, and reorganised over the past century. Bernstein (2010) expands this point in describing that who owns what is reproduced within historically constructed societal power relations, adding that who owns what is not a manifestation of the world as much as it is a constitutive force that both arbitrates and influences reality within historically constructed practices and relationships shaped by the power of capital. Cousins (2011) contends that rural-based relations have multiple political dimensions and socio-economic expressions. Often, rural reforms and development denote the politics of the governing administration or a national redefinition of power dynamics. Thus, countries have made different efforts. With the dominance of rural production in the economies of developing countries, it is not surprising that land has been both a key issue in development theories and the main issue of rural, social and political agrarian conflict (Bernstein, 2005, 2010). Contextually, there are practical details to weigh up when analysing and interpreting rural development (Hebinck, 2010). Indeed, it has been decades since Jacoby and Jacoby (1971) and Warriner (1969) recognised that access to land is crucial to poor people's capacity to construct viable livelihoods and overcome rural poverty. Existing structures of land tenure were often severe barriers to successful rural livelihoods (see Du Toit & Neves, 2007). For example, farmer practices can be vehicles for rural improvement, targeted to enhance rural production outcomes and to serve as a catalyst for socio-economic change. Other challenges abound on rural development and livelihoods. The SDGs note that rural development is crucial, not only for poverty reduction but for many other sustainable development

goals. Thus, rural development is critical for ending hunger and improving nutrition for the growing 13% of people in the developing world who are hungry, which requires restructuring the agricultural value-chain – from farmers who grow food to retailers who sell it to consumers. Lipton (2010) states that land reform has played a key role in rural and national poverty, progress, freedom, conflict, and suffering. Where agriculture continues to be central to the lives of the poor, the role of land reform will not decline (Lipton 2010: 10).

The UN SDGs build on the progress made by the Millennium Development Goals (2000–2015) in reducing global poverty by establishing "17 goals to transform our world". Three of the SDGs are relevant to this study:

- Goal 1: "By 2030, ensure that all men and women, in particular the poor and the vulnerable, have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land and other forms of property, inheritance, natural resources, appropriate new technology, and financial services, including microfinance".
- Goal 2: "By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and income of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous peoples, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources, and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment".
- Goal 5: "Undertake reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to ownership and control over land and other forms of property, financial services, inheritance, and natural resources, in accordance with national laws".

Adopted by democratic governments, the goals sum up the powerful role that land and agriculture play in creating the kind of societies we want to see in our world. While the right to sustainable development is widely recognised, the uneven manner in which access is provided, and the disadvantages that some people experience outside the state system, mean that violations of human rights in terms of environmental, social, and governance criteria and structural inequalities persist. In terms of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, land and agriculture assist individuals to achieve their potential and meaningfully take part in civic activities. Everyone has the right to participate in decisions that affect their human rights. In a rapidly globalising world without democratic supranational governing bodies, developing countries are competing against each other (McMichael, 2000; Weiss, 2007).

4.8. Linkages: land reforms, agrarian reforms and rural reforms

The perpetual land reform versus agrarian reform disjuncture discourse is problematised both in theory and practice. The disconnect is repeatedly obscured and confused. The complex nexus between land reform and agrarian reform, especially in developing economies, cannot be overemphasised. It is the main nub of the transformation matter. It is important to understand their interconnectedness and

interrelatedness – how these factors interconnect to shape agriculture and sustainability. Land reforms aim to alter land ownership structures while agrarian reforms, as a more comprehensive idea, moves beyond land reform to support access to various input systems (knowledge, credit and markets). Scholars, practitioners, policymakers, and development critics scrutinised land reforms and agrarian reforms from an array of perspectives. They provide competing theoretical discourses that assert incongruous positions on land reforms and agrarian reforms which contrast several positions that are in themselves contradictory (e.g. Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009; Binswanger & Byerlee, 2011, 2012; McMichael, 2013). A major cross-cutting analysis of national case studies in Brazil, Chile, India and South Africa speaks to the nature and context of the reforms (Borras *et al.,* 2012). While Moyo (2010) feeds significant coverage into Zimbabwe and Hall and Kepe (2011) cover the present South African dynamics, other authors (Deninger & Binswanger, 2009) study individual nation-states that incorporate both state and market-based land reforms in order to examine the distribution of agricultural development opportunities. Cousins and Genis (2011) look at the broad subdivision of agriculture land and prioritisation of state support to farmers, also rural economic development, while Genis (2008) looks at farm sizes and productivity. Cousins and Genis (2011) summarise dimensions of land reforms that can be used as conceptual frameworks to support agrarian reforms, supporting security of tenure, communal landholdings, and securing peasants' rights. Bernstein (2005) points out that because the issues are debatable, it is apt to examine the unique changes that literature offers, reflecting divergence, convergence as well as emerging and ongoing distinctive global influences. Griffin, Khan and Ickowitz (2002: 279) define land reform as the efforts to correct historical distortions in the allocation of land ownership and user rights, and to address the structural problems of accessing private investment and markets. Following political economy arguments, scholars expand the thoroughness of what it means to find new, sustainable forms of active engagement within the local and global agrarian environments. Globally, the land is power, the land is wealth, and, more importantly, the land is about race and class. Land resets both political and economic power relations.

4.9. Agriculture Paradigms and Practices

Modern agriculture paradigms and practices are often traced back to the Agriculture Revolution of 1750. The history of diverse agricultural systems, adopted in different historical periods, environments, and cultures, tells a story of ongoing social evolution (Holt-Gimenez *et al.*, 2009). Agriculture is increasingly modernised, dynamic and non-static, reflecting changes and developments (Van der Ploeg, 2010, 2013; Gliesman, 2012). Agriculture is always adjusting to the vagaries of the physical and material environments from generation to generation. Agricultural innovation characteristically results from dynamic interactions among a multitude of actors and factors occupied in the production, processing, packaging, distribution, and use of agricultural products. The major forces that drive agricultural changes are population increases and globalisation dynamics (FAO,2014). Other forces include capitalist advances in

science and technology, climate change, consumer demands and agricultural subsidies (Van der Ploeg, 2010; Hirsch, 2012), as well as pressures from social movements demanding food sovereignty, land reform, and poverty reduction reforms (Mamdani, Mkandawire & Wamba-dia-Wamba 1988). Notwithstanding the intrinsic complexities of agricultural systems and the divergent contexts in which they occur, agriculture is about the production, distribution, and consumption of farm produce (Collier, 2008). Araghi (1999) and Akram-Lodhi (2008) propose that there are different perceptions rather than a singular perception of agriculture practices. Also, agriculture practices differ in governability, accountability, institutionally and sustainability of the reforms. Single perspective analytical paradigms obscure and obfuscate the perpetuation and marginalisation of other actors in the agriculture sector (Nattrass, 1988), such as small-scale farmers. These paradigms ignore contradiction in land, agriculture, and agrarian reforms, overlook those whose identities exist at the margins, and reinforce ignorance about how intersecting farmer identities impact inequality. Unal (2012) argues that agriculture reforms help lower poverty in rural areas where the majority of the poor reside. A problem shaping the transformative outcomes of production and social supply of rural farmers is that agriculture policy has many different perception and purpose references (Montgomery, 1972).

4.9.1. Agriculture Commercialisation

As argued by McMichael (2013) the commercialisation of agriculture conundrum calls for the rethinking of the nature of neoliberalism and the conceptualisation of the world order. It was not until the late twentieth century that the present-day understanding of the concept ''agriculture'' was popularised to involve private property rights, land ownership, farming patterns, and mechanisation, as well as data and technology (Araghi, 2003). The advancement of industrial agriculture focused on the global market, weakened peasant agriculture, and amplified the power of large landowners (de Alcantara, 1976; van der Ploeg, 2010b). The intensification of class, gender and regional inequalities are documented and analysed (Byres, 1981; Agarwal, 1994). The consolidation of peasant land within fewer and fewer hands, together with the mechanisation of labour-intensive activities, pushed peasants onto marginal land and into urban slums, forcing them to subsist through self-exploitation and the competitive subdivision of densely filled survival roles (Davis, 2004: 27). The World Bank supports the economic dimension, namely the monoculture industrial farming systems, either by providing financial support for agrarian reforms, such as land tenure and land market facilitation, or by giving loans and technical assistance (Rosset, 2009, p. 117). In terms of the social dimension, policies generate commodification of rural people's collective rights and allow money to be the key to access to land (Rosset, 2009, p. 117). The programmes of land titling have degraded traditional ways of collective land rights and have caused internal conflict between members of local communities who used to accept peaceful coexistence as custom (Rosset, 2009, p. 117). The model of the corporate-controlled agro-industry has failed to produce positive results economically or socially.

4.9.2. Agriculture Sustainability

Sustainable agriculture, as a framework, potentially speaks to the discursive narratives in agriculture in a globalising twenty-first century as it has been conceptualised through space and time. The concepts of sustainability have shifted throughout history with the evolution of farming practices (Gupta, 2004). Agriculture practices have always been transient and non-static with diverse forms of agriculture crossing over different continents, making agriculture culturally specific and relevant. The concepts of sustainable agriculture have been amplified since the early 1980s in response to ecological and equity setbacks caused by the vagaries of modern industrial agriculture. Globally sustainable agriculture has re-emerged in scholarly discussions on the environment and food security and has become a major subject as agro-industrial firms have increasingly gained more control over the performance of agriculture across many localities and places (Bernstein, 2013; Bernstein & Campling, 2006). Sustainability is tied to the critique of an established output-driven productionist paradigm and technology-driven large-scale farms. Sustainability focuses on equity and environmental aspects (Altieri 2002; Ray et al., 2003). Sustainable agriculture aims to tackle the problems of conventional agriculture by employing a systems approach (Ikerd, 1992). Agricultural sustainability requires the synergistic effects of agroecological practices to achieve compatibility among the desired dimensions of the agricultural sustainability tripod: economic, social, and environmental sustainability (Herdt & Steriner, 1995; Van Loon, Patil & Hugar, 2005). Meanwhile, Gliessman (2012) addresses concerns that growth factors provided by ‘‘nature’’ are increasingly being replaced by artificial factors generated by industrial means, which have made farming increasingly and significantly dependent on external inputs, technology and expert knowledge, as well as industrial and financial capital. Food sovereignty, namely “the right of peoples to healthy and culturally appropriate food produced through ecologically sound and sustainable methods, and their right to define their own food and agriculture systems”, is part of the contestation (Nyéleni, 2007; Holt-Giménez, 2011). Taking the position that agriculture is an ongoing and evolving concern, La Via Campesina, a global agrarian movement, argues for agri-food self-sufficiency through land reform, preservation of indigenous knowledge, and agri-food systems based on agro-ecological principles (Fairbairn, 2012; Desmarais et al., 2014; Rosset & Martinez-Torrez, 2014). Since agriculture is bound to space and time, it provides a fundamental connection between humans, land, and the environment within which it interacts. Agriculture, as a farming practice within a particular time and space, has been examined in diverse ways by a wide range of scholars (Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2010a, 2010b; Clapp, 2016). Agriculture is used to address issues of access to land and methods of farming.

4.10. Reframing the Narratives

The globalisation of the agriculture industry has drawn significant notice from scholars in sociology and the development studies of agriculture and food systems (Friedland, 1994). Researchers have assessed how agricultural globalisation has transformed the socioeconomic landscapes within developing

countries (Gwynne, 2003; Dolan & Humphrey, 2004). The researchers focused on the globalisation of the food industry, enabled by multinational corporations, notably supermarket chains and food distributors. The resurgence of agriculture on the international agenda commenced in July 2009 with the Group of Eight meeting in L'Aquila, Italy and member states agreeing on the L'Aquila Food Security Initiative. In a joint statement, the heads of state and international and regional organisations voiced their profound concern about the global food security situation, as well as the impact of the global financial and economic crisis and the rise in food prices on the countries least able to respond to increased hunger and poverty. In 2010, the USA launched the Feed the Future initiative in which they target 19 priority countries for investment in food security and agricultural development to ease hunger, malnutrition, poverty and food insecurity (Lawson *et al.,* 2016). Typically, the trade-in of fresh food produce is exemplified by Global South to Global North, cross-continental transactions (Friedland, 2005). The ideas of alignment and collaboration from production through the agro-value chain to consumption, emerged in national discussions as agriculture and environment became a major issue in agriculture development (Lang & Heasman, 2004; Stern, 2007; FAO, 2009a). A contrary view argues that globalisation of agriculture has rewritten genealogies and traditions, generating homogeneity and re-emergence of new patterns, calling for greater collaboration between state and private sector companies (see Long & Van der Ploeg, 1994). Policy researchers are summarising the formation and development of integrated methods, such as the Life Sciences Integrated Paradigm that applies biotechnology techniques, including the use and manipulation of living materials in the manufacture and processing of foodstuffs (Lang & Heasman, 2004: 22). Their rapid expansion and general record of disappointments make agriculture and rural development programmes a valuable object of study to better understand how, in the words of James Scott (1998), "certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed." Small- and medium-scale agriculture and industrial agriculture, which continue to operate under separate governance and funding systems, cannot afford to operate in silos as the world faces several economic and labour issues, including the need for a more skilled workforce and improved technology (FAO, 2009b).

4.11. Ideology vs Programmes

Joshi (1975) distinguishes between agrarian reforms as either an ideology or a programme, arguing that, as an ideology, agrarian reform is pro-peasant and anti-landlord, and, as a programme, it serves the interest of superior power structures and large landowners as opposed to the landless poor. Joshi (1975) stresses that agrarian reform programmes are implemented as rational approaches to achieve goals of economic growth, social development, and political stability. Agrarian programmes have largely failed because of lack of an adequate theory and because reform programmes deal with symptoms rather than causes (Joshi,1975). Tuma (1965) draws a distinction between revolutionary and evolutionary agrarian reforms and argues that revolutionary agrarian reform is pro-egalitarianism and aims to bring about a more just and equal socialist order, while evolutionary agrarian reforms are pro-capitalist, promoting

private property, free markets and low regulation; either way, agrarian reforms are used to avert revolution. The alternative is not socialism. Development is not binary and the reality is rather more complex (see Cousins, 2011). Bernstein (2010) takes a wide view of the concentration of corporate power and discusses the emergence of global agricultural division of labour and the value of restructuring agrarian arrangements for equitable and sustainable reforms. Scott (1998) notes that states have the characteristic inclination to initiate programmes through coercion and to design projects for social engineering to achieve legitimacy. La Via Campesina (2010) urges agrarian reforms from below, led by the landless, and proclaims that no longer can agrarian reforms be regarded in dualistic silos of either industrialised or subsistence as the landless poor all over the world face economic and social struggles. Poor people are being ostracised in terms of the flow of food, food security, and the reengineering of a clean environment. Yet, developed, high-income countries, via multinational cooperatives and agencies, hold more than 70% of the global agrarian wealth and control the value chains, while the majority of those in low-income countries have limited access to food resources.

4.12. The Role of the State in Reforms

In this section, I weigh in from a development perspective, not so much in terms of the genealogy or the pre-history of the state but in terms of its contemporary role in current global agriculture and sustainability. Whereas something like 'medieval exploitation' did exist, it is arguable whether this was a form of an anti-poor working class logic or the expression of feudalism (Lonsdale, 1992; Mamdani, 1992). Even if it was matter-of-fact exploitation, medieval agriculture reasoning put tiller-of-the-land in an elevated position in comparison with later periods, since farmers in common played an active role in production and distribution. Against the backdrop of postcolonial criticism, I discern between the state in the Global South and the state in the Global North, analysing former while contextualising the latter. The aim is to present the state as an intricate interface between ideology, politics, culture, and economic discourse, from which there is a lot to learn about recent state history. The history of the state's nature, character, form, and content is long and convoluted (Marx, 1953; Hegel, 1956; Vincent, 1987; MacKinnon, 1989; Mamdani, 1992; Young, 1994; Werbner, 2002). One of the major theorists, Marx dedicated decades to the role of the state during different historical epochs (Marx, 1953). In the Communist Manifesto, Marx refer to the state as an organ of power emanating from society but which becomes alienated from society to serve particular class interests (Marx, 1953). What was supposed to be an institution to organise societal affairs, through fair democratic practices, transiently turned into a de rigueur class mechanism for legitimising working-class exploitation (Ibid). The state, to paraphrase Hegel's (1956) phrase, is an independent institutional category, with its own coherence, logic, and organic unity beyond and above society.

The chronicle of the role of the state in the colonies, past and present, is the history of the subjection of the colonised natives under the power of the imperial state hegemony (Lonsdale, 1992; Mamdani, 1992;

Kebede, 2003;). Mbembe (2001) critically observes colonial arbitrariness in terms of how the colonial state sought to integrate the political with the social and ethical, while closely subordinating all three to the requirements of production and outputs. The colonial state used racialised legislative measures to define populations, regulate levels of public and private relations, govern populations based on racialised dispossession and manage economic relations to reproduce racial relationships (Goldberg, 2009). The colonial state sustained white supremacist reason and protected capitalism from scrutiny. The state, in Marx's analysis of capital, is an organ for the coercion of the proletariat, the aim of the capitalist is to appropriate surplus value and profit. Hegel (1956), a philosopher, refuting Marx, argues that the state is both a necessary and inevitable social institution to arbitrate the inherent social contradictions, and is far from an instrument of oppression and exploitation. "State power derives from other forms of power," Foucault (1979) argues; If we want to change state power, we must change the various relationships of power that operate in society. While Marx was adamant about the role of the state, others believed that concepts of state are essential for theory development (Marx, 1953; Vincent, 1987; Mamdani, 1992; Crawford, 1994; Werbner, 2002). These different and differing points of view give the state an enhanced discursive presence. I propose a framework that discerns how farmer practices and state support are not mutually exclusive (a proposition I loosely believe is being propounded by Long and Van der Ploeg (1994)).

4.12.1.State: Justice and Equality

The role of the state has become a key conceptual framework to understand agrarian structures and food regime systems (Bates, 1981, 1984; World Bank, 1991; Boones, 1994, Evans, 1995; Katznelson, 2001). Bates (1981, 1984), Boones (1994), and the World Bank (1991) have critically identified and interrogated the nature and transformation role of states in developing economies. The universality of states or community of states has made the understanding of the state's power extremely important as people from diverse backgrounds are increasingly made to work together effectively and efficiently (Polanyi, 1957; Bates, 1984; Evans,1995; Katznelson, 2001;). Shivji (2003) opines that development aims to understand how a state through its institutions establishes and maintains a politico/socio-economic power structure and professed ideas of justice and equality. On the role and the function of the state, Mamdani (1992) argues that the state justifies its own existence or redundancy based on what the state does or could do. Kautsky (1988) argues the state is a ruling class mechanism meant to legitimise its ideological hegemony through oppression and suppression of the working classes. To the instrumentalist, the state is just an instrument in the hands of the dominant class. The origin of this thinking can be traced back to Marx and Engels, who characterised the state in the Communist Manifesto as "a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie" (Marx 1953). In neoliberal thinking, the permanence of the state in society is a statement of fact. Democracy has as its fundamental pillar the independence of the powers of the state, which must act completely free of any pressure.

Agrarian scholars aligned with political economy analysis reject the prevailing orthodoxy that states could be or should be ''neutral'' and ''objective'', arguing no state exists outside the parameters of social dynamics of economic power from which to just observe and analyse (Lonsdale, 1992; Mamdani, 1992; Kebede, 2003). In agriculture, food and even environment, the role of the state becomes useful for perceiving the mode of ownership of the means of production and distribution. Here the conceptualisation of state has made progress, moving beyond conceptualising the state as unilateral authority to an analysis of systemic functions and processes (Mamdani,1992; Boones, 1994; Evans, 1995). Rosset (2006) argues in order to build a more sustainable, just and prosperous economy, it is vital to understand the class affinity of the state and enable societies to see the state for what it is – a tool not an ideology. It can be an excellent tool when used for the common good but relying on the state as the sole authority undermines the voice of society. McMichael (2005) and Rosset (2006) argue that improved food production and free markets do not necessarily ensure equitable distribution of food, but rather target the few that can afford it.

The state faces growing criticism for what is perceived by some scholars as its pro-capitalist biases (Polanyi, 1957Evans, 1995; Moyo & Yeros, 2007). Originating and executing a social policy consist of processes and products that are neither objective nor neutral (Rochefort & Cobb, 1994; Fischer, 2003). A food system analysis challenges the idea that the state has paramount authority by pointing to the multiple hierarchies of power and control that exist within the world food system, urging a broadening of the concept to describe dynamics of decision-making and implementation within and among all human organisations that shape food systems (McMichael, 2010, 2012). In many different and differing ways, individuals stand in various positions in relation to macro- and micro-level power structures based on overlapping features of their class, gender, and race (Shivji, 2003; Moyo & Yeros, 2007; Moyo, 2010).

4.12.2.State: Functions and Implications for Transformation

Brenner and Stuart (2009) termed the "State Mode of Production", a situation where state power is used to manage and maintain the capitalist growth at all spatial scales, from the local to the worldwide. State reforms attempt to transform traditional power hierarchies and to allow democratic processes more influence over societal matters. Though local circumstances and histories vary among countries, common experiences of marginalisation, poverty, and low life expectancy have prompted many poor countries to draw parallels across the globe. In Africa, the prosperity and sustainability of social models depend on aid and investment from abroad. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank support smaller developing states in the form of establishing minimal administrative bureaucracy (Boones, 1994) and programmes where state institutions are located as investors (Evans, 1995). The small size of the state is part of the imposition of structural adjustment measures conditions for investment and loans, mostly to developing nations. The structural adjustment measures are considered necessary to curtail state interference in public sector investments, bloated state institutions are saturated with inefficiencies,

processes, practices, and relations and undermine private sector investments. The range of different approaches to state size debates aligns with various conceptions of development methods and the corresponding roles of state institutions.

Scholars across different generations have identified waves of neoliberal imperialist thought that the state is aligned to social groups (Boones, 1994; Evans, 1995). There is a clear opposition between those who focus on the state's role and size, and those who prioritise the iniquitousness of free markets, underlining failed state interventions (Bates, 1981, 1984). Crucially, the state size discourses scrutinise how political power, privilege and indeed alienation are distributed in society owing to the position individuals occupy within various power structures. Reducing the size of the state is one aspect of the neoliberal agenda to reduce budget deficits. Privatisation of some government functions is one way to reduce the size of the state, creating opportunities for the private sector. Another is to put constraints on government spending through limits on the size of fiscal deficits and on the ability of governments to accumulate debt. The development history of recent decades offers many examples of such budget curbs (e.g. the so-called Maastricht criteria). Forerunners of the dominant state argue only state intervention with high spending and taxes can control agriculture, sustainability, and food security mishap.

4.12.3.Universal Protocols: Equity

Several international instruments place legal and moral obligations on various governments to institute agrarian reforms to fight increasing global hunger and poverty and to end environmental degradation. Some of these instrument focus on issues of transforming food and agriculture for sustainable development. An instrument on agricultural markets and sustainable development look at issues of global value chains, small-scale farmers and digital innovations. The international policies for agrarian reform and rural development urges government to prioritise reform. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women calls for greater participation of women and UN Declaration for the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas advocates for greater protection for peasant and people in rural areas. These instruments strongly articulate the aspirations the world holds for agriculture to create the world we wish to see and a planet we wish to live on. Hence, the recognition by states of the ascendency of agrarian reforms to tackle poverty is justifiably well chronicled. The World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development, in 1979 and 1999, ensured governments agreed to implement agrarian reforms, while the FAO urged states to implement food security commitments made during the World Food Summit of 1996. The World Food Programme, UN Centre for Human Settlements, UN Commission on Sustainable Development, UN Committee on World Food Security and Land Policy Working Group have all emphasised issues of agrarian reform to tackle poverty. Meanwhile, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), and the World Food Programme work with governments around the world to support small-scale farmers with access to services, finance, credit, crop diversification, land restoration, knowledge management, and marketing. In these forums, access

to decreasing land resources is prioritised in the face of growing poverty, and agrarian reform is being reassessed as a strategy to combat injustices and inequalities. Poverty alleviation has become a critical requirement in major development strategies of government and multinational institutions like the World Bank and the IFAD. Agrarian reform and resource rights agendas strive to increase tenurial security to rural communities, especially land for food security and poverty alleviation.

4.12.4. Universal Inequalities

The World Bank's *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development*, to support land access for the rural poor, proposes aiding land rental markets and strengthening land sales markets and market-led land reform through the voluntary WSWB mechanism (Borras, 2003). In terms of social aspects, these policies create commodification of rural people's collective rights and make money "the key access to land" (Rosset, 2009, p. 117). The capitalist discourse, at its core, pursues a paradigm of how land is used, owned, and governed, as well as a framework of capitalist hegemony and markets. Examining the role of agriculture in economic development, Kay (2009) perceives two schools of thought: one asserts that agriculture is the key to social development, the other holds that it is only by industrialisation that development can be achieved. He describes the former as agrarianists and the latter as industrialisers. Kay (2009) claims that the most successful development strategy is one in which the state creatively utilises the synergies between both schools of thought, drawing from the complementarities and enhancing their dynamic linkages. In developing countries, economic integration and social development models espoused by the World Bank and the IMF as well as by General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade promote privatisation, liberalisation and deregulation of trade. This results in reduced protection offered to low-income producers and consumers and increased opportunities for (and profits of) private firms and transnational corporations. For farmers, this materialises in two-ways: a) in terms of production, it leads to the removal of subsidies, public support for farm inputs, and financing; and b) in terms of commercialisation, it eliminates financing, purchasing guarantees, price floors, and trade protections. Farmer participation in development is significant to a rights-based approach as it empowers individuals to challenge socio-economic disadvantages and provides them with tools to stand up for their rights and the rights of others. Farmer participation must be active, free, meaningful, and pay attention to issues of accessibility, including access to information in the language of choice. In this context, farmers are key stakeholders in the agriculture system. Their views and opinions are crucial to the design of their own development. Farmers are experts in their own field, ignoring their experiences and perspectives will invariably lead states to intervene in ways that do not work.

Scholars across various agrarian reform and rural livelihoods sustainability fields (Araghi, 2000; Bernstein, 2001; Desmarais, 2002; Edelman, 2008; De Schutter, 2014) concur that land reforms that instigate agriculture practices and sustainability experience multinational obstructions. As a result, inequality continues to grow and the uneven distribution of wealth restricts social mobility. Some scholars argue

that the state, at different epochs of development, engineers socioeconomic land relations and free markets (Kohli, 1996; Herring, 1999; Tsing, 2002). Other scholars analyse the impacts of social movements on the configuration of land distribution and ownership relations (Desmarais, 2007; Edelman, 2008,2009; Edelman et al., 2011). Polanyi (1957) states that "feudal relations and monarchies" as institutional arrangements determine social power relations and economic prosperity. The economic power of those who benefit from ongoing land disparities translates into political power, compromising democracy. The World Bank (1991) appeals that democracy with policies of liberalisation, globalisation, and privatisation are keys to economic and social development. Political democracy advances policy certainty, political stability, the establishment and enforcement of rules that protect property rights, and the reduction of social inequality. Contemporary industrial capitalism has been surpassed by financialised capitalism which is a form of extractive rent-seeking capitalism.

4.13. Liberalism, State and Markets

The phrase liberalism was arguably used as a contrary ideology to social democracy, for example, in both the United States of America and Britain. USA's New Deal and Britain's welfare-states are expressions of a social welfare system that fill the same spectrum as communism (Polanyi, 1957; Evans, 1995; Katznelson, 2001). Liberalism is fixed in a hierarchical power-loaded western supremacy ideology (Robbins et al., 2010: 98) and prospers on subjugation and exploitation through corporate global (out)sourcing strategies (McMichael, 2000: 23; Weiss, 2007). Scholars offer insights to the onset of liberalism as a high-level form of capitalism (Kautsky, 1988). Both capitalism and liberalism keep a socioeconomic and politically disputed ownership over land and agriculture (Herring,1999). McMichael (2009, 2012) professes that liberalism is not driven by an inescapable logic but, rather, it is buttressed by specific actors, institutions and discourses. Liberalism views competition as the essential characteristic of human relations. Liberalism counts on a strong centralised state that marshals to itself coercive powers and control of social spending, like with the implementation of the New Deal in the United States of America (Bates, 1984). Liberalism describes citizens as consumers whose democratic choices are best exercised by buying and selling – a production process that rewards merit and punishes inefficiency. Many of these nuanced ideas regard the role of the state, especially a large state, as an obstacle to reforms. In his enunciation of what he calls the transition, Polanyi (1957) raises the role of state institutions in economic and political changes. He argues that the formation of a market economy is only feasible through the conscious and deliberate involvement of the state as a machine of continuous "control, regulation and intervention". He adds it is wrong to view the liberal political economy and strong state control as opposing projects. Bates (1984) Evans (1995), and Herring (1999) confront ideological and economic concerns when nation-states disproportionately experience lower levels of development, reduced social equality, and higher development stagnation. Economists like John Maynard Keynes show that, after the Great Depression in 1933, there was increased state involvement in economic

development, contrary to conservative economic ideas (Jensen,1991). The major challenge to liberalism thinking is with the state and privatisation intersection. Liberalism, as an ideological domain of power, is not non-racial, non-sexist and apolitical (Moyo, 2010; Moyo & Yeros, 2010).

4.13.1. The Economic and political Narratives

Since the 1980s, the "economic narrative" holds that the free markets will always lead to the best result and that deregulation is necessary since the state only stands in the way of the market (Brenner & Theodore, 2002). In this particular "economic narrative", agriculture reform is merely an instrument for promoting economic growth (Brenner & Theodore, 2002). In a sense, this weakens the democratic system because democracy works through the state and not through the "free" market (Harvey 2005; Liverman & Vilas 2006). Since agriculture is commodified under a capitalist mode of production, it is subject to free-market activities that influence the way it is practised. The commodification of agriculture and global policies present numerous constraints when analysing agriculture practice and its influence on food security, food sovereignty, and the survival of the ecosystems. The "political narrative" is mainly rooted in questions of where power lies, and who is able to shape the future of the economy and thus of society (Myhre, 1998). The issue of agriculture is not only the available supply of agricultural land nor restricted to particular practices, but rather an issue of access, production, distribution, and consumption. Agriculture and agriculture practices are essentially both economic and political in nature (De Janvry & Sadoulet 1993; Snyder 2001; Appendini 2008). As Holmén (2006) observes, carrying out policies to achieve the net redistribution of income and political power requires much more than implementation of technical 'solutions'.

4.14. Conclusion

Various discourses and narratives shape land and agrarian reforms at global and national levels. The expansion of neoliberal capitalism has reconfigured global agriculture relations and structures, markets and the role of the state in developing countries. This section dealt with discourses and debates on agrarian reforms, land reforms, rural development and agriculture, all of which are germane to the research topic. The chapter looked at agriculture paradigms, focussing on commercialisation and sustainability. It looked at global conventions and protocols, how they influence global discourses and debates on land and agriculture. It also focused on the role of the state as catalyst for change and small-scale farmer development. These topics relate to the dispossession of prime land, which is a critical factor in black farmer development.

Chapter 5 Globalisation: Challenges and Opportunities

5.1 Introduction

This chapter considers a significant body of literature which appraises scholarly perspectives on small-scale farmers' practices and state support within the narratives of two frameworks, namely neoliberalism and political economy (Araghi, 1995; Bernstein, 2001, 2016; Rigg, 2006). Specifically, the chapter focuses on narratives of globalisation, considering issues such as neoliberalism, agro-commercialisation, land grabs, PPPs, transnational corporations and donor aid, as well as justice and inequality. These are contested issues of relevance to agro-hegemonies, agro-supply chains, and international division of labour and the lack of any controls on capital moves production to where labour costs are lower. Scholars' critical issues include efficiency, growth, inequality, and land market operations and their impact on small-scale farmers. The chapter looks at the concentration of productive land in a few global hands, its implications for justice and equality, ecosystems, food security, and securing food sovereignty. Literature expounds on the global control of local land in the twenty-first century through large, centralised and industrialised agriculture configuration in the neoliberal era (see e.g. Ko¨ssler, 2003), the concentration of global power (Moore, 2012), and complexities around small, localised practices and state support to farmers (Arrighi, 2007).

The global mechanisms that enable capitalist accumulation represent the inherent contradictions of modern land relations and the struggles of a land structure that has become a platform for the collusion of various agencies and oligarchs and that needs recalibration (e.g. Friedmann & McMichael, 1989; McMichael, 2009). Contemporary political economy narratives foreground conceptions of state support and farmer agency (see Boone, 1994; Van der Ploeg, 1994), and how states rally against small-scale family farms (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009; Escobar, 2010; Woods, 2014). Literature raises queries on how neoliberal development structures and the macro-economic systems influence state and farmer support (Bernstein, 2001) and how a strong developmental state framework is necessary in the form of concerted institutional support to small-scale farmers (De Schutter,2011; Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2016). The Government Gazette (1996) announced the South African government's agricultural marketing plan with a series of measures to integrate south Africa's agriculture into global markets. The plan's intention was to challenge the exclusionary character of markets, to increase market access for all market participants, promote the efficiency of the marketing of agricultural products, and the optimization of export earnings from agricultural products (see section 6.2.1).

5.2. Neoliberalism: Global Land and Agrarian Capture

Neoliberalism, notwithstanding wide-ranging definitions, is conventionally framed in terms of advances in capitalist modes of production; principally it lessens the role of the state in development and furthers free market mechanisms. (e.g. Castree, 2008; Ferguson, 2010). Neoliberalism emphasises market-based,

WSWB agrarian reforms. Guthman (2007, 2008) explains neoliberalism as the process by which state services are "hollowed out" and the regulation of human and environmental relations are shifted to markets, free trade agreements, and the "third sector" (volunteers, private foundations, and PPPs). McMichael (2012) notes that neoliberal economists focus on free markets and technology development without linking the socio-economic-political structures. The market-oriented structure of neoliberalism supports major agri-food monopolies, such as Cargill, Monsanto, ADM, Tyson Foods, Carrefour, Tesco, and Wal-Mart, agricultural policies of the Group of Eight, such as the United States Farm Bill and the European Union's (EU's) Common Agricultural Policy, and big philanthropy capital, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Holt Giménez & Shattuck, 2011, p. 119). The spur of neoliberal expansion is structural adjustment programmes and their conditions that are used for reducing tariffs, marginalising boards of national markets by removing "price guarantees" and "national agricultural research and extension systems in the Global South" (Holt Giménez & Shattuck, 2011, p. 111). This narrative is based on market-based economic growth with minimal reference to socio-economic processes, which widens the economic inequality gap (Bernstein, 2010; Van der Ploeg, 2000, 2010). Under hegemonic neoliberalism (Joshi, 1975; Altieri, 1995; Araghi, 2003, 2009; Akram-Lodhi, 2008; Bernstein, 2010; Moyo, 2010; Van der Ploeg *et al.,* 2015; Borras et al., 2018) is wide-ranging, if not multiple, types of land relations shape production patterns and relations through processes that connect in variable degrees with land markets. The challenge is to structure links between land relations and productive forces. When neoliberalism is acknowledged in agrarian reform policies, agriculture practices and research, it most figures as a fixed identity (uniformity of all situations, the developed/developing contrasts of economies) that ignores the institutional practices, cultural contexts and sentimental relations that shape the diversity of societies. The harmful impacts of neoliberal restructuring on developing nations with large numbers of small-scale farmers are widely acknowledged (e.g. Liverman & Villas, 2006). Furthermore, not only does modern neoliberal capitalism function on the basis of rigged markets, not free markets, but it is an intrinsic trait of capitalism.

Under neoliberal capitalism, every social sector competing in any capitalist market aspires to monopoly (FAO, 2012). Neoliberal economists acknowledge that growth in itself is not enough of a measure of development, accepting that at particular stages of development, growth may widen inequalities. Amid this conundrum, development scholars are examining approaches to social equality without sacrificing economic growth, an approach pursued by neo-Marxists, especially of the political economy hue. Neo-Marxists, of the political economy schools, assert that the actuality of neoliberalism should acknowledge complexities that move beyond binary explanations to socio-economic development (Weis, 2007). While political economy scholars acknowledge private capital investments in agrarian and land reform, such investments should progress egalitarianism, universal standards for environmentally and ecologically sustainable systems (McMichael, 2009, 2012). At issue in the discourses is how experiences of neoliberal

capitalism are presented and felt as “local”, rather than as “global”, and deeply entwined with historical, sociocultural, economic and political conditions (Holt Giménez & Shattuck, 2011). Friedmann (1978) distances himself from neoliberalism and draws from the work of Karl Kautsky to describe agriculture as a transient assemblage, explaining the agrarian crisis of metropolitan agriculture in the late nineteenth century as a logical result of the competitive impact of European farmers.

Oya (2009) indicates that the World Bank’s renewed concern with public investment in agriculture does not make the inevitable link between agriculture and industry; the report does not emphasise the significance of the urban-industrial contribution to agricultural development. With the emphasis on the private sector being the universal remedy for development challenges, as asserted by the neoliberal advocates since the 1980s, corporates’ engagement, specifically, has intensified the struggle over land and seed systems, capturing the agrarian value chain. Lang and Heasman (2004) assert that current food production is ever more globalised and industrialised, and products are subject to standardisation. The food production and distribution sectors saw the upsurge of corporations that control substantial sizes of retail sales, and the rise of internationally operated retail groups (Lang & Heasman, 2004).

McMichael (2009) argues that supermarkets in agricultural retail and marketing chains put challenging standards for the nature and quality of agricultural output as producers are compelled to meet the costs of attaining the standards. Smaller producers who cannot afford to meet the standards are excluded from participating in these markets. Food retailing is typified by extreme levels of concentration with fewer and larger retail chains sharing the market and competing on the basis of price. While the significance of the food’s foot print in the value chain for sustainability policies is now extensively accepted, efforts are deficient concerning an integrated policy of sustainable development that meet many in the food sector (Reisch, 2006). Food consumption is progressively equipped with symbolic meaning capabilities, and “social food” produced locally has become important in opposing the threats of an individualised society (Lang & Heasman 2004).

5.3. Global Configuration of Change

Over various historical periods, scholars have pronounced different theories on social transformation and configuration of agricultural change (Tuma; 1965; Long & Van der Ploeg, 1994; Van der Ploeg, 2008; Willy, 2018). Literature on agrarian theories underlines ongoing contestations within and between the dominant ideologies and discourses, which make for an ideologically contentious environment for agrarian change. Political economy analysis, mainly in agrarian studies, ponders, probes, and critiques the global neoliberal agenda of land, agriculture practices, and sustainability from multiple theoretical perspectives. Tweed (2006, 20) suggests that theories, in the first sense of the word, are ‘’travels’’, the means to find a way out of no way, which is the problematisation of major ideologies in which knowledge is constructed. From communal to feudal systems, as societies evolve and become widely dispersed and

differentiated, they tend to organise their social institutions and production systems accordingly (McMichael, 2009). Conflicting social classes led to capitalist relations, as well as shaping a worldwide capitalist relation under neoliberal imperialism (Byers, 2005), controlled by the financial sector and marshalled by private investment in agriculture infrastructure and industries. Long and Van der Ploeg (1994) proffer, at a practical level, a "caricatured" paradigm of PPPs. The axis of power in the contemporary Global North and Global South socio-economic and political categorisation is the general subordination of the Global South over the dominance of the Global North. Structural relationships between Global North and South are defined by economic power but also by other social relational structures such as class, gender, and race (Rosset *et al.,* 2006). There are also hierarchies among the Global North countries where the hegemonic economic power is understood as being positioned above subordinated national economies. The hegemonic super-economies personify the venerated global superpower which requires all other economies to orbit themselves around it (McMichael, 2009). This is for instance the situation with developing economies, which Van der Ploeg (2007) argues are the repositories of whatever is actually transmitted from dominant economies. Hence, the developing economies cannot be understood outside of their existential frame or the social materiality to which they might respond.

5.4. Capitalist Expansion

Kautsky (1988) and McMichael (2012) summarise capitalism as an economic and political system in which agrarian trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit, rather than by states. Before the advent of expansionist capitalism, people exchanged goods directly in barter economies (Robbins *et al*., 2010). The capitalist system, both as an economic tool and social order, is an inescapable expansion and elaboration from the traditional school of classical sociology that is anchored in notions of feudalism and aristocratic agrarian relations (Wallerstein, 1974; Tuma, 1965). Capitalist fundamentalists cite two basic interwoven principles that best define the system: first, privatisation which is the right of the individual to own and dispense property without incumbrance; and second, unregulated and unfettered free markets. Often, capitalism is posed as an antidote to feudal and aristocratic land relations, an embodiment of twenty-first-century liberal democracy (Polanyi,1944), and a progressive system based on the fundamental principles of private property and free markets. Traditional social institutions that are inconsistent with the capitalist paradigm become outdated, with markets taking priority over social needs. Polanyi (1944) illustrates the start of modern capitalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries with the advent of the phenomenon of ''commodification'', maintaining that competition and market delivering benefits cannot be achieved without planning. Industrial capitalism is traced to the early nineteenth century (Araghi, 2003) as a system of private resources ownership, production, and distribution. McMichael (2012) asserts capitalism has been expanded by neoliberal protectionist trading blocs like the EU and the Common Market of the South, known as Mercosur, in Latin America. In general,

capitalist agriculture development models often lead to four related outcomes: (1) agriculture becomes technology- and capital-driven, generating an abiding anti-small-scale farmer bias; (2) agriculture heads to standardised monoculture; (3) agriculture artificially depresses the rural economy; and (4) agriculture becomes detrimental to both population and planetary health (Mann & Dickson, 1978). An ongoing conceptual problem is to view agriculture and industry as both equivalent and binary where the former is supposed to lead to the latter while at the same time sharing its internal logic.

5.5. Capitalist Free-Markets' Expansion

Capitalism as an ideology and as an economic production system (Moore, 2012) builds social conditions of privatisation, deregulation, outsourcing that deepens inequality in the distribution of income and wealth (Arrighi, 2007). Capitalist markets have normalised industrial-like methods in agriculture commerce in many ways that commodify, even mystify, production and distribution. Polanyi (1957) argues, "the idea of a self-adjusting market implied a stark Utopia. Such an institution could not exist for any length of time without annihilating the human and natural substance of society ... Inevitably, society took measures to protect itself, but whatever means it took impaired the self-regulation of the market, disorganised industrial life, and thus endangered society in yet another way". Glassman (2006) argues that once commodities are incorporated into markets more generally, they are capitalised, meaning controlled by capital groups (e.g. speculators, trading companies and supermarket chains). As Polanyi (1957, 2001) reasons, a self-regulating market can only prosper within a ''market society'' that allows the system to function according to its own laws. Polanyi (1957) asserts that the founding of a market economy was only practically feasible through the conscious and deliberate participation of the state as a machine of continuous "control, regulation and intervention".

5.6. Epoch of Land and Agriculture Liberalisation

Global liberalisation policies and outsourcing of agricultural supply oppress small-scale farmers in the Global South. Agricultural infrastructure, land, labour, and subsidies become progressively disconnected from national needs in favour of the demands of urban consumers, and transnational food companies (Sanderson, 1986). There is a need for change and there is increased recognition that nation states can improve current agriculture practices by acknowledging small-scale farmer perspectives (Long & Van der Ploeg, 1994). The current agrarian crisis shows not only the flaw of domestic agricultural or food policies but also the imbalance of global power dynamics and limitation of current accumulation schemes. For example, in 1961, the Law of Orientation of Agriculture, an agricultural policy founded by the United States, and "global restructuring of agriculture" (McMichael 2013: 86), it streamlined developing countries' agriculture systems to become adjuncts for United States exports. The costs of the transition from being a largely self-directed farmer to being a farmer that is solely a small cog of the agri-food commodity chains have led to the proletarianisation of small-scale farmers. In reality, farmers have become alienated from the product of their labour and have lost ownership of their means of production

(Altieri, 1987). As a result, the liberalisation of developing countries' food markets created new international divisions and relations of labour systems (Van der Ploeg, 2000, 2010).

5.7. Land Grabs: The "New" Status Quo

Harvey (2003) explains that following the end of World War I and World War II, western states engaged in some form of "colonial wave" of foreign land grabbing for agriculture and food production. The aftermath of the wars saw the creation of the IMF, the Marshall Plan, and the UN. Shivji (2003) argues that the Cold War and the Great Depression collapsed colonial empires, and the post-colonial era of recolonisation targeted development by economic industrialisation**.** Globalisation financed the growth of transnational agriculture, supermarket chains as main actors in the global agri-food production and distribution (Dolan & Humphrey, 2001; Gibbon, 2003; Hatanaka *et al.*, 2005; Konefal *et al*., 2005). In the former colonies, local politicians and foreign donors directed land reforms as a move towards modernisation and for political consolidation and democratisation. Developed countries depended on offshore food supply (Moore, 2012) through the global ordering of international food production, circulation, and consumption systems (McMichael, 2009; Borras & Franco, 2012). Wallerstein (1974) examines the governance mechanisms to justify and enable a new phase of land investments, a world regime around a single division of labour within which regions and states form, compete, and stratify. Research focuses attention on power balances in agriculture, supply chains and the role of land grabs in food regimes. Friedmann and McMichael (1989) explain food regimes in the context of British, United States and corporate hegemony through favourable rules and protocols. Also, the land grabs open a chapter in the redistribution of power across an increasingly multi-centric global food system, with rising agro-export powers in middle-income countries (Borras *et al. ,*2011; McMichael, 2012).

The non-governmental organisation, GRAIN, documents over 400 land grabs worldwide, a substantial size of which are initiated either by states or state companies, constituting the new ''security mercantilism'' (termed ''developmental outsourcing'') (Hofman & Ho, 2012). Through ''security mercantilism'', multilateral trading arrangements are overridden by direct foreign land acquisition to secure food, feed and fuel supplies for designated foreign consumers. Land, wealth, and power are inextricably connected (McMichael, 2009, 2013; Borras & Franco, 2012)**.** Land grabs have become a conceptual framework to understand post-colonial land occupation by foreign states and agencies (McMichael, 2013). Also, land grabs are increasingly acknowledged in food regime discourse (Zoomers, 2010; Deininger, 2011; Deininger & Byerlee, 2011, 2012; Edelman *et al*., 2013). On comparable analysis, the global spread of land grabbing is broadly recognised (Borras et al., 2011, 2012; De Schutter, 2011; Fairhead et al., 2012; Borras & Franco, 2013; Van der Ploeg *et al.,* 2015).

Land grabs demonstrate historical and contemporary global inequalities, which redefine social relations of labour, capital and ownership within societies (Friedmann & McMichael, 1989). The land grab

infrastructure follows several decades of the dismantling of public capacity in the Global South (particularly in sub-Saharan Africa), making states more vulnerable to the reformulation of policies to accommodate private and foreign interests (McMichael, 2013). Friedmann and McMichael (1989) present a general understanding of the transnational corporations' global land grabs for agriculture purposes, analysing contemporary examples of how western states have implemented various forms of land grabs. Often supported by the domestic state and local agencies, "accumulation by dispossession" (Harvey 2003) supports large and middle-scale settler farmers but oppresses the small-scale farmers. The United States and EU investments through "small but powerful global governing classes" hold magnificent tracts of land in countries of the world (Anseeuw *et al*., 2012). To feed its growing population, the western world relies on offshore resource supplies (McMichael, 2013).

The International Food Policy Research Institute has formulated a code of conduct framework for foreign land acquisition (Von Braun & Meinzen-Dick, 2009). IFRI does empirical research on the role of land grabs in re-territorialisation to secure offshore land for the objective of repatriating agricultural produce to foreign and investing countries (McMichael, 2013). Re-territorialisation leads to huge state investments in industrial agrofuels and high-energy chemical agriculture, concentration and centralisation of agribusiness and retailing capitals, as well as the declining stability of small and medium farming (Zoomers, 2010; McMichael, 2013).

An additional trend is the research of global land governance or character traits (see e.g. Anseeuw *et al.,* 2011, pp. 48–49; Colchester *et al*., 2007; Fairbairn, 2011). Yet another analysis of land grab policy is viewed through a food-regime lens, which illustrates ways agriculture procedures and practices affect nations differently (Patnaik, 2008; Rosset, 2008; Kaufman, 2010; McMichael, 2012). Araghi (2009), Borras *et al.* (2011) and McMichael (2012, 2013) assert that land grabs are no longer a crisis of metropolitan farming alone, but a general agrarian crisis insofar as no social form of agriculture is deemed particularly stable. Large-scale land acquisitions and their implications for development (Zoomers, 2010; Deininger, 2011; Deininger & Byerlee, 2011, 2012; Edelman et al., 2013), referred to as ''land grabbing'', occur on a global scale (Borras et al., 2011, 2012; Borras & Franco, 2013; Van der Ploeg et al., 2015). Land grabbing is associated with the corporatisation of agriculture and the ongoing process of agro-industrialisation. Araghi (2009) criticises several characteristics of the modern agriculture production system – how small-scale farming is equated with subordination and power is equivalent to large-scale farming. McMichael (2013) points to concrete observations on the many practical agriculture applications that morphed over time driving a cheap food regime, declining sustainability and rising costs that have stimulated offshoring to exploit cheap inputs. Borras *et al.* (2011) and McMichael (2012, 2013) employ a political economy analysis to more broadly analyse land grabs and to provide a compelling context to help illustrate the role of transnationals and states. Borras *et al*. (2011, p. 44) use political economy in very concrete ways to show the impact of land grabs on land and agriculture, disputing the idea that land grabs are non-political

and that they simply provide an opportunity for development. McMichael (2012, 2013) shows how land grabs contribute to the disruption of the socio-political world order while Castree (2006) elaborates on how neoliberal perspectives consider agriculture hegemony a credit and asserts that histories and cultures of developing economies have to be recognised and valued.

5.8. Transnational Corporations: Alienation of Land and Produce

The inquiry into the transnational land investment web and land grabs, together with the contestation of global governance, is chronicled by, among others, FIAN International (2010), Cotula (2012), Edelman (2013), Fairbairn (2014) and GRAIN (2016). Historic and contemporary verification indicate that developed countries together with transnational corporates use economic incentives to change developing economies' land and agriculture systems (Araghi, 2003; Akram-Lodhi, 2008; McMichael, 2013; Van der Ploeg, 2010). In its fiscal policy advice, the IMF supports transnational corporate agreements set within a "global land hierarchy" between and within nation-states and corporates. Borras and Franco (2013, p. 20) state that transnational corporates with the patronage of the EU spread corporatisation and intensification of industrialised farms, which have altered farm structures and practices. To this end, capitalist supremacy is entrenched in the current neoliberal agriculture milieu, shaped by corporate interests to maintain western dominance over disadvantaged society (Africa Agriculture and Trade Investment Fund 2015; Borras & Franco, 2012)**.** The private sector is where the basic model of the private, commercial, and market culture is influential (Africa Agriculture and Trade Investment Fund, 2015). The transnational reconfiguring is achieved through trade agreements and comprehensive agriculture networks, with the specific goals of installing and maintaining power structures beneficial to corporates. Transnational corporates, through structural rearrangement and reorganisation, influence free trade agreements through loans imposed on states (Bretton Woods Project, 2014). Barry *et al.* (1996) maintain that, notwithstanding change targets, corporates foster private sector intervention in the production and distribution of agricultural produce. Corporates' role in the "global restructuring of agriculture" (McMichael, 2013:86) causes domestic agricultural decline, and abandonment of vast tracts of farmland as the state and transnational corporations actively acquire agricultural farmland in the Global South. Naylor *et al*. (2008) assert that the abandonment and rezoning of domestic farmland have built large-scale industrial farming, advancing what is called ''farming without farmers'' (Schlesinger, 2013). Transnational corporates oversee global agricultural land and control the supply chain (Wolford *et al.,* 2013). The solutions to land grabs in the context described above are ''conjectural'' as nation-states facilitated the land deals, which raises questions about domestic democratic governance (Harvey, 2005). The lessons outlined in the literature listed above are ''theoretical'' as the nation-states are both the initiators and complicit in the global reconfiguration (O'Connor, 1973). The strives to rectify the situations outlined above are ''continuous'', as the nation-states struggle for political legitimacy and stability (Levien, 2013). Peemans (2013) argues that, as a result, nation-states degenerate into foreign

dependency or recede into outposts with the incorporation of national spaces designed to the requirement of global markets.

5.9. Public-Private Partnerships: Outsourcing Development

Hartwich *et al*. (2008) assert that a PPP is commonly recognised as an agreement between a public sector institutional authority and a privately-owned entity, and is financed and conducted by a mutual arrangement structure. Traditionally, the public sector entity is a monolithic organisation with overall management, finance control, and budgetary control all held by the state (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2017). The International Food Policy Research Institute explains PPPs as "collaborative methods through which public organisations and private entities share resources, knowledge, and risks in order to achieve more efficiency in the production and delivery of products and services" (Hartwich *et al*., 2008, p. vii). The Africa Agriculture and Trade Investment Fund (2015) conceptualises collaboration for PPPs in the context of rural development within a culturally specific framework so as to originate meaningful and enduring transformative relationships. With land deals, PPPs involve development cooperation agencies and public investment funds (Hartwich *et al.,* 2008). In their research, FIAN International (2010) explains the significance of understanding the character and nature of PPPs, as well as the existential threat posed by such joint ventures, noting that PPPs exercise disproportionate influence over all of the agriculture value chain, solely for-profit purposes. Private companies are not incentivised to provide national service because they do not make a profit from upgrading infrastructure and providing services. In actuality, PPPs distort the borders between public and private actors and mix up their respective roles and responsibilities. PPPs in developing economies gained ground in the 1990s, following similar examples in developed economies that started global PPPs. As such, global PPPs are models where relations of power and technical uses are applied in traditional and non-traditional approaches (OECD, 2012). Global partnership models are defined through particular sets of agreed relations, for instance, development priorities are either economic or social. The opportunities that are created are not necessarily consumer-led markets but are predominantly provider-led in that multinational corporates or agents make choices on behalf of the public. In framing PPPs, based on farmers' agencies, Long and Van der Ploeg raise the *potentials* of state and farmers collaboration (Long & Van der Ploeg, 1994). Harvey (2015) identifies the imperial challenge of assuming models from the private sector that are not necessarily fit for purpose in the public sector. Daniel (2012) analyses circumstances in which contracts are replaced by hierarchical control measures and identifies situations in which uncertainty is high, outcomes are uncertain, and direct state control is required. Also, where transactions vary, the costs involved in collaborating may be so great as to render partnerships unrealistic.

5.10. Donor Aid and Development Cooperation

The World Bank, together with the FAO, IFAD and the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), developed the Principles for Responsible Investment in Agricultural and Food Systems, known as the RAI Principles (FAO *et al*., 2010). These investment principles are built on the 2009 Code of Conduct, created by the International Food Policy Research Institute (see Von Braun & Meinzen-Dick, 2009), to bring together multiple stakeholders to institute an international code of conduct for transnational land transactions as a critical move for crafting broader win-win development outcomes (Borras & Franco, 2010). The EU developed the EU Land Policy Guidelines to support land policy designs and land policy reforms in developing countries (EU, 2004). The guidelines form the origin for a shared position framework, impacting improved co-ordination among EU donors and with bilateral and multilateral donors. The guidelines entail a policy framework with matching operational guidelines to assess national policies and an appropriate EU response strategy. Key principles for a successful policy design and donor engagement are exposed. The EU focus is mainly on land reforms because "[l]and policy reform can make substantial contributions to poverty reduction, in removing obstacles on access to land for the poor, in giving them legal rights and access to credit through collateral, giving people access to assets and economic opportunities linked to agriculture or natural resources, forbidding land grabbing, encroachment and other processes of exclusion" (EU, 2004: 20). The African Union, African Development Bank and the UN Economic Commission for Africa jointly formulated a Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy to fortify land rights, improve productivity and secure livelihoods (AUC *et al.,* 2010).

Foreign development aid has a long, complex and controversial history (see Dreher *et al.,* 2008; Easterly, 2013). Donor aid is tied to economic or political motivation (Nkrumah, 1963). Alesina and Dollar (2000) argue that donor aid is given for political and strategic reasons. While Doucouliagos and Paldam (2007) claim that development aid has not been effective, Easterly (2013) opines that technocratic approaches to aid have overlooked the real causes of poverty, described as the unrestrained power of the state over poor people who are denied basic human rights. Technical experts confer powers and legitimacy onto local governments to implement proposed technical solutions (Easterly, 2013). Development aid, as presently undertaken, is an agreement framework that developed countries and transnational corporates utilise to reformulate and influence the direction of change in recipient developing or low-income countries (Rosset 2006; Weis 2007). Development aid, closely related to transnational agreements, initially emerged as a way to address issues of economic justice, equality, and democracy, as well as women and youth development issues. Development aid is granted by OECD-member governments and targets the welfare of developing countries with the lowest global per capita incomes. The Group of Eight nations collaborated in 2010 to set up the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition that informs their collective activities with regard to agricultural development and food security in sub-Saharan Africa states and beyond.

Aid and cooperative resourcing narratives emerge with troubling consistency across agriculture policy and programmes meant for agriculture reconfiguration (McMichael 2000; Weiss 2007). Sen (1999) argues that aid narratives streamline and obfuscate the complexities of developing nations' practices. With the ideology that the free market is the remedy and that competition and profit are the answer, neoliberal expansion as a creative destruction has penetrated countries, usually without the participation of small-scale farmers (Harvey, 2007). As Lui (2014) indicates, the impacts of foreign agricultural investment on host countries usually overwhelm the limited benefits to the local community. However, investments carry more positive and sustainable impacts on local economies and social development when local farmers participate as equal business partners, allowing them an active role and leaving them in control of their land (Lui, 2014).

Development cooperation, signifying a widespread range of coordinated efforts, is often used synonymously with development aid and in discourses associated with the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (Global Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation is a multi-stakeholder partnership that maximise the value of co-operation for development for the shared benefit of people, planet, prosperity and peace). In this way, development cooperation covers activities precisely related to aid, such as domestic and global policy changes. Delgado (2004) argues where neoliberal policies cannot be imposed domestically, they are enforced imperially in aid treaties in which transnational corporations can press for control. Scholars scrutinise development aid and cooperation to see how the two interventions reproduce marginalisation and inequality, despite the rhetoric of equality of opportunity (Rodney, 1973). As King (2005) puts it, the poor state of agriculture in the developing economies calls into question the values of development aid to developing economies. Class, gender and race are complex issues to consider in agriculture aid, especially the persistent systemic and structural inequalities that economic systems seem to perpetuate, sometimes implicitly (Mkandawire, 2001; Shivji, 2003; Moyo & Yeros, 2007). Moyo (2010) and McMichael (2010) warn that aid insertions are not enough to address the pervasiveness of inequality. Moyo (2010) asserts that aid agreements need to explicitly instil content-specific terms that bring significance to national development. In addition, it is essential to infuse social movements with ideological tools to engage in dialogues on aid and cooperation.

5.11. Conclusion

Globalisation in the context of neoliberalism and free markets shapes land and agriculture relations which are influenced by international agents, and economic liberalisation has spurred massive foreign direct investment and interventions in the Global South and accelerated the process of assimilation of national agriculture regimes into a hierarchical global value chain system. The chapter shows that global transnational corporations, foreign donors, aid agencies, and PPPs have a strong influence over the farmer development discourse and the land use and agriculture practices that are promoted.

Chapter 6: Findings: Examining the Outcomes of The CRDP Approach

6.1. Introduction

Alignment and collaboration between the Global North and the Global South, and between nations of the Global South are key issues for consideration even as dialogues on farming practices are dominated by concerns over increasing productivity and ecological sustainability. No longer can small-scale peasant farmers in developing economies and industrialised farmers afford to operate in silos in view of global insecurities and inequalities. Small-scale farmers and industrial farmers persist to function within unequal governance and financing structures. Hence, institutions and mechanisms are necessary to ensure justice and equality. Findings suggest that farming practices and sustainability during different periods varied according to how state institutions defined challenges and solutions. Define the type of and extent to which state and private resources were employed, and how local actors constructed and institutionalised agricultural support. The NDP in its official statement on Agriparks states that "in centralized global and local markets there is a need for providing innovative market linkages for small-scale farmers and create preferential procurement mechanisms to ensure that new agricultural entrants can access these markets" (see, 7.6.3; and 7.7). Government defines an Agripark as "an innovative system of agro-production, processing, logistics, marketing and training and extension services located in a district municipality. As a network, an Agripark supports a market-driven integration of agricultural activities and rural transformation services" (see, 6.2 and 7.2.1). The large number of black small-scale farmers in rural areas that are spread across large expanses, with little or no access to facilities and road infrastructure, provides a huge challenge for growth (see,7.4.3).

This chapter provides a global view, under neoliberalism, of the operationalisation of the globalisation of agrarian structures and relations, from Chapter 6.3 it provides case study findings. There is a rise of global agendas on sustainable development goals which come from institutions and forums with a universal voice and challenge existing power structures around the world. These global agendas and commitments speak to power as a group that is conscious of their basic human rights. The chapter focuses on agri-clusters and the integration of value chains. It looks at how global agencies like IFAD, the World Trade Organisation and OECD, as well as PPPs advance the globalisation of agriculture practices. It focuses on South Africa's CRDP and elaborates on the Agriparks' framework, operational structures, and implementation in the case study sites. It provides thematic findings based on the information gathered using the various tool explained in Chapter three.

6.1.1 Global Overview of Challenges

Globally, amid grotesque and widening income gaps, wealth inequality, decades of development stagnation, the existential threat of the climate crisis, a monopolistic system, and a crisis in food security

and food sovereignty, dialogues urge global institutions and government to act in the common interest of the ecosystem, not just on the greed of wealthy oligarchs (McMichael,2012,2013,). Literature demonstrates that in a free enterprise capitalist economy, wealth will certainly accumulate upwards and towards those with the resources to capture it (Araghi, 2009; Bernstein,2010). Globalisation has accelerated this process. Developing nations will fail when riches accumulate to the wealthy land grabbing oligarchy through the mechanism of globalisation and offshoring of agriculture industries as well as through the use of economic power to control global value chains (Borras et al., 2011, 2012). Privatised farmlands, agri-industry and agriculture clusters are today owned by multinational investors with tentacles around the world who treat basic needs as tiny income streams to siphon off profits. Among the many questions this raises, one of the most fundamental is: how do small-scale farmers win against such corporations and public sector behemoths? All is blamed on national endogenous forces and technocratic responses rather than on deliberate political choices and values (Mamdani,1996; Moyo,2010). But various scholars have focused on how the modern agriculture corporation is globalised, outsourced and often dependent on nation states. A growing coalition of social movements and activists are demanding the introduction of wealth measures across the world to help close the "staggering" gap between the richest and poorest in society (La Via Campesina 2003, 2010). Africa is a continent with deep-seated historical development problems (Shivji,2003). The capitalist system, with its monopolistic character, has no intention or will to appreciate or comprehensively address these problems even though the global status quo is unsustainable (de Janvry,1981; Harvey,2005). Scholars assert that, like any system, capitalism can be altered to suit the interests of its benefactors if and when they need to do so (de Janvry,1981; De Janvry and Sadoulet 1993). Scholars argue this is not beyond the realm of possibility in developed economies if they can deal with the vested interests that have largely captured land and production processes (Harvey, 2007,2005).

6.2. Conceptions and experiences of services in Agriparks

The analysis of primary and secondary data presents both dissimilar and similar intersecting occurrences of emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them, as well as conceptions of services in the Agriparks. The data indicates the different ways Agriparks' participants perceive and experience support services. In interpretivist research approaches, the significance of the conception of support services, how support is actually experienced by respondents, is shown in the different themes. Significant and valuable data was collected from informants in diverse content areas. This chapter submits the gathered data, mainly organised in direct quotes to capture the essence, and mapped in thematic categories to summarise and consolidate common areas of convergence. The different categories describe support services, such as facilities, infrastructure, skills training and inputs, while the themes provide much wider reflections and viewpoints from respondents and reflect the width and depth of meanings and understanding that are crucial in respondents' own illustrations of their development. The reasons for

increased government intervention in agriculture and rural development programmes rest in the affirmed connection between agriculture and the economy (see, Bernstein, 2013; Cousins, 2013b). Farmers argue that government subsidies will help farm start-ups and farming diversification which is critical for small-scale farmers. In recent years, scholars have warned about the massive role played by industrial farming in land grabs and commercialisation of agriculture, as well as how agri-clusters have hurt small-scale farms while enriching agribusinesses and corporates (see, Harvey 2003; Borras & Franco, 2010). These points are further elaborated in chapter 7.6.3 which talks of the configuration of agriculture. These findings mirror those from studies conducted on agri-clusters based in other countries, especially in Africa, as well as from studies on the variety of services across the spectrum of emerging farmer development, and the value of agriculture-based economic growth.

South Africa's Agriparks have followed the same neoliberalist trajectory, as explained in the introduction section. The Agriparks concept has its flaws. In Agriparks, though, hierarchies are formalised and fixed, which can explain the apparently amiable relationship between farmers and officials turning confrontational from time to time, especially in Westonaria were there are various types of land and tunnel sizes among the farmers. These asymmetries in power relations between farmers and officials lead certain officials to act more dominantly and being manipulative. Officials' behaviours indicate that this clear linear hierarchical structure legitimises such behaviour and officials do not believe that they will face any repercussions for their decisions. The only way forward for the process is for the state to increase its spending on infrastructure, which includes everything from land to extension services support. Spiralling income inequality is a major issue in Agriparks and all the evidence suggests this is deeply harmful to collective morale and trust. Vastly disproportionate profits for a very small number of citizens will not make for a cohesive and just national community. However, this study's findings go beyond those findings generally referenced in literature, showing significant, valuable, and collective sharing among Agripark beneficiaries.

6.2.1. Globalisation: A New Globalised Agrarian Order

Fundamental changes to global agrarian relations that have taken place over the past half century necessitate far reaching deregulation, influencing production patterns and practices or production relations. Across the globe, massive changes in land control through privatisation and marketisation and land grabs as well as commercialisation are driving unprecedented land dispossession. The globalisation of agrarian relations is not a novel phenomenon. Early expansion in search of natural resources, markets and labour pioneered the world-wide extension of the agriculture and industrial revolutions. This phenomenon is mainly inspired by western governments, private foundations and international agencies such as the World Bank and the IMF. Global agrarian relations have raised issues of efficiency, growth, inequality, and land market operations that link in diverse ways to other factors within the land market. The World Bank's Enabling the Business of Agriculture Report, (2017), sets out to governments the

measures they should adopt to “enhance the productivity of land use” and supports agribusiness expansion. As a network, an Agripark supports a market-driven integration of agricultural activities and rural transformation services. Amid controversy over the neoliberal character of the marketing of agricultural products plan, there are calls for the state to be more visible in transforming the markets to promote the efficiency and equity of the marketing of agricultural products (see, section 5.1).

Capitalist expansion through the ownership of the means of production, land, labour and capital, intensified the globalisation of production relations, the social structures that set the relation between humans in the production of goods. This construction enabled owners of capital and workers to more easily connect and transact across global geographies. The World Bank is instrumental in the drive to privatise and commodify land and to establish the main policy directives that involve formalising private property rights, relaxing the sale and lease of land for commercial purposes and regulating the sale of public land by auction. The World Bank states “undocumented [land] rights pose challenges and risks to investors” (UNCTAD and World Bank, 2018). Hence, the African continent is “held back by land ownership confusion” (World Bank, 2013). The construction of a land market in Africa, and developing countries in other parts of the world, aims to expand large-scale, industrial agriculture dominated by agribusiness. Despite the swath of research illustrating the positive values of small-scale farmers’ aid agencies, international financial institutions fail to acknowledge the evidence and continue to propagate and support the privatisation of land and the establishment of land markets. Scholars argue that instead of opening a land market and risking concentration of land ownership so as to stimulate economic growth, emerging economies should adopt agrarian policy choices that protect the benefits of small-scale farmers and agriculture workers.

There has been a strong and widespread global trend toward neoliberalism in agriculture, it has increased global inequality which in turn harms the sustainability of growth (Harvey,2003). Advocates of the neoliberal reforms still need to pay attention to the distributional outcome (see, 7.2 on globalization and accumulation from above). Social movements, La via Campesina, argue that advancing PPPs instigates land grabs by creditors, the allocation of prime land to multinational corporations, and the loss of livelihoods for local farmers. Instead of limiting local governance and opposing individual rights, governments must create models that bring together a broad diversity of ownership and tenure systems, and a pathway that meets the interest of the rural people instead of favouring corporate profits. Government support systems, working together with social movements, should provide farmers with direct financial and technical support to shore up agricultural production and incomes. Furthermore, governments should expedite economic growth founded on the sustainable use of prime farmland by small-scale farmers. La via Campesina argue that the IMF is progressing an industrial agriculture model that is environmentally untenable and disastrous for the ecological system.

6.2.2. The State and Public-Private Partnerships

State interest in global agriculture competitiveness is increasingly driving large-scale agriculture reform agendas aimed at addressing the challenges of global food security, food sovereignty and environmental sustainability. State reform agendas typically incorporate notions of competition and consumer choice. Moreover, they support policies and programmes that would simultaneously reduce the role of the state but support the expansion of the role of western agencies and oligarchs. Literature presents three roles of the state: (i) the developmental state where markets are socially embedded, underlining the endogenous role of the state in economic transformations (Polanyi, 1944); (ii) legal institutionalism unravels how the collective processes through which legal measures frame, influence, and sustain the organisation of the economy and the state; and (iii) the entrepreneurial state highlights the risk-taking role of public actors as drivers of the scale and direction of innovation. Schumpeter (1934) asserts that new markets shaped through innovation are influenced by inventiveness or entrepreneurship and investor capital. In Schumpeter's view, chiefly in the initial capital-intensive stages of development, the state is a principal financier in market economies; on the one hand as a capitalist (risk-taker) and, on the other hand, as an entrepreneur (opportunity-driven). Mazzucato (2016) argues that the role of the state is better appreciated as co-creator in shaping markets, and not only in fixing them. Other scholars are concerned that the state selectively or incorrectly uses agri-clusters for development.

While the nineteenth-century liberals wanted a minimal state, the neoliberals of the twentieth century wanted to empower the state to establish and uphold free markets and competition (see Amanor,2009; McMichael, 2010). The UN General Assembly, 2015, approved the SDGs outlined in *Transforming our World: 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, the two key aims of which are to eradicate poverty and hunger in all its different manifestations. The SDGs demand increased and improved investment in agriculture by domestic and international players, as well as foreign direct investment. The FAO, by analysing chances and challenges for agriculture investment, by assembling empirical evidence on good practices and by supporting the application of guidance, contributes to the Committee on World Food Security's RAI Principles. These principles (i) tackle the central elements of what makes investment in agriculture and food systems responsible; (ii) identify key stakeholders and their particular roles and obligations with regard to accountable investment in agriculture and food systems; (iii) serve as a guiding framework for the actions of all stakeholders engaged in agriculture and food systems by outlining principles which can uphold much required responsible investment, enhance livelihoods, and shield and moderate against risks to food security.

The OECD-FAO Guidance for Responsible Agricultural Supply Chains upholds a framework for conducting responsible business practices in agricultural supply chains. The OECD-FAO Guidance for supply chains incorporates several long-standing standards for responsible business conduct, such as the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, International

Labour Organisation Tripartite Declaration of Principles Concerning Multinational Enterprises and Social Policy (ILO MNE Declaration), and the UN Committee on World Food Security's RAI Principles. The OECD-FAO Guidance tackles domestic and international, small, medium and large enterprises across the agricultural supply chain – from small-scale farmers' organisations, cooperatives and start-up companies through to parent companies or their local affiliates, state-owned enterprises and funds, private financial actors and private foundations.

6.2.3. Agro-Clusters: Remaking of the Agriculture World Order

Agri-cluster (also referred to as agro-clusters) is an umbrella term for a cluster of agri-activities extending from local, day-to-day activities to multiple global agribusiness contracts. Galvez-Nogales (2010) states that an agro-cluster is a broad network of producers, and suppliers of agribusinesses and institutions that participate in a related agricultural or agro-industrial subsector, and interconnect and build value networks when addressing mutual challenges and pursuing mutual opportunities (see ITC, 2006a). Agro-clusters come in different forms. Scholars do not all share the same views on agro-clusters, but together identify four components of cluster initiatives: physical space and settings, objectives, performance, and processes of development (Sölvell et al., 2003). Another major consideration in how scholars, researchers and policymakers define the agri-cluster relates to the context and background as well as the range of agro-productivity activities (see FAO, 2006, 2010, 2017, 2019; Galvez-Nogales, 2010; Greenberg, 2010a). Literature recognises the terms agri-cluster or agro-cluster, which is more often used in Europe. African Union regional bodies call them Agricultural Transformation Centres, while South Africa defines them as Agriparks. Some use the terms interchangeably, yet, others use the shifting terms of agribusiness value chains or agri-networks to embrace the full spectrum of economic activities, going by names such as agro-industrialisation.

Agro-clusters emerged to describe industrialised commercial farming based on network and value chains. The term originates from the wide and global range of PPPs – the diverse modes set up in both developed and developing countries. The mix of services offered by agri-clusters can vary dramatically from one model to another, within and between countries. Since there is variability in how countries construct and implement agro-clusters, it is important to recognise that there is no single way of achieving this end. The concept of agro-cluster has evolved and spread far and wide in both developed and developing economies in response to an array of agro-industrialization and commercialisation challenges and problems posed by the adoption of modern industrial agriculture. It evolves through the transmission and adoption of ideas, and in response to local externalities, such as a skilled labour pool, specialized inputs, and enhanced access to information technologies and markets. Agro-clusters are mainly the geographical concentration of industries which gain advantages through co-location (Bosworth and Broun, 1996). Given all of the above, the promotion of agro-clusters can be seen as taking the following forms, among others:

- Agribusiness complexes: the concept of “complex” denotes the interrelated activities necessary to produce and market a particular agricultural product, and it also highlights how companies within these complexes are often dependent upon one another (Simons et al., 1992). The “agribusiness complex” differs from that of agro-clusters in that agro-clusters have a more explicit geographical dimension.
- Agro-industrial parks: also known as agro-production or (agri) food parks, are shared facilities and services (e.g. transport, storage, and packaging) built for the processing of agricultural products (FAO, 2006c).
- Agri-export zones: represent the initiatives to explicitly link agro-clusters in zones designated for export industries, normally incentivised with tax concession, in the hope that this will enhance the export of agricultural products.
- One-village-one-product: promotes regional development, villages or local areas are urged to focus on one value-added and local product, with product development and marketing assistance being provided.
- Subnational Innovation System (SIS): The SIS is based upon public administrative boundaries (Yim, 2007). It looks at multiple benefits of co-locating: accelerated spread of innovation and other benefits, such as external economies of scale. By contrast to other agro-clusters, an SIS focuses solely on innovation potential.

The agro-cluster concept is mainly supported by western governments and private foundations, as well as international agencies such as the World Bank and IMF. It is about driving the marketisation of land and agricultural products with a focus on cash crops (World Bank, 2017). Both the IMF and World Bank have been laying the groundwork for the creation of a land market to the benefit of agribusiness and private investors who promise economic ‘‘growth’’ in exchange for access to land. Governments are urged to pass laws, create land markets, direct land reforms, and sign PPPs to avail lands and natural resources to exploitation.

An agro-cluster structure embraces the following features and functions:

- Agribusiness incubators (accelerators) that offer a shared social environment to entrepreneurs to have access to shared infrastructure, coaching, business and financial services, as well as linkages with the broader agribusiness environment (infoDev, 2009). Services include business development, market access and technology assessment services; financial services; and mentoring and networking.
- Agribusiness innovation centres (knowledge centres) that offer a one-stop shop where a collection of support services is provided to new or established entrepreneurs engaged in specific

activities. Services include training, mentoring and coaching services, facilities, market research and linkages, financing, and government, industry and donor networks. These innovation centres foster the use of innovative agricultural practices and technologies to make agriculture more environmentally sustainable and productive. Also, they can provide incubation services to selected clients although they are open to all interested clients. In various ways, the programmes all aim to build world-wide socio-economic capital and position PPPs as an integral component to the local and global expansion in food security and environment (see McMichael, 2012).

Agro-clusters, and in South Africa Agriparks, attempt to fit into rather than challenge the forces supporting the globalization movement, which include increasing scale and international consolidation of markets; the increasing role of global corporations; the liberalization of markets; the rising dominance of large food retailers in distribution channels; and the increasingly rigorous demands for food quality and safety. The United States of America's corporations championed transnational accumulation which undermined the independent capacity of the national state to regulate production and trade (Friedmann & McMichael, 1989). Friedmann & McMichael (1989) assert agriculture was broken into specialised sectors allied to input chains that crossed national boundaries to establish food products marketed transnationally. Hence, the power of capital to organise and reorganise agriculture undermines states' policies focusing on agriculture for national purposes, such as food security and the preservation of peasant communities. For instance, agri-food complex originated in the United States of America in the nineteenth century transformed into a critical basis for United States dominance in the twentieth century. Firstly, the United States of America exported grain as food aid to developing countries; secondly, agriculture became an industrial sector dependent on foreign inputs (Friedmann & McMichael, 1989). Agriparks in South Africa follow the same logic of creating an agriculture ecosystem that links farmers to agro-business and markets which prioritise cash crop production. Agribusiness activities focus on standardization, homogenization, and coordination on a worldwide basis.

Agro-clusters focus on the prospects of agribusiness and agro-industrial development and claim to aim for equitable benefits for agri-food chain participants, especially in developing countries, through trying to build favourable business environments, where agriculture policies, institutions and services are conducive to sustainable competition. Furthermore, improved integration of the agriculture value chain is seen as being attained by vertical relationships that improve product flow, contract farming, outgrower schemes, and coordination of financing (ITC, 2006b). It has been argued that developing countries can increase funds to improve their value chains "by promoting the development of and organising their assistance around clusters" (ITC, 2005). Agriculture development is unequal globally with agriculture in poorer countries under-resourced and the agro-cluster system cemented inequality (ITC, 2005; Friedmann & McMichael, 1989). Literature indicates that agri-clusters in developing countries are usually dominated by small-scale farmers, are organised in an informal manner, have weaker linkages, face more

difficulties in achieving critical support and are specialised in lower-value niches (Galvez-Nogales, 2010). Agro-industrialization, reinforced by agro-clusters, requires an understanding of agriculture sustainability that considers various livelihood strategies pursued by resource-poor farmers to improve their livelihood sustainability (Friedmann & McMichael, 1989).

6.2.4. Agro-Clusters: Influences on Farm Practices

The World Bank's "Agribusiness for Development'' agenda, specified in the *World Development Report 2008*, emphasises the role of corporate agribusiness in assisting a dynamic and prosperous agricultural sector in developing countries and contributing to the development of small-scale farmers (World Bank, 2007). According to the report, agro-clusters bring awareness, knowledge, and appreciation of the global agribusiness chain and to develop an ability to compete in the markets. Also, agro-clusters are considered critical for small-scale farmers and agribusiness, as they enable them to be involved in higher productivity, and more market oriented and higher value-added production (Svensson, 2001). According to FAO (2006), agro-clusters offer farmers common infrastructure facilities to be economically used and allow various enterprises to gain from the benefits of clustering. However, the power held by corporations allows them to wield economic influence on a system in which small-scale farmers merely survive (De Schutter, 2011). A handful of personalities and corporates make profit by dictating who farms, what gets farmed and who gets to eat (Amanor, 2009). Agro-clusters occur in a broad spectrum of interventions from land grabs, contract farms, corporatisation, consumerism, marketisation, and global food governance (see Amanor, 2009; McMichael, 2009; Woodhouse, 2009). The majority of clusters from developing countries are dominated by small and medium enterprises, whereas in developed countries larger firms predominate. The weaknesses of enterprises and the sporadic interactions between cluster agents in developing countries – in comparison with developed ones – exemplify obstacles to cluster development (Anderson et al., 2004).

6.2.5. Agro-clusters: Opening Pathways

The agriculture sector provides a vital starting point for countries in the continuum of economic recovery, growth, addressing issues of justice, equality and ecological sustainability. Scholars indicate that agriculture development inspires economic growth in other sectors of society, especially in developing countries with high rates of unemployment and associated poverty and hunger. This requires sustained investments in the quality of agriculture, facilitating access to land, resources, investments, support services, inputs, fertiliser, fuel and seed (FAO, 2009). The World Bank (2007) reports that investment in agriculture development is the most powerful investment a country can undertake which surpasses the amount of the original investment. The agro-clusters, backed by the IMF and World Bank, launched the global spread of agri-businesses and associated networks and agriculture value chains. The agro-cluster reform approach stresses sustained focus on productivity of land use, encourages agribusiness expansion in developing countries needing economic growth, and generates generational social and economic

dividends (see section 6.2.5.4 on agro-processing). A closer view at agro-clusters' suggests a technocratic framing of the issue in which agriculture is primarily seen as a financial investment concern, removed from its broader social, political, economic, and ecological contexts.

6.2.5.1. South Africa: Comprehensive Rural Develop Programme

In South Africa, the context of this research, there is a strong political and socio-economic basis for a developmental state-driven agrarian reform process. The South African Constitution mandates government to take the necessary legislative and administrative measures to address historical imbalances (CRSA, 1996, as amended), and mandates government departments to align with these broad principles and community needs. South Africa's pre-existing inequalities, such as the dual agriculture system and high levels of urban–rural disparities, continue. However, policies and programmes are neoliberal, market driven, uphold finances and markets and ignore the country's legacy of apartheid's racial reengineering of agrarian relations. Hence, the findings locate the *historical, socio-economic and political* contexts, so as to situate the analysis of the specific district and to explore the motivation local stakeholders hold when implementing the Agripark. KI.3, a politician and councillor, explaining the challenges of addressing past injustice and inequalities, say: "South Africa has a complex historical background, economics cannot be divorced from politics, and neither can [it] be divorced from history. This is continuing now because for decades we have been electing self-serving, and corrupt politicians that only care about the next election outcome and never address anything remotely transformative".

6.2.5.2. Agriparks: Schisms and Challenges

The introduction of the Agriparks in 2010 was a first step to address the right of small-scale farmers to quality state support and service. In the Agriparks, the study finds the dominant perception of emerging black farmers as a marginal and dysfunctional sector. Moreover, Agriparks programmes often have not articulated a response that speaks to the effectiveness of small-scale farmers' practices. Farmers and communities all express the experienced reality of the situation. An academic and agroecologist, KI.2, points to enduring structural defects within South Africa's land and rural development policy itself. At each case study site, approximately 90% of black farmers said they supported state intervention. The remainder were more disillusioned regarding state support rather than opposed to it. Those with access to their own land, other than that provided by the Agripark, felt more positive about their farming prospects and were more likely to recommend access to investment and markets. This was evident in the case of the restitution community, Levubu, who had consistent and intensive farming experiences. The Agriparks programme challenges include the downgrading of sustainable agriculture practices, of which agroecology principles are the pinnacle.

In designing the Agriparks, South Africa drew on a sizable body of global research on agri-clusters, farmer development, and incubation. As a national programme for farmer development and incubation for

equity, and high-quality farming system. Agriparks envisaged to address the growing levels of rural disadvantages and underperformance which are becoming increasingly evident in small-scale and large farm practices. Understanding the national roll-out of Agriparks in all the 44 districts, as anticipated in the CRDP, is not straightforward to understand. Its controversial implementation, in the absents of verifiable data, is even more complicated over a multi-year timeline. The Agripark aims for nationally consistent implementation of 44 district-based structures providing support and extension services to rural farmers. The Agriparks' claimed accomplishments have mainly focused on extension services, agriculture inputs, commercialisation and marketisation. I found that while the farmers and government officials treated Agriparks "as a viable vehicle for change", and while there were "structural problems" with the implementation processes which made it unfit for purpose, there was no convincing evidence of attempts by the state to abandon the programme. As noted by beneficiaries, whether state officials have been paying attention, and reaching acceptable conclusions about the myriad problems confronting Agriparks, ought to become clearer over the next few years.

The state programme perpetuates rather than rejects capitalism. These state-driven support services include access to land, water, infrastructure and facilities such as storage, implements and coolers, access to markets both local and national, training, inputs, seeds and fuel. I find that the challenges faced by the Agriparks is the current ''top-down'' district-driven agriculture system which has achieved limited success. It raised the question whether state policies and programmes are matching emerging black farmers' needs, experiences, aspirations and values. This was evident in Westonaria, Rooiwal and Sedibeng. I, also, find that ''Bottom-up'' driven initiatives, which encourage local participation, have also encountered challenges in their inability to successfully advance in a biased system, unable to secure sustainability and rural livelihoods. This was evident in Levubu and Kuruman. The programme clearly has governance and transparency problems, for instance farmers are not consulted over the budget preparing process. This entrenched the negative conviction among beneficiary farmers that the Agriparks programme was rigged against them.

6.2.5.3. Agriparks: The National Coordinating Framework

Introducing agrarian reforms is not easily achieved, nor is emerging black farmer development. This is partly due to complexities of a three-tiered system of government with unitary and concurrent power, and partly due to contending funding priorities. For the programme to achieve its objectives, it must be appropriately resourced to do so, and government has developed symbiotic relations across various departmental policies. A national strategy that establishes the information infrastructure required to drive policy and improvement is quintessential. First, the NGP 2010 provides a connecting point and aims to reduce inequality and eliminate rural poverty by identifying areas of priority. Second, the national framework, NDP 2030 (2010), prioritises uniting all South Africans across a common programme for prosperity and equity, and promotes active citizenry to strengthen development and progress towards

faster economic growth. Third, the Industrial Policy Action Plan 2013/14–2015/16 earmarks a food-processing strategy and action plan with the objective of accelerated growth in the food-processing and milling industry to allow small-scale maize milling enterprises to produce for local markets at competitive prices. Fourth, importantly, the APAP (2015–2019) aligns objectives to the NGP, NDP, and Industrial Policy Action Plan, focusing on inclusive growth, rural development, food security and the enhancement of environmental assets and rural resources. Fifth, the DAFF IGDP targets the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (2011/12 – 2014/15) for a long-term strategy for the growth and development of the agricultural, forestry and fisheries sectors, fostering a common South African vision that will ensure equitability, productivity, competitiveness, and sustainability.

6.2.5.4 Agriparks: The Organising Framework

Key government stakeholders of the Agriparks are the Department of Land Affairs, DAFF and the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs. At a decentralised level the 'custodians' of the Agriparks, in so far as the plans show, are the district municipalities under the stewardship of the local economic development units. In the long term, the Agriparks are meant to be farmer-controlled. CRDP provides the guiding framework and principles. The CRDP is underpinned by a three-pronged strategy that aims to coordinate and integrate broad-based agrarian transformation, strategically increase rural development, and improve land reform. The strategy for rural development is to rejuvenate and revive creation of innovative economic and social opportunities tethered to the acquisition of and access to land through the programmes of redistribution, tenure, and restitution. In this way, the beneficiaries of land reform programmes will be connected to the strategic objective of the CRDP. Hence, the Recapitalisation and Development Programme, 2014, which provides capital support to the development of farmers, connects to the CRDP, prioritising capacity development, infrastructure development and the provision of operational inputs. Supporting small-scale farmers and addressing long-standing gaps in opportunity and outcomes for farmers from historically marginalised communities will take commitment at all levels of government. It is important for the national government to have a clear vision for how to organise the district municipalities to help small-scale farmers and rural communities that need the most support.

6.2.5.5 The Implementation Framework

The Agripark programme is detailed in the 2011 Green Paper on Land Reform, directing itself on tenure, food insecurity, rural underdevelopment and inequalities in the agricultural sector. The Green Paper's mandate emphasises, among other actions, the selection and training of small-scale farmers and the incubation of unemployed agricultural graduates and agro-entrepreneurs. The Agriparks framework is interactive and interrelated. There is some variability in the services provided and the scale across district municipalities and the provincial governments.

6.3. Key Findings

On the question of how to improve Agripark services, key informants propose sustainable practices to ensure that Agriparks deliver, especially because they are funded from the public purse. Respondents argue that:

- Farming practices and food systems have a major effect on the environment. Thus, Agriparks must adopt sustainable farming practices.
- Government must ensure that Agriparks achieve their objectives and are appropriately resourced to do so. Government must scale up evidence-based and intensive programmes for the most vulnerable rural communities.
- Government must initiate a national database that sets out the information infrastructure needed to improve farmer practices and to strengthen knowledge and beliefs about sustainable agriculture practices.
- Agriparks must diversify and make a clear distinction between private and public interests.

With all informants and interviewees of the study, the perennial land question about historical exploitation and dispossession is intrinsically linked to race. In South Africa, land and race form the basis of injustices and inequities. Land and race are also connected to social problems, including poverty, hunger, and, lately, the spread of Covid-19 with huge socio-economic consequences for the poor.

KI.2**,** an academic and veteran social researcher, explaining failed land reform and the urgency of sustainable farming, says the agrarian situation demands rebuilding the capability of the state to perform the essential functions required of it by its citizens. KI.2, "there is still merit in the struggle against the global food crisis, but it is not a future embodied by large multinational bodies and institutions".

KI.1, an experienced land activist with civil society organisations**,** and KI.4**,** a small-scale farmer and land activist, maintain that white supremacy is such a powerful global phenomenon, entrenched in all social spheres and it manifests itself in various structures and institutions**.** KI.4 argues that modern-day tactics used to maintain white domination and set black farmers up to fail – such as the ones on display in the Agriparks – are the vestiges of apartheid. These key informants' call for greater justice and equality within South African society was a common theme among participants, as were poverty and hunger. Another theme was that providing services to people in the most marginalised rural areas who face major barriers to realising their rights should be prioritised by government.

All South African citizens, regardless of historic background or ability, should have equal access to land and development resources. NB.1, a non-beneficiary female cash crop farmer, says "Farmers want to be a force for change, but without the right legislative levers to help them make the transition, and to prioritise sustainable farming systems, they have to take their chances in the marketplace – or leave farming to big global agri-businesses".

KI.1, an experienced land activist with civil society organisations, says he did not expect Agriparks to be successful, explaining that, as an activist, "you relish having your views changed by the facts on the ground. That's different from a situation where you've adopted a party-political position, where it's viewed as reactionary if you concede ground. I honestly did not reckon Agriparks were going to work. I think I have been proven right. There has been no example of a successful black farmer programme to boost rural reforms and the Agripark development prospects were not that good. I debated black farmer development in various forums and said it was unlikely that anything would be successful within the current markets' framework. So, I was completely unsurprised when reports came out and government had failed to mobilise enough will and resources to succeed. The outcomes are so much more ineffective than I'd considered. As an activist who has been working with rural communities for over 30 years, I could predict that, if anyone could."

KI.2 says his reading was that the general evidence on the effectiveness of the programme in rural settings was vague and unreliable. The emphasis on private financialisation and marketisation raised a concern about pesticides, herbicides and then monocropping, thus providing a route to environmental degradation. The possibility of small-scale farmers being assimilated into agribusiness chains and behaving less cautiously as result of profiteering also raised concern. When evidence showed that the major route of food distribution was via retail networks rather than community markets, the case for agroecology became stronger. There is also persuasive evidence from studies about small-scale farmers supporting a superior quality of life and moral and spiritual values than industrial society. Research continues to generate good evidence that small-scale farmers and Indigenous people are more cautious with the use of land. However, private farm landowners and their monopolistic hold determine the global food systems and land-use patterns. Research strengthened KI.2's resolve to be strongly in favour of alternatives. There are a number of international and national instruments that place obligations on the South African government to develop and practice sustainable ways of farming.

KI.3**,** a government official within the Agriparks programme, thought society would accept more intrusive state interventions, saying, "I believe I underestimated the differences between white and black farmers, including their readiness to be brought under intense levels of observation and scrutiny." KI.3 explains that like other policies and programmes before it, the Agriparks programme is divisive, inspiring anger but continuing to grow in popularity among local officials. There's a lot of anger by a lot of farmers and rural communities that they're not getting a fair deal from the government. Most of that anger has been directed at state officials. It is now trickling down to local officials because people think local officials are not doing enough. Local officials cannot be held responsible for the development setbacks. It is clear that there are no short-term fixes to reforms. Land reform disruptions in the form illegal occupations and threatening rhetoric are seen in public places across the country in what politicians view as an alarming situation.

KI.4 says, “several critics have suggested recently that I am against the programme or that I have changed my mind on Agriparks. Actually, I haven’t. I have consistently been of the view that the local community must be the driver of rural development, with the state as a central pillar and the private sector as an equal partner when there is limited state support. On the downside, the trust level between small-scale farmers and private sector has been eroded, and that will take some fixing. It's all about global supply chains, is it not? Very few industrial farmers produce inhouse to their own exact standards any more, instead sourcing the cheapest products they can find from all over the world. I believe oligarchs, for example, have networks of thousands of different global suppliers. With limited resources, the state’s case for supporting small-scale farmers trumps the more marginal gains of improving profit for those who already own the wealth. That doesn’t mean that I am against Agriparks, just that I am pro-equity”.

A female farmer drew the study to gender inequalities; the underlying causes of the gender gap are complex and difficult to untangle. “I think gender problems are social problems,” she adds. “Trying to treat them as problems of individuals doesn’t work”.

In my interviews and interaction with informants, I explored how farmers interpreted their experience with Agriparks. About 70% of the beneficiary informants indicated that the programme has had a positive impact on farmers’ problem-solving and decision-making skills, on their functional literacy and their agriculture practices. Some of these processes have been driven through discipline-based approaches, with an increased emphasis on innovation and creativity. For example, farmers were asked to use their mobile phones for taking orders and selling their produce. In Westonaria, a farmer is using hi-tech-hydroponic systems for vertical agriculture. Other innovation has been targeted interventions related to information sharing and teamwork. For example, teams of Levubu farmers investigated strategies to improve their water-tunnel and the quality of their produce; interns used their academically acquired knowledge to improve and integrate what was already taking place; and new management helped farmers take on greater ownership and responsibility for their work.

In network development, I focused on how Agriparks supported relations between and farmers and outside stakeholders, such as buyers and traders. I looked at how farmers shared the application of their skills and knowledge, took responsibility for change and shared their insights with others. In Levubu, the manager and interns were more hands-on with regard to the day-to-day activities than in Westonaria. In JTGDM, extension officers visited irregularly, and the services were limited. In some instances, farmers developed internal groups limited to familial relations that shared skills, produce and sometimes funds for buying seedlings. Interestingly, faced with the challenge of non-delivery of seeds, Westonaria farmers all stood together against the programme manager and blockaded the entrance. In all instances, farmers developed cordial face-to-face relations with buyers and other stakeholders. In JTGDM, most farmers wagered on livestock production as a livelihood strategy that presented fewer costs and risks than crop production. In general, the finding emphasises the need for sustained capital investments in the quality

of agriculture activities, and the facilitating of farmers' access to land, natural resources, investment opportunities, support services, inputs, fertiliser, fuel, and seed (FAO, 2009).

With regard to the impact of the extension services on farmers' practices, respondents recalled the positive impact that the services had on their farming and the savings they had made, although they did have to buy seed and fertilisers. A theme that ran through the interviews with regard to support services was ''farmers'' engagement with the decision-making processes' and that farmers often felt left out in decision-making about inputs and extension services. The farmers in all three case study sites had strong engagement with the communities they came from, who served as a market, supplementary labour as well as the farmers' eyes and ears on what was happening in the farmers markets. The farmers' overall strategies and practices were embedded in the communities. Most of the farmers do not have the finances to pay for private extension services to improve their farming practices, especially with limited state support and growing inflation. In some instances, individuals within the community provide supplementary financial support in terms of soft interest-free loans.

6.3.1. The Big Picture: Revisiting Research Questions

The succinct main research question is: What are the challenges and opportunities of emerging black farmers and how are they supported by the state? The research question endorses a *forensic* exploration of the *what* so as to better understand or answer the *how* question. This study questions both frontiers. The *what* and *how* of the research question acknowledge the myriad of interrelated factors that catalyse or exacerbate either one of the question or both. Follow-up questions to the main research questions are:

General question 1: What are the stakeholders' perspectives on the role of Agripark support?

General question 2: What are the success expectations of farmers and other stakeholders and what do these farmers and stakeholders see as barriers to achieving their expectations after a period of support?

Given the far-reaching scope of responses and reflections from respondents, it is beyond the ability of this study to address all of them. This study instead focuses on practices of emerging black farmers in Agriparks by setting out the sub-questions as frames of analysis. In using this framework, the study reveals more relevant themes that address the central research questions and guide the analysis.

KI.6, a cattle farmer and local politician, provides an analysis of post-apartheid circumstances of South African society by referring to the different policies and programmes targeting small-scale farmers in general and black farmers in particular, an array of programmes that are dominated by similarity. He says, "Generally, emerging black farmers share the same historical background, similar life experiences, basic similar skills and attitudes, opine similar opinions and values"**.** KI.7, a farmer and land activist, backs the interpretation by asserting that, with the advent of democracy, government departments were slow to reform according to the changing nature of the socio-political context. He refers to the institutional and

structural arrangements, embedded predominantly in the legal, political and agriculture systems inherited from the past; the legacy the majority of black people opposed**.** In a similar manner, KI.1, and KI.2 both claim a general sense of disillusionment and disgruntlement in the strength of existing policies and institutions reflected in the recommendation of the Presidential Advisory Panel on Land Reform and Agriculture of 2019**.** KI.4 explains that no challenge facing emerging black farmers in South Africa is unique, even within the Southern Africa sub-region. South Africa needs to reorganise and modernise support services' provision in the face of a changing socio-economic and political landscape. South Africa has a legacy of sectarianism and a divided agriculture and farming system, and entrenched interests of corporate bodies act as a barrier to reform it. When I raised the Agriparks' contribution to food security and social welfare, in all instances, participants raised concerns about the preferred seed provision that prioritised cash crop production. For example, KI.9, a cattle farmer, raised the programme's emphasis on marketing of produce over the daily needs of poor communities.

6.3.2. The Role of Agriparks

Interviews with both beneficiaries, to understand their practices and state support, and non-beneficiaries showed that participants' views were both positive and negative regardless of their respective positions. The main issues related to the Agriparks' institutional practices and support services and farmers' confidence in their own practices and their perceptions of the importance of state support services.

For example, KI.3 opines "a market approach is likely to result in interpretations that are positive and is likely to be at odds with the interpretation of emerging black farmers who were previously excluded from the markets." This difference in interpretation is revealed in literature which features the impact of apartheid's racial land dispossessions on black farmers. There is a purposeful determination on both sides of the Agripark aisle, it has undoubtedly raised awareness of matters that need significant reconceptualising. NB.3**,** a cattle farmer, says that as much as the Agripark is characterised as a free-market space, it ignores the freedom of the poor, including the small-holder farmer who should be able to influence decisions about his future.

State support has always been controversial, but at the time of writing, amid fierce political debate, issues seem particularly polarised. In terms of marketisation ideology, beneficiary respondents propound feisty interpretations of the financialisation influences on the provision of support services. Non-beneficiaries cite state officials' supremacy in terms of their proliferation of bureaucratic procedures. NB.1**,** a farmer in Gauteng, argues that upper-level state officials in Agriparks pose a threat to farmers' innovation and progress by strictly adhering to the use of high-value fresh crops, to competitive processes, and to a technical and individualistic selection process. NB.2, another farmer in Gauteng, refers to the Agripark as a competitive environment: "the system or grid is capitalist, cash before care".

During my observations in Gauteng, the Agripark resembled a school environment with the extension officers telling the farmers what to do with its programme drawn mainly from the private sector and consultants. It is highly competitive with farmers trying to maximise output, and beneficiaries have three years within which to work in the Agripark, although most have been there for longer than the required period, mainly because of bureaucratic failures to administer. Support services in the form of extension services advice and mentoring on the nurturing of seedlings, horticulture seed varieties, soil management and use of fertilisers are instructively instilled by transfer into the farmer's practice. There is no coherent, uniform and strictly sequenced support process which recognises farmers' prior experience and knowledge and which is righted by an accredited system.

KI.10, a DRDLR official, argues that the private sector approach is embedded in the CRDP, dominated by government officials in alliance with the private sector. She concludes that "their status and therefore their viability is built upon their retention and entrance processes." In varying ways, the official's comments are contradicted by several farmers, both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, who talk of how lack of access to land and capital continue to limit ambitions for small-scale farmers. Access to services remains bureaucratic and painfully slow, and many small-scale farmers are forced to relinquish farms. During all my visits to both Westonaria and Levubu, extension services and mentoring were provided by college interns with a one-year contract with the departments. The interns complained of being overworked with little support from officials. However, in Rooiwal and Sedibeng no one provided systematic support, although inputs like seed and fertiliser were sometimes provided.

My analysis of primary and secondary data, interviews and observations largely support the views of Laakso and Olukoshi (1996) and Scott (1998*)*, among others, on the dilemmas of state-supported programmes. The authors also indicate the existence of two discourses in opposition with each other over the issue of development programmes in post-colonial states. On the one hand, a set of discourses defend a highly participatory state, where people have access to politicians to influence their decisions. These discourses emanate from post-colonial scholars and also from officials and farmers whom I interviewed. Of these farmers, seven were non-beneficiaries. On the other hand, free-market discourses are often ambiguous about current state arrangements. These discourses come from neoliberal scholars, most noticeably from the IMF and World Bank (see FAO, 2006a). But, perhaps, there is a third discourse, backed by KI.1 and reinforced by Long and Van der Ploeg (1994), about the state targeting specific interventions with farmers that drive partnerships instead of the state being a central character for growth. History teaches us that such a targeted approach is also possible for wider social reforms. KI.1**,** explains "the role of the partnerships would be strategic". "No more than the neoliberals ever supposed will state intervention stop private ownership," he added. "But state intervention both establishes the base and contributes to the socio-economic stability needed to mobilise public resources towards economic resilience, justice and equality". The central argument was that Agriparks' rise reflected the

flourishing of the industrial and imperial phases, and that South Africa's agriculture was becoming unsustainable as an industrial silo.

6.4. Addressing the Research Questions

Section 1.4 lists the seven sub-questions to the main research question. These seven sub-questions are addressed below from the perspective of the research participants.

Sub-question 1: What are the historic and socio-economic contexts of the emerging black farmers in each of the three case study sites?

The overwhelming response to sub-question 1, albeit differently phrased, was: We lost land and wealth. That wealth cannot be regained and black farmers will never get the land they lost back. As stated by a beneficiary, "As the concentration of ownership shows, land, especially in developing economies, has diminished the belief of farming as a social good. Over-concentration of ownership manifests the grotesque investment stratification of modern agriculture".

KI.9 says**:** "There is a lifetime of hardships and discrimination in farming support provision and services". Black farmers offered familiar testimonies of minimal support from the Agriparks, as well as from the private sector. The informants, talking about their socio-economic situations and challenges, referred to a "struggle against all odds", using phrases such as the "legacy of apartheid" and "injustice and inequality" (interviews in Westonaria and JTGDM).

In the South African context, I interpret these phrases as synonymous with racism. Overwhelmingly, the response is that when apartheid was over, the system was not over. The legacy of landlessness and poverty continues to plague the majority of the landless black population, especially poor rural women and youth. About state efforts to attain justice and equality by supporting PPPs, participants unanimously agree that support measures are far from satisfactory and require improvements in numerous areas of implementation. Views of alignment between small-scale and industrial agriculture resurfaced in discussions and has become a major issue in agrarian reform (KI.1, 2, 3). No longer should emerging black farmers and large scale, mainly white, farmers operate in silos in the face of several economic issues, including the need for an inclusive and growing economy (KI.1).

Sub-question 2: What are the agriculture practices of emerging black farmers in the three case study sites?

In Levubu, the farmers work collectively. The decision regarding what to produce and how to produce it, is taken by the management team which is constituted by university advisors and community representatives. Respondents say the decisions focus on inputs purchased from cooperatives. Farming methods are largely mechanised and organic farming methods are not used. As one farmer explains, "the management prefers buying seedlings, though we cultivate our own limited beds, we buy fertiliser,

pesticides and other agrochemicals to speed up production for the markets." Elaborating, he said, "The profit motives of the financial investors aid the use of chemically based solutions to crop production and soil management." In terms of the idea of moving to more sustainable practices, such as agroecology, the farmer explains, "We need our community to revert to more traditional ways of farming. These are more aligned with caring for our concerns and the environment."

In Westonaria, the project manager takes all the purchase decisions. When telling me how they make their choices, the manager argues, "We are faced with enormous challenges of poverty and unemployment. We need to create opportunities for the people. Other sustainable practices are expensive." He said, "We need a major cultural shift throughout the system. We need to challenge the education system, make people more aware of alternatives and sensitise the markets; it is much more than a routine decision." A farmer explains, "We also buy our own seeds to supplement those that we receive from the state. We use our own labour and that of the family." Another farmer adds, "We are a company selling to the community and retailers. We buy our own seeds, fertiliser and chemicals. Our choices are influenced by what people want and the turnaround of crops." Yet another added, "I farm alone in these three hectares. I come in early and leave late. Over and above what I receive from the state, I buy my own inputs. If there is a lot of work, I bring one of my friends."

In JTGDM, a farmer says "I buy my own feed and chemicals. The cattle are kept communally in the village. I don't pay for the grazing, though sometimes the chief wants contributions to mend the fence and such improvements". Another farmer added, "I have leased grazing from another black farmer. I pay a monthly rent. I buy whatever is needed without state support. Together with the owner we have just drilled a borehole." In the Agripark context, farmers are key stakeholders. Their views and opinions are crucial to the design of their own support service. However, there is limited input from them. A farmer proffers, "Hearing from farmers is not only empowering for them [the farmers], it helps officials to get matters right".

I raise the issue of agriculture production practices in the context of social, economic, individual and collective practices, considering the study in a site-specific way. I do not intend to make universal claims on production practices. I recognise that a farmer might, and often does, carry out more than one activity with more than one individual involved, for example livestock and fresh produce. In his work experience. KI.9 attests and has often seen multipurpose farmers trying to maximise land use and outputs. As he explains, "Production and productivity are influenced by a variety of factors such as size of holding, efficiency, tenancy and employment agreements, technological variation and mechanisation". He adds, "The production pattern or production relations link with the land issue". KI.1 agrees, "To isolate agricultural production under these circumstances would be problematic because we would have to do a broader decoupling between variables and constant production activities". In contrast, KI. 5 argues, "There is globalisation and liberalisation of national land markets which are defining and redefining

power relations, agriculture production practices and at global and national level". KI.5 concludes, "It is about markets. It relates to the increasing ease with which an individual on one side of the world can interact, to mutual benefit, with another on the other side of the world."

Based on the literature review and interviews, I acknowledge the historical basis and the socio-cultural dynamics influenced by the neoliberal production model which redefines farmers' experiences. In several ways, globalisation has altered farming genealogies and cultures causing homogeneity, redefining structural features and challenging established forms of production practices.

Sub-question 3: What are the emerging black farmers' inputs and outputs – their production and marketing practices?

The Literature indicates that a handful of global giants dominate the industrialization and marketization of agricultural produce (see, Lang & Heasman, 2004; and Reisch, 2006). Perhaps as a response to this and the challenges they have faced in corporate dominated markets, participant farmers emphasized local retail markets and door-to-door sales as marketing approaches that worked well for them. Based on the literature and interviews, I find the public discourses on practices of emerging black farmers stereotyped. The portrayal of their identity is orchestrated to rank agriculture hierarchically. Agricultural production is diverse and seasonal and part of the construction of a more complex system of hegemony. I find, from the interviews, limited understanding about produce markets, marketing and input supply experiences, for example the workings of global commodities markets, analysis of global and local trends and the use of detailed theoretical tools and perspectives that allow analysts to grasp market fluctuations and potential. As noted by KI.1, social practice and critical political economy research must recognise the relations of power and privilege that characterise farmers' practices under neoliberalism, to reveal their alienating impacts on agriculture production, marketing and input supply practices of emerging black farmers.

NB.3, a livestock farmer, applied for participation in the JTGDM Agripark when it was planned. He retorts officials rely on the lie of "meritocracy": work hard and you will be rewarded, and you can achieve whatever you want. He does not receive government support, he grazes his animals on communal land, and buys feed and supplements from his meagre pension. He sells at the auction as and when possible. He adds, "That's how I make money". B.1 and her team farm in Westonaria. They grow cash crops like spinach, peppers, carrots, lettuce and kale, depending on the seasons or seedlings. They use four hectares of land, water, fertiliser and other support services from the Agripark. However, when there are delays in delivery of supplies, they have to use their own resources which are never reimbursed. It is "precarious", she says. They sell to walk-in buyers, local guesthouses, spaza shops and retailers and do farm-to-community sales. NB.4**,** Levubu is a land restitution case, growing bananas, avocados and litchis. They supply local street vendors, walk-ins and the Johannesburg Market and undertake contract farming

for retailers. Although Levubu is designated as an agri-hub in the provincial master plan, it still has not received any form of government support.

Sub-question 4: What are the main successes and challenges of emerging black farmers?

KI.1 explains that instead of *successes* and *challenges*, he prefers *risks* and *opportunities*. He adds that farming is influenced by three factors, globalisation, collaboration and automation, which present opportunities as well as risks. Though these factors provide an opportunity for higher productivity and market access, given their disadvantages experienced in the agriculture value chain, emerging black farmers are likely to bear greater risks. Agriparks are considered an innovative and welcome agriculture and rural reform strategy. All of the interviewees in JTGDM, Sedibeng, Rooiwal, Westonaria and Levubu state that farming is their primary source of income and that farmers face multiple challenges like lack of market access, lack of information and knowledge and fragmented pieces of land. For many, the district municipality approach under the auspices of the local economic development unit is considered a success in terms of increased support for people from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. Agriparks create a sense of "success" around restructuring and make rural farming more competitive through local networks, value chains and extension services. However, despite the fast growth of Agriparks across most of the districts, their future remains uncertain due to limited restructuring in agri-value chains and decreased services in recent years. "Even while recognising the path-breaking value of Agriparks, we must accept that it has taken relentless political struggle to keep the programme alive," says KI.4**.**

The findings at each case study site locate success and challenges in wider social, economic and political discourses. Success is viewed as part of a continuum of *learning* and *becoming*. Commenting about changes, successes and challenges, KI.6 says that government policies and programmes, including the amendments to earlier reforms, should focus on best practice tools, cost-benefit analysis and regulatory impact assessment. At each case study site, approximately 90% of farmers said they consider collaboration and networks as a form of success that is critical for development and progress. Those farmers who owned land felt more positive about their farming than those on communal land. This was evident in the cases of full-time farmers who had gained regular and intensive farming experience for several years previously. Throughout, when farmers told me what was most important to them, many of them expressed a desire to be heard and more engaged in decisions affecting them and their communities. They also said that they wanted more women and youth involved.

When I interviewed B.2**,** a deaf-mute farmer, she was careful to emphasise the potential role of luck in her success as a person who is differently abled. "If you feel there's something you want to do, and it inspires you, do it!" she tells me. "And if you find you can't do it, then look for other opportunities." She and her team, all differently abled, keep five agriculture tunnels growing with cash crops for sale to locals and retailers. By learning to reject fatalistic beliefs and appreciate some of the positive changes, she says "we may be more motivated to embrace new challenges". She and her team are planning to grow their

farming, obtain land and participate at the highest possible levels, as exporters of crops. Greater equality of opportunities for women, youth and differently abled people is needed to address high disparities. B.3 adds that the land lease operation provided by the Agripark provides beneficiaries with a livelihood. However precarious, the door-to-door (farm-to-community market) benefits most in the area in terms of food and nutrition. B.3 adds, "I can take my children to school and afford the basics". An important aspect that emerges from the findings is the individual character of the transformation that ensues in farmers, rather than the economic, social and collective dimension of success.

The farmers' challenges overlap with many other impediments to small-scale farming, notably political and economic priorities, the role and structure of policies and programmes, and dominant powers in the agriculture value chain. KI.5 argues that the state must provide support by addressing constraints that limit the capacity of the rural poor to gain access to land and the state must implement a support programme that focuses on sustainable improvement of production on small farms. KI.1 says civil society is acutely aware that the 'problem' is more complex and deeply rooted in history. Emerging black farmers are a critical component of building a strong and vibrant farming system that can face the challenges of our society. But emerging black farmers are only one component of the broader set of challenges facing agrarian activities**.** NB.4 and NB.5 suggest state spending should focus on small-scale farmers, increase the capacity of communities in poor rural areas and support women and youth. Increasing state support in rural areas would be a cost-effective way to boost farming outcomes, and ultimately productivity, while also reducing inequality.

Sub-question 5: What support services do black farmers receive, from whom and where?

A common refrain among farmers, recited like a mantra is, "We continue to use our own funds and resources, we are not getting money and farmers need operating money each year". NB.4**,** supported by NB.3, says "we need credit to produce at scale but we are not getting credit, I have a loan from dad which I'm slowly paying back". NB.6 observes, "The uneven manner in which state support is provided, and the disadvantages that some farmers experience outside the state system, mean that unfortunately there continue to be farmers who fall through the cracks in our system". He adds, "The state, through Agriparks, provides access to land lease operations, infrastructure like storage, coolers, support services like extension mentoring as well as inputs like seedlings, fertilisers and pesticides". During the Covid-19 pandemic, the state gave support grants to some of the qualifying beneficiaries. B.4, a member of a farming cooperative in Westonaria, explains, "This area where the Agripark is situated used to be a dumping ground which we converted to farming fields with the help of the local mines". Westonaria, located west of Johannesburg, is surrounded by several goldmines, like Simunye. He continues, "The mine gave us a daily stipend to clear the place. The mine got us a private consultant to help us register the cooperative that is now farming here". NB.1 has participated in a farming workshop organised by the private sector. B.5, a cattle farmer in Limpopo, explains that she received cattle under the state's Ilima

programme and that she receives regular extension services, Lucerne and a Covid-19 state grant. In Levubu, the community continues to receive support from the University of Venda in the form of extension service support, mentorship, capacity building and managerial skills.

In my observation, most other farmers in Agriparks went on privately organised training for which they had to pay. This is the case on all the sites I visited. It is more common with individuals who are self-funded and established as business farmers. In Limpopo, KI.7 and KI.8 self-financed to kick-started their farms, investing in infrastructure, land clearing, purchasing of seedlings and inputs. The financial amounts are exorbitant, the time spent excruciating and the pressure unyielding.

Sub-question 6: What support do the Agriparks provide and to whom?

B.6 suggests, given the many challenges faced at the initial stages of production, providing a structure is not enough but that building capacity and reorganising all farming activities will enable small-scale farmers to expand their operations. B.7, a cash crop producer, mentions that farmers receive support in the form of the three-year land lease operational contract, water supply, seedlings, fertiliser and pesticides. B.9, a cash crop producer, adds “security, extension services and advice”. The farmers do not have to pay for any of the support that they receive, including net shading, irrigated land and outer fencing. While participants noted the importance of Agriparks and the benefit of the support to individual farmers as a viable means to livelihoods, managers and officer did not highlight the role of markets and skills training in the farmers success. All of the Agriparks officials I interviewed shared the same sentiment, saying: “our job as a governing structure must be to protect the interests of both the small- and large-scale sector and the industrial farmer as well as to consider the right levels of support and opportunities to succeed. I think that is possible.” KI.5, added “I think you can have a successful small-scale sector and a successful pathway for national growth”.

Sub-question 7: I explored the impact of Covid-19 on emerging black farmers’ practices and what shaped state responses. The question was a late addition, following the advent of the pandemic.

The global outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, with its rapid mutations, deepened global wealth and income inequality, as well as wealth inequalities within and between countries. Throughout the pandemic, South Africa imposed some of the longest and harshest lockdown measures on the African continent. KI.6 argues, “when global and nation furlough schemes end and temporary shelters fade away, the global community will confront a crisis that will be almost unprecedented”.

6.5. Study Sites: Case Studies

This section describes each case-study site in terms of a brief background; the support, services and processes of implementation; and whether the Agriparks match farmer expectations and how beneficiaries perceive progress of their effort. In this way, the section focuses on Agriparks, their programmes, and the manner in which support and extension services are designed and implemented.

Agriculture is the backbone of this nation's economy and democracy, and it should be at the top of mind for economic growth aimed at justice and equality. What follows, then, are the findings about who makes decides about, who controls, and who benefits from the Agriparks.

6.5.1. First Case-study: Westonaria

The Westonaria Agripark is situated to the west of Johannesburg along the R28 close to the Donaldson Dam. The introduction of the Westonaria Agripark in 2015 was to incubate small-scale farmers by providing them access to land, extension services, input, infrastructure, as well as access to finances and markets. The Westonaria Agripark is on 66 hectares of land. The infrastructure and facilities on site include, a 300m^2 hi-tech hydroponic vertical growing chamber, 20 greenhouse tunnels covering a total of 6,000m^2 (20 tunnels x 300m^2), office space, training room, ablution facilities, pack-house, cold room, boreholes with irrigation systems, and high-security fence surrounds the property. Some of the infrastructure and facilities, such as the packing and storage rooms, are currently standing empty because of lack of refrigeration or still under construction. There are approximately 27 small-scale farmers at the Agripark. This number is based on the plots allocated for each farmer, however, the number of operational farmers at any given time varies, some farmers do not use their plots after allocation for different reasons. The farming practices have a lot in common, the main produce is high-value commodities such as lettuce, peppers, tomatoes, cucumber and baby spinach. Westonaria Agripark has one project manager, who also manages Sebokeng Agripark. During my many visits, it was the security personnel and interns, who were available and acted as "officials''

The Westonaria area has a high incidence of poverty and landlessness. The Agripark neighbours once were well known and thriving gold mines but most mines are now either closed or have scaled down operations leaving untold economic devastation and hardship for the people in the sprawling nearby informal settlement areas. KI.10. comments: "Consequently, the incidence of landlessness and poverty is high as many people here have lost employment and business opportunities. The local population consists mainly of local immigrants as well as foreigners who came to work in the mines and local industries. Most of the people were either once directly employed by the mines or indirectly benefited from the various spin-offs brought by the mining operations".

The Westonaria Agripark started as an initiative of the surrounding gold mines. Faced with the closure of mine operations, mines started the Agripark to support retrenched miners and the local community. The nearby mines funded the clearing of a dumping site, belonging to the local municipality, to allow the community to start farming operations. Prospective farmers were paid a monthly stipend to clear the area and operate gardens. The initial farmers were recruited by the mining companies, and others responded to advertisements by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and applied for plots. The applicants are from the community, and unemployed, no prior experience was required, however, preference was given to women and youth.

The farmers are mainly organized as cooperatives others as PTY (LTD) companies. The local farmers, mostly women and youth volunteers, were provided with seeds and fertilizer and drew water from the neighbouring dam. The mines appointed, at their own expense, independent service providers such as horticulture experts, for advice on farming, and legal advisors to register the farmers as cooperatives. The farmers produced high-value crops such as kale, lettuce, pepper, carrots, lettuce, and tomatoes. The farmers sold their produce to street vendors, local community members, retailers, and businesses. When the local municipality took over the from the mines, the mines withdrew all their support for the farmers, including the monthly stipend.

The Westonaria Agripark is currently under the control of the local municipality, which is the owner of the land. The Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development finances developments, infrastructure, facilities, security fencing, equipment, and extension services. The same department coordinates the administration of all the Agriparks in the Gauteng Province. The department buys bulk inputs such as seeds and fertilisers, there is no individual breakdown perm item. Officials were unable to share the budget and or any financial information. Following the takeover by the government, the farmers' practices and markets have not changed, they continue to produce the same crops and sell to the same market. Farmers use their own labour, and implements, such ploughs, spades and rakes. No other private company or individual gives support, however, farmers at their own cost participate in training programmes outside the Agripark.

Since 2015, with the intake of the first group, none of the farmers has graduated out of the project, partly because of a lack of funds to purchase land and relocate farmers and partly because of the intervention of COVID-19. There are various neighbouring small-scale farmers using communal land or open municipal land who produce similar high-value commodities. The neighbouring non-beneficiary farmers finance themselves and/or are subsidised by other members of their families who are employed elsewhere. In some instances, the beneficiary and non-beneficiary farmers are kith and kin and cooperate in many innovative ways, like sharing of seedlings or use of transport. Both groups of farmers sell to the same markets, local communities, street vendors, bed and breakfast facilities and retailers.

I first knew about Westonaria from the different reports on Gauteng Agriparks, a conversation with an academic involved with food systems and a conversation with a provincial official, and that it is located in a huge black neighbourhood. It is very vibrant, very interactive and very community-oriented. I was struck by the reports and information, especially the existence of vertical hydroponic facilities about which the researcher wanted to understand more. Historically, it is a mining community, but is rather diverse today. I spoke to the project manager who is a University of Pretoria Masters' Graduate in agriculture, just before the Covid-19 restrictions. "We are, I reckon, practically certainly going to go expand operations in the next couple of years," he said. "The Department must allocate more funds to the Agripark. He introduced me to the interns, the Agripark employs agriculture graduate students on

one-year short-term contracts who were supervising farming, looking after the seedlings and distributing fertilisers to some of the farmers. KI.5 comments, the Agripark needs to be properly funded but, simply throwing money at the problem is not the answer. Instead, we need to think radically about how the Agripark can deal with the challenges of the future. We would be scientific with investment. Beside the government, private enterprise is actively promoting agro-commercialisation through high-value cash crops, and agrobusiness opportunities. Informants say, the Agripark is just the beginning of a process if Gauteng is to address the growing levels of farmer disadvantages and underperformance which are becoming increasingly evident at provincial and national levels. The commercial farming efforts are steadily diverting scarce agricultural lands from food production for the people to commercial production for industries and wealthy consumers.

This study finds that the Agripark places farmers for three years on an incubation programme to train, develop and prepare to 'graduate' and 'qualify' for agricultural commercial enterprise, to access land through redistributive programmes, to obtain private finance and to gain access to markets. In almost all instances, Westonaria Agripark, farmers either belong to a cooperative or a proprietary limited company (participants talked about registering proprietary limited company's which are also known as sole traders or personal liability companies). In the three instances where the entity was initially registered as a cooperative the farmers reregistered as a proprietary limited company. The choice of the legal entity is often influenced by consultants that farmers consult. However, there is largely a common, but unexplained, belief that a proprietary limited company is a more credible registered legal entity with private sector institutions, such as commercial banks. Upon further follow up questions on the choice of a preferred legal entity, it became clear that farmers believe that members of a cooperatives do not contribute equally in terms of labour and responsibilities. A farmer reckons the real concern is about the capacity of the individuals to relate to either of these legal entities, for instance no cooperative meetings are held by members, no minutes are kept and no bookkeeping is done.

In short, what farmers told me, was that they need a government that is in charge of change. They have difficulty with markets and infrastructure and they say the government has not been planning in advance. Farmers who want to graduate from the Agripark say they cannot afford land and the government has not helped them find any land. The farmers say they asked the government, for example, to negotiate a preferential local market agreement. The government has not done that and the farmers complain they have a crisis of the government being inattentive and unresponsive.

6.5.1.2. Site of Change and Development

The Agripark site is owned by the District Municipality and managed by the district municipality's local economic development unit. The Gauteng Provincial Department of Rural Development and Land Reform is the project leader who leases the land from the municipality. Before the Agripark was established, the site was a rubbish dump, used by locals for many years without authorisation. The neighbouring gold

mines, as part of the mines' social responsibility interventions, had the site cleared by the locals for a nominal monthly stipend, trained them on crop farming and registered the farming cooperative, bringing work and food. Informants told me that even before the Agripark was established, residents of the informal settlement area, especially women and youth, grew their own food. Most of them secured their family's consumption needs from their own produce. The Agripark programme took over residents' subsistence farming and residents started growing cash crops such as bell pepper, carrots, kale, spinach, cabbage and pumpkin. Informants told me that the transitions brought only a slight difference to what they had produced before, which was mainly cabbage and spinach. Before that, they produced for self-consumption but now they mainly produced to sell and use the income for their necessities. However, less often do they make a reasonable profit by selling to retailers and vendors but more often, the money generated from selling their produce is insufficient to meet their other non-food essentials. KI.1 observes that if a privatised system of production and distribution is allowed, regardless of promises to the contrary, the public system, Agripark, will slowly weaken and collapse. Also, the range of other subsidies, supports, and relief measures that rely on government intervention will invariably diminish and collapse. This was echoed by KI.4 who said, "public goods and services should be in public hands, not making profits for corporate agriculture agents; I support common ownership of land, environment and water". Interviews with farmers show that a protest action by the farmers against the Agriparks services and management raised concerns about the future of the site, inadequate state support despite repeated requests, that no private investors are willing to support them and that the markets are biased against the small-scale farmer. B.6, a farmer, tells me, "While we have reached some significant interim resolutions, we are not done". He adds, "We will continue the mission to let the state do enough to support us and provide access to fair markets and land for those who need it". KI.2 statements by the COP26 announce pledged by PPPs to fast-track agriculture innovation financed by the same agribusiness corporations that now mask many of their practices under the garb of 'climate-smart agriculture'. Also, "We receive fertiliser, seedlings and other inputs. However, state support is ad hoc, nurturing anxieties about its permanence and stability". B.7 says the government could "do better" in helping them get land outside the Agripark to allow to grow, and they often feel trapped within the programmes. B.2 wants to stay in the Agripark but says, "The government could do more to help us feel safe, improve security, improve the reliability of water and other facilities and motivate us to build a future by making it easier to become permanent". B.4 says, "we just need shelter and security and safety and to not worry about tomorrow. We will produce, sell and grow". On training, B4 says, "we do not receive any formal coaching, if I may name it that, I attended outside training and mentoring workshops to improve".

6.5.1.3 On land and Farming

The majority of interviewees agree that land reforms with shrinking budget allocations will not even begin to undo the socio-economic damage done to communities that lost land. Interviewees say that a

committed government, with political will, would enable communities across the country to thrive, providing security of tenure and prosperity for all. KI.2 argues, “The current structures are not fit for purpose as they focus on competition and not enough on the integrated approach to food sovereignty and environment that is so badly needed. We need to return to a more streamlined knowledge and hegemony structure for the agrarian system that is more in keeping with ecological objectives”. KI.2 adds, “what we really need to reform goes deeper than just supporting individual farmers. We need comprehensive reforms that give real powers to local governments to start community-based projects, rather than give responsibilities over national projects, and, together with institutional reforms, that remove pre-existing inequalities. Full community involvement in deciding priorities is something that any alternative proposal has to address”. B.8, describing how the programme emerged as a profoundly politicised form of expression for marginalised black farmers and landless rural people who are mired in poverty and hunger, says: “Here’s a programme that was created to embrace people who were excluded from agriculture – a programme that was born to fight exclusion”. B.8 stresses, “There’s no such thing as farming without politics – farming is politics.”

6.5.1.4. On Livelihoods

Since 2018, the Agripark has been politically neglected. According to B.1, the Agripark is in decline and the neglect has caused major imbalances in land, agricultural, rural and infrastructure development, but also in jobs and livelihoods. B.8 commented that there is a need for more public spending on agriculture, land redistribution, infrastructure investments. The data reveal that none of the farmers who enter the Agripark ever ‘’graduate’’ out of the system to get land and to farm autonomously. Instead, farmers are retained on their contracts long after the expired period. This is partly to the institutional arrangement between the Gauteng Provincial Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and the district municipal council as to which entity is responsible to fund farmers who have expanded their operations, it partly because there are no funds to support the farmers beyond the programme or to allow new entrants. Whichever is true, farmers confirmed a ‘’territorial’’ conflict between the provincial department and the municipality, the municipality being the custodian of the land and lessee, while the provincial department is the lead agent and services provider. KI.13 noted that, “There is no proper alignment between the province and the municipality at all significant levels. There is a ‘’turf war’’ here, politicians compete to take credit for the programme”. He also pointed to strained relations between the Agripark manager and the local economic development unit manager, stressing the lack of a common vision between the two. As such, farmers are behind or missing out on opportunities and the programme fails to achieve its milestone. This turnaround requires sustained political intervention, a positive culture, and quality support. KI.1 stated, “Introducing and maintaining the momentum of agriculture reforms has not been easily achieved, nor will future programmes. This is mainly because of the complexities of policy making, bureaucracy, regulation, and funding.” According to KI.1, “There is a mismatch between investment and opportunity in agriculture support”. Empowering emerging black farmers creates a

critical window for building the foundations that enable all farmers to become independent, entrepreneurial, resilient and capable. However, as B.8 explain, the current policy framework is not meeting the needs of small-scale farmers who stand to benefit most.

Overall, more than 80% of farmers think that the state is doing a good job supporting the Agripark. Just under half say the same on handling the land reform and rural development. Westonaria is not an outlier in this assessment, it is shared by other provinces. KI.13 states, “I agree that there are some problems with the programme and some aspects of the support services within the Agripark. I do think there are some very, very serious and significant issues that need, not just following up, but further examination”. During a go-along with farmers and a departmental official, I listened in on a confrontational exchange, taking notes. The following transpired: B.10, a farmer, said: “We’re faced with a government out of ideas and out of steam, too worn out by its own conflicts to do the hard work when it matters.” KI.10, a senior official, responded and denied that the Agripark was failing to reach its transformative objectives. He said, “The provincial department and local municipality are fully committed to transformation, not only in Westonaria but the entire province”. KI.10 stressed, “We have said it before about why we are doing this, in order to give farmers in the province the network structure they need to tackle the stagnation that has built up, as well as tackling the long-term issue of land, justice and equality. So, as I say, the province is committed to continue investing in the Agripark”. KI.10 added, “I would point back to the fact that this is something that we have legislated for, and again, we’ve been open with the justification for it”. Asked if he could promise no U-turns on the policy, the senior official said, “As I say, we are scaling it up in other districts like Ekurhuleni. Ultimately, the legislature would support the expansion of the programme”. KI.10 continued, “Of course, we understand that other social activists might not support Agriparks”. Asked if the future was certain with ‘no ifs, no buts’, the senior official responded, “Of course, I think the provincial premier was clear when he announced Agriparks”. The official rationalised why it is the right and best way to transform agriculture, justifying whether the policy decision today will determine whether South African farmers are equipped to take up the challenges of the future. He said, “We must act now to ensure black farmers can succeed in this new global order, they need land”. The group of farmers mumbled incoherently. Noticeably, they would like the Agripark to continue but it is important that the provincial department moves urgently to tackle the logjam that has grown in agriculture. KI.2 proposes, “The Agripark should open an arena for both the policymakers and grassroots people to engage in processes of the community. As a local platform for root level people in disadvantaged areas, Agriparks can play a significant role for rural development by emphasising sustainable agriculture, biodiversity, food sovereignty, agroecology and developmental challenges of the community and nation.”

One of the challenges is access to markets that give them a fair return for their produce and work. B.3, a young famer, tells me that they are facing market access challenges, meanwhile the government say

nothing. He has adapted to the situation by carrying his produce to the community where he sells door-to-door to make a living. While it is hard work, the benefit of this approach is higher prices paid in cash.

6.5.1.5. Reaching Out: Support and Extension Services

To understand the support services given to farmers, I considered both primary and secondary data sources because the Agripark concept is recent and no detailed local programmes or detailed studies have been implemented in this regard. I relied largely on interviewees to explore the scope and significance of the support, especially to understand the meaning beneficiaries attached to it. The Agripark master plan emphasises the collaboration of various agriculture sectors with the state to work towards a goal of social equality acknowledged to be in the interest of the public good. Government concerns about global economic competitiveness are increasingly driving research and development agendas to address the challenges of farmer practices and farmer development. The concern drives the quest of neoliberal policies in order to ''correct'' the challenges, so the research and development studies often incorporate ideas of competition and market choices. This leads to policies and programmes that reduce the role of the state in supporting farmers and that boost the expansion of the role of the private sector. All beneficiaries, including key informants, agree that state investment in small-scale farmers and rural development is woefully inadequate for their development. They recognise that focusing on women and youth will not only improve livelihoods and ease huge unemployment but save the environment. Supporting small farmers and rural development is not only good public policy, but it is also cost-effective.

KI.5, a programme manager, explains the Agripark strategy, “Agriparks remove unnecessary duplication and enable the deployment of a greater proportion of resources into the agriculture value chain. It contributes to a more efficient government footprint that will assist in achieving agriculture parity and ensuring the sustainability of government operations”. On integration, KI.5 states, “Removing the traditional silos in agriculture, government – within the relevant departments – will deliver an improved capability that truly focuses agriculture policies and programmes in an integrated and holistic approach”. On transformation, KI.5 states, “However, any large-scale reorganisation of the agriculture sector comes at a high price as it distracts and disrupts the service and risks paralysing the system”. On support and extension services, KI.5 states, “We provide the basic infrastructure and facilities, such as storage fridges, implements, fertiliser and seeds, we train our managers in various agriculture skills and provide the basic support. We also have interns on one-year contracts who provide additional support to the farmers.” Explaining the costs, KI.5 says, “This is at no cost to the farmer – we provide water, electricity and coolers, all at the state’s expense”.

Speaking to me during a go-along, KI.10 said political pessimism as expressed by social activists was “biased and unwarranted”. He said that the political parties’ statements had damaged the public image of the Agripark and knocked stakeholder confidence and the market currency. Referring to the political spat and accusations of corruption, he said, “The department should not abandon the Agriparks. I don’t

think we have a crisis here.: On research, KI.10 said, “We rely on independent researchers; we do not have internal capacity to conduct our own research”. On extension services, he said, “Our interns provide basic support to farmers on seedlings, watering and management of the crops; this is important for the quality of the produce”. Interviewees feel that disclosures such as these present critical questions about the government’s integrity and sincerity about research and development in agriculture. KI.14, a departmental official, defends this saying, “As a department we understand the importance of agriculture to our provincial economy, ending poverty and hunger as well as the role that research and development plays in nation building. If research and development is to empower learning, we must learn from our successes and failures and from the experience of other nations. We will need to be more pioneering in addressing the weaknesses in our agriculture system and the global challenges facing us”.

6.5.1.6. On Training

Individuals or groups seeking each other out and taking advantage of learning opportunities emerged as significant motivators. Farmers participated in various unscheduled training programmes, often at own cost. With regard to theorising about processes and mechanisms of farmer training, the findings show significant and valuable learning based on comradeship. However, in many instances, the interns provide training with no clear directives from the programme manager. Asked about related concepts on farmer training, for example, using key words like agroecology, sustainable livelihoods, sustainable agriculture, and integrated approach to rural development, all farmers showed a vague understanding of the concepts. However, all farmers showed and understanding of global warming and its possible environmental consequences. Again, all farmers showed support to methods that would mitigate global impacts.

The farmers expressed disquiet at the lack of training and development. B.10 expressed it thus: “We need to learn and develop the skills needed to solve problems. Farmers at all levels need to make greater use of well-designed training, cooperative and problem-based approaches. As farmers, we need to mix practices with the rapid adoption of smart technologies. Innovations are the result of the work of multidisciplinary teams, sharing ideas and daring outside the box. The lack of training is just another failing in a catalogue of poor management which has resulted in wastage of significant amounts of public funds.” B.8 commented further, “As small-scale farmers, we are increasingly under pressure with decreasing government support for agricultural development, we need training to find sustainable ways of farming and taking care of the environment. Otherwise, all will be truly lost, along with taxpayers’ money wasted”. KI.16’s take on training is, “We need to address the institutionalisation of apartheid practices and to create a stronger country and economy. We must plan for a non-racial future. We’ve got to grasp the possibility of agriculture and innovation smouldering across South Africa, meet our potential and seize hold of tomorrow”. In the meantime, many farmers endure what they describe as unfair farming conditions, fearful that demanding training will lead to a confrontation with the management

team. During an interview with farmers, they asked how, then, do farmers use experience to equip themselves with the capacity to actively participate in a network- and technology-driven period? I broached the training and development issues with interns on a one-year contract with the department. They said there was no coherent programme for emerging farmers. Also, the programme underscores research and development that create a learning environment, build capacity and improve skills of farmers to make agriculture globally competitive.

6.5.1.7. On Collaboration and Capacity

This section looks at the support given to emerging black farmers to ensure that they become more autonomous as envisaged by the programme. The section also looks at the challenges and opportunities, the provision of training, extension services, inputs and resources, and, to a limited extent, the culture and accountability of senior management. The findings inform questions of farmer efficacy and productiveness within a wider perspective of being and becoming a successful farmer. In Agriparks, farmer incubation is perceived as the initial stage of a practice spectrum of doing, developing and growing expertise, instead of a distinct preparatory phase building on existing knowledge. It is a non-linear process mediated by challenges and broader socio-economic and political context. According to interviewees, it is necessary rather than important that there should be a united, powerful, and relevant structure for farmers across the country to achieve fundamental change in the way that agriculture is approached. It is essential that farmers have a truly illustrative structure as a catalyst for change. The Agripark is such a structure.

The Agripark, in the ‘‘eyes’’ of respondents, should be reflective, represent the broad spectrum of farmers, and be a forerunner for change in South Africa. It is through engagement with the Agripark that farmers from all sectors and levels can actively contribute to setting the agrarian agenda. Emerging black farmers must lead the public debate on agrarian challenges and changes based on experience and evidence derived from the South African context. Data and information provide invaluable input for politicians and policymakers about the current state of support and other services at the Agripark and about what needs to be done at national level. The farmers showed an understanding of the importance of initial farmer support and of the necessary knowledge and skills to enter agriculture as effective emerging farmers. However, they also acknowledged that their training and growth were contingent on many variables. As noted, farmers’ observations about how well their incubation had prepared them were influenced by a variety of issues. In each discussion, 100% of farmers said they would recommend the incubation programme to others. Furthermore, 100% of farmers working on the Agripark were full time without alternative sources of income. However, all women farmers received government child grants. Those who held land outside the Agripark felt more positive about their prospects than those without their own land. I found that the context of various forms of formal and informal support to farmers had a large impact on how both beneficiary or non-beneficiary farmers perceived their Agriparks

programme experience. An opportunity brought by the Agripark with government support, at least in theory if non-existent in practice, is perceived as that farmers will be able to sell their produce at a market price directly to private buyers, agribusinesses, supermarket chains and online grocers.

6.5.1.8. On Networks

B.8 comments, “Agriparks should implement informative programmes; modern farming is based on technology and innovation.” Besides marketing and purchasing of seeds, Agriparks can help the farmers to get information about different methods and strategies of seed and seedling preservation. We need alternatives to the current form of farming. B.8 explains, “The Agripark is a broad platform of expressing and sharing varying views, thoughts, ideas, challenges and success of rural, disadvantaged, vulnerable and hardworking farmers. As a network, Agriparks targets information with regard to large-scale monocultural production. Of all the challenges facing us, global warming and climate change pose the most serious threat to our common future”. The findings verify that there is no road map for coherent farmer development, no looking beyond the end of another incubation year. The findings expand that no significant and valuable training was located for farmers, although administrative meetings were held. Further, the findings show that there is no sign that government will grab hold of the opportunities and tackle farmer challenges, to grow the sector, make it stronger and spread prosperity across the country.

6.5.1.9. Supporting Women and Youth

I find that, in general, women and the youth participate longer in the Agriparks programme. This will help prepare them for the high-skilled transition of the future. Five farmers interviewed were below the age of thirty-five years, the South African cut-off age to be considered a youth. The youth is also more likely to be able to adapt to changing agriculture systems and practices. The youth I interviewed spoke mostly of skills such as communication, teamwork, problem solving, creativity, and digital literacy that can be built into the training systems in a number of ways. However, there is still a significant number of youths that are not developing the technical skills they will need for future agriculture. Women farmers observe that a significant number of women and youth are not participating in the Agripark and developing the skills they need for complex and flexible work of the future. NB.1 aired her views saying agriculture may not be the wished-for miracle cure for women and youth empowerment. She reckons that agriculture institutions must equip women and youth with the basic skills needed for development. The state must engage with stakeholders to generate coordinated and flexible approaches to training and development. The government’s funding package to empower women and youth through training represents a good start. One interviewee, a land activist, states, “Our country has been torn apart in the civil war within capitalism: between the agri-businesses seeking stability and predictability, and the land grabbers and oligarchs who want to own and control the entire value chain’’.

6.5.1.10. On Covid-19

B.3 declares, “I’m in a position of a huge amount of responsibility. I’m basically caught in this whirlwind. It’s never wind-up. And now the costs of everything are rising and I don’t know what’s going to happen. We are going to suffer without income, which will cost the government more.” On the Covid-19 Social Relief of Distress Grant, B.3 says, “I have applied for the grant but still have not received a response. Deprivation will only deepen. It would help if we were offered a sustainable alternative, such as a basic grant sharply and continually argued for. In a pandemic, you need collective national action and state leadership”. Most informants knew of the government’s Covid-19 support package. At the time of my visits, none of the interviewees had received support. Interviewees rhetorically asked, given the number of destitute families in devastating financial ruin who could end up losing livelihoods, whether the state was in a position to impose and police a localised lockdown without additional funding from central government.

6.5.2 Second Case-study: JTGDM Kuruman

The John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality (JTGDM) is the second smallest district in the Northern Cape, comprising 186 towns and villages 80% of which are rural. The main economic activities are mining followed by agriculture and tourism. The JTG Agripark was launched in 2013 as part of the Fetsa Tlala (End Poverty) programme, an integrated government initiative to promote food security and end structural causes of food insecurity. The 50-hectare Agripark site is located along the N14 towards Vryburg.) The JTG Agripark is on non-arable land and without any high-potential agricultural soil; it is considered to be best suited to extensive livestock grazing production. The JTGDM area is renowned for its livestock farms producing cattle, sheep, goats, ostriches, and pigs. On-site infrastructure includes a surrounding security fence, a cattle kraal, dipping facilities, and water boreholes.

The Agripark land is owned by the district municipality, the provincial department of land reform provides extension service and inputs. The JTG Agripark seeks to address two objectives: build production capabilities by focusing on the production of livestock commodities (e.g. large stock (beef), small stock (sheep); and contribute to development through income generating projects that will boost the economy of the district municipality. The conditions of admission are not stringent, the target is small-scale livestock farmers, especially women and youth. The Agripark aims to extend the farming operations by marketing the products into local and global markets and setting up secondary industries for processing.

The Northern Cape Department of Agriculture, Land, and Rural Development is the centre for coordinating departments and stakeholders involved in the Agripark. The department believes it can deliver change without spending much more overall by redirecting, and reprioritizing existing budgets and lines of funding. The department aims to achieve its objectives by linking existing livestock farmers, cooperatives and approaching adjacent mining companies to invest in the initiative. The department

faces farmer support challenges, such as a lack of human resources and skills, made worse by poor management, that has frustrated the growth of small-scale farmers. The scope for raising the necessary revenue is limited as potential investors don't have confidence in the policies and government capacity to deliver. The aim is to construct fences, provide grazing land, breeding facilities and skills, feedlots, abattoirs, auction facilities, bone cutting equipment and veterinary services. For now, the JTG Agripark is in a state of disrepair and underfunded. The government officials say they are waiting for investors who could restore it to be able achieve its purpose. Local farmers graze their livestock on the otherwise unused land but not as part of any programme of the Agripark.

The non-beneficiary farmers in the area are often retired teachers or government officials with reasonable incomes. The farmers, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, organized themselves into the Ga-Segonyana Livestock Cooperative, entirely funded by its members with no support from the Agripark, to become self-sufficient and grow their livestock farming. The cooperative has 34 members and they have established a custom livestock feeding project, constructed livestock kraals, built storage for animal feed, and put in water systems. The cooperative with its livestock production development programme helps the farmers with breeding skills and cattle dip facilities. Farmers in the cooperative sell their livestock at various markets like the local auction, to individual buyers, and to various local catering companies. The farmers' main challenge is access to land, funds, and markets, especially at national and global levels.

In 2019, I visited Kuruman for the first time as a PhD candidate. I had worked in Kuruman for more than five years as the director of ANCRA, focussing on land issues, restitution, redistribution and tenure reform as well as rural development. As a result, it was relatively easy for me to make contact and talk to locals from almost all spheres of the community, but I was nervous about talking to the people as a researcher and student. However, it got easier with time. I stayed three nights with a local family and shared their sparse meals of daily cabbage and pap. We reminisced that ideology sometimes trumped common sense but that was born from decades of land struggles. My host commented, ''That has not changed. The ruling party betrayed its rural and working-class base''. The farmers' firmness on the need for state support is based on pragmatic motives. Farmers argued that small-scale farmers risk further marginalisation if they adopted agro-cluster farming practices without a supportive policy environment. In 2019, I visited Kuruman for the first time as a PhD candidate. I had worked in Kuruman for more than five years as the director of ANCRA, focussing on land issues, restitution, redistribution and tenure as well as rural development. As a result, it was relatively easy to make contact and talk to locals from almost all spheres of the community, but I was nervous talking to the people as a research student. However, it got easier with time. I stayed three nights with a local family and shared their sparse meals of daily cabbage and pap. We reminisced that ideology sometimes trumped common sense but that was born from decades of land struggles. My host commented, ''That has not changed. The ruling party betrayed its rural and working-class base''. The farmers' firmness on the need for state support is based on pragmatic motives.

Farmers argued that small-scale farmers risk further marginalisation if they adopted agro-cluster farming practices without a supportive policy environment.

6.5.2.1 Site of Change and Development

While many farmers, especially livestock farmers, live in the district, NB.3 says there is rampant poverty and lack of support services. As a result, the youth is immigrating to Tshwane, Kimberley or further afield to find work. “Farming is an important part of rural life. If we want it to be part of our future, we have to invest”. NB.3 adds, “Whether you support them or not, Agriparks are putting the microscope on rural issues”. A young livestock owner starting up comments, investing in the Agripark would be a good decision; it will help us organise better among the farmers. In an interview with farmers, interviewees say they supported Agriparks preparing youth and adults to participate in community development activities. Interviewees say it should be an inclusive environment which enables youth to mix and build positive relations with those from different areas, and equip youth with the skills, knowledge and values to be active community builders. Interviewees raised serious concerns about the lack of progress in view of rapid social depeasantisation and economic diversification.

6.5.2.2. On Land and Farming

In a district with vast income inequality, poor health and sharp political divides, the study’s findings have been grim. NB.6, commenting on land and farming, says, “We still have the tribal authority controlling land use that is frustrating to many of us because there are no regulations on the number of cows and disease control”. Answering on future prospects, NB.6 says, ‘‘One of the things that is really hurting at this point is there seems to be no light at the end of the tunnel’’. KI.9, who lost land during the formation Bophuthatswana homeland comments, “The pace of redistributing land from white to black ownership has been exceedingly slow and appears to have slackened and security of tenure is still a problem in the mostly rural JTG district”. On land use, NB.6 says, “The customary land rights of people should be endorsed and institutionally recognised”. He attributes the precarious land reforms to a lack of a comprehensive vision of the kind of agrarian restructuring that is desired, of the means to get there and of the intended beneficiaries. KI.3, giving a national perspective on land issues, farming and support services, argues, “What we have seen in the last 30 years or so is a gradual decline of state support and acceleration of land grabs, private investments and build-up of market forces. We cannot perfectly predict the future, but we have now been saying to the state for some time that we are in a window when a rampant social land occupation by the citizens could begin at any time, a major public action could begin in JTG any day now”.

KI.1, a land activist, highlights the land question, “Land reform in all its aspects, black farmers and rural development, is today’s question. And almost certainly tomorrow’s too, with continued injustice and inequalities. Three decades and a half on, I think, redistribution is, in fact, today’s question”. KI.1 declares,

“It is critical to help black farmers access farmland, but the emerging black farmer is not a neutral concept. The emerging black farmer is the product of a combination of dispossession and rampaging imperial acquisition. White-owned large-scale farms are sites that represent some of the most troubling legacies of empire, they can and should also be resolved. The state has a duty to act decisively”. KI.3, a politician and councillor, highlights the need to address the agrarian question more broadly: “The notion that land ownership should inform agrarian policy has deep roots. Activists from around the world, but especially in developing countries, have demanded for decades that states listen to their needs and create agrarian policies that actually address them. It is a major failure of the current state that well over two decades after democracy we are still left with an unchanged, multitiered agrarian structure”. On the Agripark, KI.3 says, “In the Agripark case it could be summarised that there is a serious problem with finances and planning; we are heading for the cliff edge, the consequence of this on the community could be disastrous”.

6.5.2.3. On Livelihoods

Amid rising rural poverty, most mines in the area have either closed down or are shutting down. Officials are under pressure to prove that they are aggressively confronting the issue of rural poverty and this is a significant concern among politicians. The politics of livelihoods and rural development are complex. KI.3 proffers that development initiatives too often ignore the voices and the needs of the people in the communities that are the most affected, stating, “Land, what it represents, is always of concern with black farmers”. NB.11, an agribusiness investor, comments on how the Agripark could support livelihoods and rural development, saying, “There’s no question that the district has plenty of socio-economic woes, but they can’t be blamed on the local community. One of the problems is that people’s movements are too weak, rather than too political”. He bemoans corruption, political dysfunction and lack of economic progress. He argues, “There is a reason for doing ant economic activity. Whatever is within our power can benefit our own social development. We realise we have some power. We are not helpless, even if our contribution is small”.

6.5.2.4. Finance and Markets

When it comes to livestock markets, small-scale farmers are always over-reliant on the purchasing power of their local community. Interviewees say that although some farmers go to auctions, they complain about the white farmer manipulation. For example, white farmers collude on the number livestock they bring to the market and have the resources to purchase this easily manipulate prices. Commenting on markets, NB.3 tells me, ‘‘The white unions impose the price of the livestock, they decide whether or not to bid on them’’. KI.3 says, ‘’Again, and again people judged the local market not as farmers but as a community,’’. KI.3 adds, ‘‘We do not have the technology and trace and tracking systems that are important in livestock value chains”. NB.9, a former education minister under the Bophuthatswana government and a tribal chief who backs the Agripark project initiative, states on markets and challenges,

‘‘The market reforms should include new rules on agents to create a more dynamic and productive economy’’. NB.9 says, ‘‘I am disappointed with the lack of progress. The Agripark working with the local farmers as a cooperative to supply the community was a progressive idea’’. On markets, NB.9 says, ‘‘Like most others, I sell my cattle directly to the community – funerals, weddings and other big events. I’m worried if unemployment rises significantly, that would be a bigger problem. I will not have buyers”.

NB.7, a school principal and part-time livestock farmer on communal land, comments that his farming, which he wanted to pursue with the Agripark, was the sort of diversification of income streams emerging farmers need to survive. He elaborates, ‘‘My farm would have created jobs for up to five people and given local farmers and other food producers a more lucrative market for their goods. It would also shorten the supply chain and reduce food prints”. He adds, ‘‘There is an ambition to allow farms to diversify, to attract more people into the value chain and break down the gap between farm and plate’’. Explaining that sheep farming was not viable in the village, he is keeping his flock with a neighbour’s. On finance, he says, ‘‘I cannot borrow money from the bank because I do not have a farm in my name. I have to use other reasons to get a bank loan’’. Concluding, he says, ‘‘It is difficult to get a loan when you don’t have a farm and you are black’’. KI.4, a member of a dairy farm cooperative who keeps more than 40 dairy cattle and would like to increase the number, says selling milk directly to the customer and producing cheese and amasi keep their business going. He says, ‘‘The cooperative hopes to add more products; all of that depends on whether or not they receive state support or a bank loan’’.

NB.11 says that, as a farmer, he was trying to do his bit to save the Agripark project by putting his skills to use within the community and participating in meetings. On finance, he says, ‘‘I would like a loan to buy land and cattle, but as a black farmer, I’m subject to all forms of bias’’. KI.3, a local politician and member of the local economic development committee, says the Agripark would provide services to the community and ensure the sustainability of farmers and farming while others in the sector would supply critical local products. NB.7 says, ‘‘People in the area used to have two job choices, either as farm workers or working in mines. But those jobs are few and anything that creates employment is to be welcomed. The department must try to get the best out of the district, but in the end, if it is to be seen as successful, it needs the councillors to get their house in order’’. NB.9, a post-graduate in livestock farming, says, ‘‘The Agripark project has several political and socio-economic aspects to it, but it has also fast become a symbolic battle between those who support active involvement of the state in agriculture and those who oppose it’’. NB.7 says, the importance of his project needs to be understood in terms of its effect on sustainable rural development.

6.5.2.5. On Support and Extension Services

Speaking about the potential of the Agripark, NB.9 submits, ‘‘Since the launch of the Agripark, there had been a lot of stakeholder engagement. The promise was that it involved a massive expansion of land redistribution – it will end rural challenges and struggles”. On extension services, NB.9 says, “From time

to time, extension officers announced visits to the village to come and vaccinate the animals. It is random, there is no routine. In fact, we buy our vaccination and feed". NB.9 adds, "From time to time, the chief asks the villages to contribute money for a borehole or chemicals to vaccinate our livestock". Speaking about the standstill of the Agripark, NB.7 explains, "Such enquiries into the Agripark are unavoidable and necessary. Not all the local farmers approved of the Agripark. People complained that it would only serve the interests of a minority of wealthy users. However, the project is weakened by a confusing and counterproductive bureaucracy. The current model simply will not work". KI.4, a dairy farmer, says about state support and services, "The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform has largely been absent in this dilemma while the district has not yet established health limits for livestock. Instead of implementing a wide-scale programme to test livestock well-being, extension officers count on us, the milk industry, to self-report and often we must get farmers' permission to test livestock conditions. Even now, some farmers with high levels of chemicals in the soil and water they would not let extension officers test their livestock. The state must disallow livestock farmers the use of antibiotics or steroids, establish health risk standards, compensate farmers who are impacted and hold chemical companies and polluters accountable". NB.8 laments the collapse of the JTGDM Agripark, "The Agripark would have been hugely successful, with shorter local value chains, when every added mileage brings a greater risk to the environment. The Agripark would have helped deprived women with little access to transport, those living in isolated rural areas and those without money. What is happening is haphazard, we need a lot more monitoring of our livestock to make sure we are keeping toxic chemicals out of our food supply". Concluding, he said, "As a black farmer, it is not easy to get a loan or investment because you do not have land and credit worthiness". NB.9, says local people were more worried about depopulation, people leaving the area, and basic services: 'It's about all kinds of infrastructure, from telecoms and internet to roads. He says, "The Agripark was always going to become financially viable and self-sustaining as a community-interest company, a type of social enterprise".

6.5.2.6. On Supporting Women and Youth

There was anger and frustration when I interviewed NB.6, a female farmer, and NB.8, a young farmer, both from Kuruman. NB.6 says, "We keep hearing lies, all the time, from politicians. We've got more work to do to get more women into farming. We have to show them we can be entrusted to succeed in farming with a very scarce amount of money we have". NB.8 echoes the sentiment, "The youth is marginalised in farming. Politicians pay lip service to youth empowerment". Commenting on finances, NB6, a qualified teacher, says, "I can't even get a loan because I'm a woman and I'm black". NB.8 echoes the same sentiment, "I have knocked on various doors for a loan, but because I'm a black woman I was denied".

6.5.2.7. On Covid-19

I find that most farmers did not apply for the government relief grant, either out of ignorance, distrust or lack of good advice. On government support, NB.6 says, "I did not apply for the government support grant

as I did not think I would qualify". Farmers say most social activities and businesses were closed, most of the time, during the early stages of the pandemic. However, since 2021, essential services have been allowed to stay open regardless of Covid-19 resurgences. Farmers and many citizens regard going to the farms almost as essential as accessing other public services. Speaking about going to the farm, NB.6 says, "We are in the rural areas. We could very much go where we please; policing was not very stringent. The challenge was going to town to buy supplies for the animals. When businesses opened, things went back to normal".

6.5.3 Third Case-study: Levubu Tshakhuma (Barotta UIGC Farms)

The Tshakhuma farms are in the Levubu area and stand midpoint between Louis Trichardt and Thohoyandou on the long-winding Punda Maria Road. Located in Thulamela municipality the Tshakhuma Community owns the 222 hectares of land which consists of 26 farms. The farms, formerly part of the Venda homeland, were returned to the community following a successful land restitution claim and bought at R67 million by the government. The Tshakhuma land was returned to the Communal Property Association (CPA) under the local chief. Under the CPA the farms collapsed and became unproductive because of alleged misappropriation of funds, corruption, and nepotism within the CPA. The infrastructure, like roads, irrigation systems, tunnels, and boreholes collapsed, and the electricity critical for cold storage was disconnected. Under the CPA the buildings and machinery were neglected and collapsed, as a result, the farms were unused for some years. The local municipality which has designated Levubu farms as an Agripark has yet to allocate funds to the initiative. The provincial department of land, rural development and agriculture, according to the district development plan is responsible for the Agripark, is yet to finance developments, such as infrastructure, equipment, machinery, and training facilities.

The Tshakhuma farms were returned to the community in 2006 following a successful land restitution claim. Following allegation by the community of corruption and mismanagement by the CPA farming collapsed during 2010. In 2016 the CPA appointed the University (of Venda) Innovation Growth Company (UIGC) as the exclusive project manager and financial adviser. The University of Venda signed a joint partnership agreement with the Tshakhuma community to constitute the "Tshakhuma Barotta UIGC Farms". The UIGC, an investment wing of the University of Venda, is exploring various types of private capital investment, including private equity, venture capital funds, and consortiums. The farms were on the brink of collapse when the UIGC came on board as an investment partner to restore stability. The UIGC invests in increased production capacity, infrastructure, and the community to provide suitably skilled farm workers. For the UIGC, production growth without export markets is difficult, exports without being members of historically white owned cooperatives and marketing agents are risky. Currently, there are no new private investors and the farms are relying on income from sales for any new investments. The university of Venda was not forthcoming with its expenditure information, which includes payment

for electricity, provision of seeds, fertilizer machinery, and equipment. During my visits talking to the managers and farmers, I was told there is a need for private capital investment to bring the farms to full production, and to repair the dilapidated infrastructure, facilities, and buildings. They also said the university has limited resources.

The community doubts that there will be a successful future for the farms without state support. Owing to the interventions of both the Venda University and Tshakhuma College, the community has developed management skills, trained in seedling production and nurturing. Tshakhuma College of Agriculture, which is based in the village, entered into an agreement with the CPA in 2017 to allocate interns to support and provide advice to the farmers. The farms have three permanent staff, seconded and paid by the university.

The Tshakhuma community, located next to the farms, is experiencing high unemployment rates, poverty, and economic stagnation, especially among women and youth. The CPA with the UIGC is working to get the farms back to full production to help address these challenges. The farmer workers come from the beneficiary restitution Tshakhuma community, and their numbers and skills vary based on the production and harvesting seasons, almost always around 50 farmers. The farmworkers include packers, drivers, mechanics and security personnel. The farms sell to local markets, street vendors and the Johannesburg Fresh Produce Market, as well as doing contracting farming for local wealthy farmers.

Levubu, where the Tshakhuma farms are situated, is close to the “Punda Maria Road Market” operating on the side of the busy road literally around the clock, selling fresh produce such as spinach, mangoes, avocadoes and bananas. The street vendors at the market are mostly women who source their products from the Agripark, small-scale produces, and white commercial farmers in the area.

The Levubu area around the Agripark has many black farmers who are non-beneficiaries, who are growing and expanding their operations. Most of the black small-scale farmers are self-funded, others are in partnerships with the existing white commercial farmers in the area. These black farmers who own their land or lease it from white farmers, use modern machinery and farming techniques, as well as employing full-time managers and workers. Some of the black farmers use agents, for a fee, to sell their produce at the Johannesburg market or export to global markets. Macadamia nuts, litchis, and avocadoes are some of the profitable crops that are exported from this area.

Before I visited the Levubu farms, I had by chance met NB.4, a supervisor at the farms, during a Spring Day fresh produce promotion in Soweto. So, I had a good idea of their operations when I first visited. When I arrived in Levubu, the supervisor, together with NB.12, the manager, and NB.5, another supervisor, drove me across the farms. They emphasised the phrase ‘the farms. Standing at the back of an open bakkie, ducking when driving under hazardously low hanging avocado and litchi tree branches, they pointed out stretches of cultivated and uncultivated land areas, all belonging to the community.

There were other kinds of trees as well, for example macadamia nut, mango, and banana, all under various demarcated areas. I also saw broken infrastructure such as a water dam, damaged irrigation tunnels and inoperative machinery. They explained that the farms were not fully utilised (but) have the potential for other crop types or even bee keeping. B.4 explained that the farms, under the former Venda Bantustan government, were heavily subsidised by the apartheid government and were vibrant, supplying food and creating employment opportunities. Market agents took the farm produce to the markets, far and wide. He complained that, under the democratic government, there was no such investment and support. However, he admitted that the initial post-settlement grant given by the government to the community to start farming operations was the source of conflict and was no well invested in the farming operations. They spoke of the lost opportunities due to community infighting, and the outside security fences falling down, which increased theft of produce, implements and infrastructure. They pointed out wrecked and partially dilapidated boreholes, pipes, and water tunnels, all of which negatively affected the viability of the farms and attraction of future investments. Many of the buildings that housed the previous Bantustan management were either destroyed or in a poor state of disrepair, including offices and cooler rooms used to ripen bananas.

A statement from one of the young interns who has benefited from the mentoring reads, ‘‘We are completely blown away by how much we are learning and growing’’. NB.6 tells me, confirming other accounts, that the community is unaware of their status as an agri-hub. “Neither the consultants who wrote the master plan nor the district officials interviewed or informed us or the community”, says NB.6. I ask NB.5 about the UIGC strategy and he explains UIGC is expected to provide widespread support to the community but the support will be removed or at least greatly reduced over time. “Support at the levels we provide is not sustainable indefinitely, unless there is private investment”. NB.5 says it is difficult to indicate their operational costs and profit as the amounts vary according to seasons and quality and quantity of produce. However, NB.5 stresses that they are not making much profit. NB.4 and NB.5 tell me that crops can be wasted owing to a variety of factors that are often beyond a farmer’s control, like produce not being the right shape or size for supermarkets, weather patterns changing harvest times or labour shortages. The farmer cannot sell the sub-grade produce, though perfectly edible. Such produce is then sold at local marketplaces at ‘‘buy-it-now’’ prices. NB.5 adds that lack of private investment or state support has adversely affected their farming capacity, with huge tracts of land lying fallow. Because of lack of funds, the farms are unable to invest in infrastructure and facilities like storage refrigerators and tractors, even in improving ablution facilities for the workers. During my go-along I observed old buildings, underutilised infrastructure, dilapidated equipment, and damaged boreholes, water tunnels and machinery which would not be repaired because of lack of capital.

B.5 proffers, “We have an entire political system that doesn’t work for us rural farmers. We need to challenge it so as to change it. The government is in a cul-de-sac concerning black farmers”. B.4 adds,

“We were never consulted or told that we were an agri-hub. It is the first time we hear from you, what does it mean for us?” They need to tell us that. Talking about his involvement, NB.4 explains that the supervisors were deployed by the UIGC to assist the community. He says, “Supervisors and members of the support team earn less than what is stipulated as a minimum wage or industry benchmark standards in the sector, whichever is higher”. The supervisor and claimants are shocked and surprised when they see the district plan which indicates that they are designated as an agri-hub. “Nobody told us anything”, they all say.

The farms stand in hideous contrast to the many privately owned white industrial farms on the same road. Not only do the whites farmers have better access to private funding and bank loans but, as agents, they also control the agriculture value chain. If any of the independent growers’ practices conflict with their [agents’] standards or with the local cooperation, and in cases of noncompliance, this can lead to the termination of the relationship, NB.5 tells me. B.4 says, “In this belt, small and medium-sized local enterprises give way to a group of large-scale farms, most of which are white-owned, and almost entirely export-oriented”. Agents export almost all of the macadamia products, dubbed “green gold” by local farmers. The bananas, avocados and litchis go to the fresh produce market. From what I witnessed, and as backed by some farmers, the local street vendor buys the poor-quality leftovers, which they sell cheaply to locals and travellers at easily negotiated prices or given bantsela, for free.

6.5.3.1. On Land and Farming

Interviewees tell me the story of the Levubu farms as cash crop exporters began in the late 70s, when Venda became an independent homeland under apartheid policy of separate development. The South African government subsidised land and agriculture in the newly created bantu homeland, creating a two-pronged strategy to consolidate apartheid hegemony. The Venda agricultural cooperatives had a one-way duty-free access to South African markets for a range of products, such as avocados, bananas, litchis, mangoes and nuts. The CPA took over the farms as a going business concern, in the early years due to community conflict lack of capacity, and more importantly lack of state support, the farms experienced economic decline. The University of Venda (Univen Innovation Growth Company) intervened to provide support because of geographical proximity providing managerial capacity, advice and support to produce at more competitive prices. B.5, tells me “I would very much like to have my own independent farm, perhaps I will be able to attract investments.” The sentiment is shared by about 70% of the other farmers who would like to be on their own.

6.5.3.2. On Livelihoods

Most people do not appreciate how much land is needed exclusively to support industrial crop farming and its wider environmental impacts said NB13, an intern. “We are using this land in a manner that creates an environmental footprint and a lot of problems that contribute to climate change,” she tells

me. Today few people are employed on the farms and huge hectares of arable land lie idle, most of the food eaten in the village is from outside the area, grocery prices are high and many people experience food insecurity. “Unemployment is high and prices are high, migration from the area is high,” NB13. “I think the growth of this farm is a sign of how much support there is for it,” NB.14, an intern says: “I really think there is a positive energy among the community people to bring the farm to full capacity.” NB.14. Interviewees, tell me, they use their earning on essentials like food, education and medication and transportation, one person used her earnings to open a Spaza shop to support her extended family. Another interviewee helped his daughter pay for her college tuition to improve the family fortunes. Almost all participants said that the earnings helped to reduce their stress and worry about finances. Despite the relatively small amount of earnings, most of the participants were able to build houses. NB.15, a tractor driver uses the earnings to move out of the family home and build a shelter for his family. NB.16, says the earning allows her to save for the education of her children, she also receives a grant for her two children. NB.16: “Without it, I would still be struggling to meet my daily needs, much less save for schooling.” She also receives a grant for her three children. NB.17 uses the earnings to support her elderly parent who also receives a government pension grant. NB.18 who lives in a single-room can afford to buy basic supplies and maintain her children. To have a community able to secure livelihoods on their own resourcefulness and work with others to get the development they need, it is important to keep it going and there is a moral obligation for the state to invest and also encourage other communities to try to do similarly, says KI.6.

6.5.3.3. On Support and Extension Services

significant support and extension services, in a range of content areas, is organised by university of Venda (interviews). Almost all respondents tell me that they did not have formal training, capacity and knowledge, all relied on intergenerational hand-me- down skills. The training content is structured in formal academic ways, such as knowledge, skills, and capacity. For example, knowledge reflects the education curriculum, based on rote learning rather than the lived experiences of the farmers. In the interviews, respondents identified the main barrier as the lack of concerted state support. Respondents endorsed private investment in collaboration with the state, in a tripartite partnership of the community, state and investors. On top of this, farming for profit, rather than immediate needs, is often very complex and sometimes controversial. NB.4 and 5, related concerns regarding the commercial crop production, one of the most common was a concern about meeting market standards, especially coming from a low resource base and the lack of knowledge and understanding of how to integrate into industrial farming. “So, in light of this challenging context, how do we begin to incorporate global regimes in Levubu,” NB. 4 says.

For the community people, farming is both a basic human practice and a public service. It is one of the best investments that an individual or a community can make, bearing a wide range of economic, social,

health and cultural benefits. In economic terms alone, investing in small scale farming is critical to rapid and sustained economic growth and quality of life. Given that individuals and society benefit from investing in farming, it is not unreasonable to expect the cost burden to be shared. NB.5, “we believe such a project can help maintain the long-term economic and social stability of Levubu”. The number of community members seeking work has tripled in the last ten years, increasingly as well, graduates from the local agriculture college want work. If current development trends continue, demands for commercial activities and services will grow exponentially, requiring the financialisation of production systems. However, the driving force in the food production market seems to be self-interest. We must use the opportunities created by the university for economic growth and development, not just to prop up our tertiary institution.

6.5.3.4. On Supporting Women and Youth

NB.5 observes that women and youth are the most employed groups, in the face of the challenges, an upsurge of interest in food and farming among women and younger people is emerging, as a campaign demanding equality and social justice. Small scale farming is urging a revival in locally grown produce, which vendors, retailers, officials and informants argue will revitalise the local economy, improve food sovereignty, halt the decline towards poverty and hunger. NB.14 “the majority here on the farms are women and the youth, we would like to see more women coming in not only as vendors but as farmers, but, we need state support for that.” NB.15 “there is a lot of talk about women and youth empowerment but we are still to see that. We have many graduated from the college who are still unemployed.” Adding, most women and youth would like to own their own farms and become business people, like most of the white farmers in the area, but we do not have loans or investment support.”

6.5.3.5. On Covid-19

Interviewees are especially concerned about what Covid-19 has meant for people who had gone weeks without an earning and are not eligible for state unemployment benefits. The Levubu farms had to shut during the Covid -19 restrictions and delayed reopening because of lack of PPEs, they cannot afford any (during my visits no Covid-19 measures were in place, despite government calls for mandatory masks and 2m social distances (interviews). The management applied for the president’s grant and received a miserable R50000 much to their displeasure, which they could use to only buy fertiliser. Individual members were advised to apply some received support and some were still waiting (interviews with farmers).

6.6. Conclusion

Emerging black farmers already have customs in the form of practices and sets of rules and principles that govern their daily life. This chapter highlight the dynamics in the three study sites, the practices of emerging black farmers, such as selling locally to informal and municipal markets, stakeholders and

support systems. Repeatedly, commercial interests trump emerging black farmers' practices and broader societal interests. Rather than affirm emerging black farmers' rights to remodel their practices, Agriparks have allowed entrepreneurs to control what emerging black farmers learn and how they learn it. Entrepreneurs' interests, such as cash crops and livestock bred for markets, have sacrificed important principles on which human rights are based, such as dignity, fairness, respect, justice and equality. As KI.4 told me, the governing party has demonstrated that it is not committed to amending agriculture structures and rural programmes. As a result of these misplaced priorities, we are seeing the exacerbation of land-related and market inequalities. It is important to note that participants considered the agriculture marketing plan as a neoliberal framework that does not advance their interest (see section 2.3.8 and 5.1).

Chapter 7 Analysis: Striving for Agrarian Equity

7.1. Introduction

This chapter presents a wider analysis of the findings of the study sites, relating the findings to broader global issues of land reform, agrarian reforms, and agriculture. The chapter raises issues of neoliberalism and globalisation in the context of the state and its role in reforms. Globalisation has influenced the forces and relations of production on a world scale; and, for many countries, this has implications for the agrarian question and agrarian transition (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2010). Globalisation reconfigures agrarian relations into a global system via agri-clusters, influencing the role of the state as a catalyst of reforms, with specific reference to the CRDP through the implementation of Agriparks. In focusing the analysis, I pay attention to and reference issues that relate to land, agrarian change, rural development, agriculture, state and black farmer practices in particular, as explained in chapter one. This framework of analysis is particularly relevant to the case studies placed in a historical context where the meanings attached to notions of black farmers and emerging black farmers have changed considerably over a particular time frame. In this context, Cousins (2013) indicates that the primary beneficiaries of land reform in South Africa should be ''the rural poor'' and ''smallholders'', rather than "commercial farmers". Also, Cousins argues that the nucleus of agrarian reform in South Africa should be the large-scale redistribution of both land and water to a nascent class of small- to medium-scale market-oriented farmers who are able to engage in ''agricultural accumulation from above and below''. Accumulation from above describes a situation where capitalist farmers, producing for profit, engage in commodity farming, and accumulation from below exemplify family farming. This will be a minority of the rural population, but a sizeable one, comprising around 200,000 households, or a million people (Cousins, 2015). It is my analysis that the post-apartheid government has not ensured that the demographics within agriculture reflect the diversity that exists within the farming sector. Calls for state interventions in agriculture is based on the historic connection between the economy and the socio-political power structure. An informant commenting on global agriculture and Agriparks, says, these trickle-down programmes create inequality in the world as a whole, between the global north and the global south. Inside Agriparks, inequality is one of the most obvious experiences we have. What we need in this country is a programme that takes more care of small-scale farmers. We need a national reform programme that brings women and youth into sustainable farming as the most vulnerable groups.

7.2. Globalisation: Accumulation from Above

I find that there are some synergies that emerge from the informants and literature to the various challenges. That the political arena of policy-making, power, and institutions providing support service. Issues of justice and equality, as well as democratic transformation, have been replaced with targets, key performance indicators, and small farmers as state clients. Small farmers, hard-working families, and

rural working people (those without secure access to land and resources) are not being served well by the Agriparks executive and deserves state support for their effort and hard work. In my discussions with informants about small-scale farmers, black farmers are regarded as constituting a singular community. The majority of black farmers have been, for the most part of previous settler governments, the highest discriminated and segregated group in the sector. White farmers owned the best agricultural land and control the agriculture value chains. From an array of literature resources, two dominant perspectives emerge which guide the analysis of the key research findings. Both perspectives, political economy and neoliberal, are detailed in chapter three. As indicated in chapter six, the findings indicate extreme polarisation based on race in South Africa's agrarian structures, and the impact of this polarisation on agrarian relations remain strong.

As indicated in previous chapters, especially chapters three and four, the analytical convergence of this study, on land and agrarian reforms, rural development and small-scale farmers, is widely proliferated in literature (see Akram-Lodhi, 2007; Araghi, 2000; Byres, 1977; Cousins, 2013a; Hall, 2009a, 2009b; HSR, 2006; Long and Van der Ploeg, 1988, 1994). Furthermore, my findings confirm what Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2010) as well as Bernstein (1985, 2010, 2013) assert that there are multiple means and methods by which regulated capitalist social relations of production of who owns what could be established in agriculture. The notion of multiple ways of establishing capitalist social relations incorporates both the global and the local. However, establishing capitalist relations of production in agriculture is not an event but a complex and contradictory process. I agree with Bernstein (2010) that aspects of social inequality relating to market domination in a class-based society shaped models of agrarian change in both developed and developing nations against which class binary oppositions are established and maintained. The key contention being made with assertion is that globalisation has constructed an elaborate system of interconnected an interdependent social relation (See, chapters 6.2.1 a new globalised agrarian order, and 6.2.5.4 on agro-processing).

7.2.1 Reconfiguration of Agriculture Systems

In the twentieth century, agriculture built ''innovative'' linkages between the North-South agribusiness relations. The global agriculture ''innovation'' is organised under the universal umbrella of the agro-based clusters, summarised as networks of producers, agribusinesses, and institutions that are attached in a similar agricultural or agro-industrial subsector and that build agri-value chains when addressing common challenges and when pursuing common or collective interests. In tandem, global agriculture markets – especially global agro-value chains – increase in both size and scope. Extensive and interwoven supply chains have been constructed with agriculture goods moving backwards and forwards across borders in the pursuit of gains in efficiency and profits, and money flowing into emerging markets looking for high returns and flowing out again (see, chapter 6.4, KI.5). In my findings, the concept of the 'innovation' has taken on divergent meanings and manifestations, it offers the ideas of ''commercial counter

urbanisation'' to explain the growth of rural economies stimulated by inward migration (see, Bosworth, 2010). Key informants equate agriculture clusters with suppliers of specialised inputs, machinery, services, and infrastructure, while other researchers view clusters through a much broader lens of characteristics and forms of social histories and identities.

Generally, agriculture clusters involve behaviours, values that are learned, shared, and shown by a collection of people, including state and other institutions, such as universities, agencies, extension services providers, and associations that provide training, information, research, and technical support. Clusters are considered as a catalyst for sector cooperation, diffusion of innovations, and channels for public support to increase competitiveness in the agricultural sector. Though agriculture clusters are almost non-existent in some countries, but, they play a leading role in the development of agriculture and agro-based industry in many other countries (see, Ji-Hyeon, Jang & Byung-Joon, 2007). The development of specific country agriculture clusters follows different routes: some are a result of centralised state planning while others are the outcome of the collaboration between pioneer entrepreneurs and the public sector. In other cases, clusters are generated by the initiative of large entrepreneurs alone. State institutions emphasise that the support for agriculture clusters is valuable for agricultural enterprise growth and integration into global agricultural value chains in a more efficient and sustainable manner (Galvez-Nogales, 2010). In agriculture clusters, research studies reveal a strong economic buoyancy.

7.2.2 Building Homogeneity Through Synchronisation of Practices

I particularise agricultural clusters as an assembly point of agriculture producers, practices, agribusinesses and institutions that occupy a similar agricultural or agro-industrial subsector. I find that they are interrelated and build value chain networks when tackling common challenges, and undertake common opportunities. In Levubu farming practices aiding agribusiness value chains comprise of urban-rural programmes, mechanisms and strategies to enhance productivity and market access within the global business (see, Dolan & Humphrey, 2004; Gwynne, 2003), that also supports the contemporary capitalistic imperialistic order (Jussaume, 1994; Jussaume et al., 2000a). Based on my literature review and interviews, I acknowledge the historical basis and the socio-cultural dynamics influenced by neoliberal production model which redefines farmers' experiences. Agriculture clusters reframed farming genealogies and cultures causing homogeneity, redefining structural features, and challenging established forms of production practices. Galvez-Nogales (2010: xi) propounds that, in a globalising context of standardisation, high-value production, immense growth in produce demand, retail, packaging innovations, and production efficiency, the 'new agriculture' supports clusters.

7.2.3 Horizontal and Vertical Agriculture Linkages

I assert that the principal feature of agriculture clusters lies in their embedded relationships, at both vertical and horizontal levels, maximising value through various value chain networks. In Levubu, the farms offer a contrasting context for the detailed examination of the political, economic, and social life of land restitution. An informant observing the disparities between the Levubu farmers and the neighbouring white commercial farmers, comments: thirty years on, we can see the issues of land and access to markets as more complex and less given to simple binary oppositions. The challenges facing farmers and small-scale agro-industries is what is explained by Galves-Nogales (2010) as a ''transaction relationship'' within which the farmers produce and sell a product as ''price-takers''. In these various relationships, producers are subjected to the vagaries of the free markets and producers have limited or no opportunity for creating value or for initiating richer commercial and developmental spin-offs. Agriculture cluster build 'Value networks' build value relations, raising potential for long-term effectiveness within the agricultural sector. As shown in Levubu, section, 6.5.3, value network establishes interactive relationships: vertical relationships among suppliers of raw materials and production inputs, agricultural producers, processors, exporters, branded buyers, and retailers. Also, Value relationships among producers take the form of growers' cooperatives or various types of smallholder business related consortiums. At a global level, value networks support relationships between producers and related sectors that support the quality, efficiency, sustainability of the value chain, like local governments, business service providers, research institutes, universities, and non-government service organisations. I find that, the value chain networks are slow to create wealth and prosperity in the small-scale agricultural sector.

7.2.4 Corporatisation and Concentration of Agriculture

The agricultural value chain covers a series of connected activities to bring an agricultural product from the farm to its end-user and beyond. A ''global agricultural value chain'' spreads among multiple firms and across wide swaths of geographic space, hence the term global (Vorley and Fox, 2004). In relation to the universal corporatisation and concentration of agricultural value chains in the hands of a few corporations, a key informant raised the threat of small-scale farmers being assimilated into corporate agribusiness chains pursuing profit at the expense of livelihoods. Global corporate value chains are driven by the increasing scale and international consolidation of the market; the growing role of global corporations; the liberalisation of markets; and the growing ascendency of large food retailers in food distribution. Examples of this happening in South Africa are touched on in section 2.3.8. The globalisation of corporate value chains entails a focus on similarities, standardisation, homogenisation, concentration, and coordination on a worldwide basis (see Chapter 6.5.2). South Africa face a contrasting agriculture structure as most agriculture investment is directed toward infrastructure for export rather than downstream food delivery to communities. As the country pushes for rapid agriculture transformation,

there is a need to think critically about agriculture investment, regulation and ownership, so that agriculture is less extractive, corporates are held accountable, and communities benefit through co-ownership or community ownership (see, Levubu, Chapter 6.5.3). With the global corporatisation and commercialisation of agriculture the universal outcomes are agriculture becomes technology and capital intensive, thus causing an anti-smallholder bias (Bernstein, 2013; Cousins, 2013b). Commenting on commercialisation and corporatisation of agriculture a key informant commented: "Spiralling farming input costs tear through the notion of small-scale farmers as a communal force for rural livelihoods as inputs become increasingly unaffordable, the practice of farming now seems to be earmarked for a select wealthy few".

7.3. South Africa's Dilemma

The main assertion is that globalisation of agriculture has constructed an elaborate system of interconnected and interdependent social relations. Writers such as Harvey (2003), Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2010), Bernstein (1985, 2010), and Araghi (2007) assert that there could be multiple ways by which a set of capitalist social relations of production could be established in agriculture. The multiple ways of establishing capitalist social relations incorporate the global and the local, and capitalist relations of production in agriculture is a complex process (see, Chapter, 6.5.3). In my analysis I consider two key perspectives. The first perspective is the neoliberal viewpoint that argues for a regulated state role in society, waging on deregulation, privatisation, and marketisation (see Broad, 2004; McMichael, 2007). Since 1994, South African agriculture reform has been broadly aligned to neoliberalism, for example through economic policies such as GEAR and ASGISA. On neoliberalism, Kurtz and Brooks (2008) argue it is not either less state or supremacy of the markets proffering an ''embedded liberalism'' in which liberalisation (i.e. of trade) co-exists with certain other forms of state intervention, such as export promotion, service provision, and public employment generation that appeal to (particularly middle-class) voters (see, Westonaria: Chapters, 6.5.1.2. Site of Change and Development, 6.5.1.3, On land and Farming, 6.5.1.4. On Livelihoods, and 6.5.1.6. On Training). Bruhn (1996) and Graham and Kane (1998) state that opposition to neoliberalism is less prevalent than anticipated because governments make strategic use of targeted benefits to compensate social groups negatively impacted by reforms, hence neutralising potential opposition. Some scholars maintain that market-led restructurings create new forms of social and economic exclusion but others interpret popular support for market-led restructurings as evidence that these policies make people better off than they would be otherwise (see Bair & Hough, 2012). The second perspective is the political economy. It conceptualises issues of political power structure, class, race and gender (Akram-Lodhi et al., 2008; Long and Van der Ploeg, 1988, 1994) to address historic injustices and inequality. Commenting on the dilemmas facing South Africa's agriculture an informant argues that the greatest lack of diversity in the country's elite agriculture is not only racial but class-based. Additionally, beyond these two perspectives, what needs to be forged is a

universalist perspective that embraces equal treatment but does not deny the reality of existing racial inequality. In a political economy analysis, government introduces transformation measures to develop and consolidate a new class of agricultural commodity producers in the districts.

Post-colonial scholars, aligned to this school of thinking, have further outlined and reformulated several critiques. These scholars look at the colonial history and how it continues to impact former agrarian reforms and perpetuates pre-existing inequalities from where the legacy of colonialism continues to shape agrarian relations and efforts to alleviate poverty and the life circumstances of thousands of poor people, requiring root-and-branch agrarian reforms (Shivji, 2013). I draw generously on Araghi (2007) who argues that a peasant may own some of the means of production (e.g., title to a small plot of land) but may have lost his or her non-market access to the means of subsistence, [because they] have lost control of the labour process. What they produce, how they produce, and for whom they produce are decided mainly by the agro-food corporations (or their subcontractors). Here agriculture production is carried out by the peasantry but not for the peasantry (Araghi, 2000: 150). I consider this argument significant as it analyses the extent to which rural producers may lose control of their own labour processes without being dispossessed of the land they are working. For instance, Levubu farmers produce cash crops for the unregulated markets rather than for their immediate needs even though they own their land. As Bair and Hough (2012) explain ‘‘rural producers lost control of their labor process not to “agro-food corporations (or their subcontractors)”, but rather to agencies of state’’. The authors describe this as partial possession. ‘’Possession’’ is used to refer to producers’ control over the means of production, such as the land. However, this form of possession is ‘’partial’’ because the ability of producers to maintain a livelihood by growing crops is contingent upon continued access to the government support that underwrites their participation in these commodity markets. For instance, in Westonaria, the farmers have partial user rights but production is influenced by state services and inputs. An informant in Levubu asserts: “At a practical level it comes to redistributing resources and capital”. The informant is engaged in schemes and interventions to give capacity skills to marginalised rural communities”.

There is mounting critique among respondents and key informants of this study that the state’s efforts maintain and perpetuate pre-existing apartheid inequalities and neoliberal capitalist status quo, both serving the interest of minority white farmers. The state, in recent years, has deliberately outsourced authority and power to unfettered agents and private retailers, refusing to take seriously its responsibility to the public. Bair and Hough (2012) caution that the dependence of rural communities on state support fosters clientelist bonds between the producers and the state, which, over time, result in conservativism in the producers’ political tendencies. Harvey (2007: 40) argues, neoliberalism imperils the material well-being and cultural integrity of working people and their communities, it is hatching a ‘‘swath of oppositional movements’’ that open new ‘’lines of social and political struggle’’. Baker (2010), in

mitigating the extremities in neoliberalism and market debates, argues that people show support for trade liberalisation because they recognise that it benefits them in the form of access to lower-priced imports. Among other political economy scholars, Akram-Lodhi (2007), Amin (2003), Araghi (2000), Broad (2004), Byres (1977), Cousins (2013b) and Hall (2009a) explain commercialisation and marketisation as well as deagrarianisation and depeasantisation in farming, together with state responses and private sector collusion. McMichael (2007) locates the sharp increase in these rural processes in the industrialisation of global chains, the establishment and expansion of agribusiness chain courses and the organisation of agriculture through land grabs, contract farming and agri-clusters. Private agri-food standards have materialised as a major factor influencing both technical and social relations in global agri-food systems. Expanding market power and concentration of the Global North retail sector, their fast infiltration in the global value chain and the food market in the Global South, and the aiding neoliberal ambient under the global rule of the World Trade Organisation encapsulate the major milieus. The agri-food global value chain began to enhance value-adding activities, raising anxieties with modernisation of the procurement system in general, and hygiene conditions. Most importantly, it required the establishment of post-harvest storage, packing and barcoding, which necessitated further investments in refrigerators, and an assortment of equipment and machineries (Dolan & Humphrey, 2000). These changes in the global value chain have imposed significant investments in an array of new technologies and facilities. The changes have required rising overhead costs for the upstream sector, particularly exporters.

From this conceptualisation of agrarian reforms and relations, the analysis revolves around global land grabs and industrialisation under neoliberalism, where a well-defined evolution of programmes and particular phases becomes obscured. Akram-Lodhi (2007), Amin (2003) and Araghi (2000) signify strengthening the power of the state, alongside that of the individual, to mediate unregulated marketisation in the agriculture sector. Agri-clusters, linked to global agribusiness chains, allow the capitalist system to operate unhindered by government policies or regulations, and developing countries are required to focus on those areas of farming activity where they have a competitive advantage. In addressing the partnership between the state and the private sector, FAO (2006), Hall (2009a, 2009b) and Shivji (2013) concentrate on the state, its role in farmer development, food security and sustainable rural livelihood. Cousins (2013a) mentions the productivity of small-scale farmers and its contribution to rural livelihoods, and appeals for targeted support to the sector. Long and Van der Ploeg (1994), urge a paradigm ‘’shift’’ in the dichotomous debates and admit heterogeneity between and within theories, which recognise a ‘’centre of power’’ that propels social change. Perhaps paradoxically, both neoliberal modernisation and neo-Marxism recognise that development and change are steered from centres of power, focusing on structure and actors. Both theories consider the advance of modernisation as a required process of development. Scholars like Kurtz and Brooks (2008) consider the influence of

entrepreneurs of the neoliberal school during the introduction of industrial agriculture in developing countries to be to the detriment of and subsequently damaging to small-scale farmers. A comprehensive reproach is offered by Bair and Hough (2012) who note that neoliberal rationales for participation may shift responsibility for success or failure from society to the individual. Harvey (2007) advises that proponents of small-scale farmer development are faced with a shifting paradox, as small-scale farmers are drawn by purposeful obligations of accountability rather than through enduring commitments to democratic agency.

Agriparks not only promote commercial ideas of farming practices but also reinforce these practices through the state by disregarding the everyday social inequalities imposed on rural communities in terms of resources and communal responsibilities. As argued by KI.1, the goal of the state supported programme is to enhance commercial privileges by weakening beneficiaries' rights by making agriculture separate and unequal. KI.1 argues that progress made by social movements has slowed down and although rural community comprise the majority of most societies, they remain marginalised. KI.4 says, ''Hierarchy engrained global agriculture value chains do not serve rural communities' daily lives. The issue about family or small-scale farming is generally rural specific, determined by marketisation that deems certain forms of behaviour and practise correct. It is about a family or small-scale farmer feeding its own family and selling the surplus, while highly constrained by the lack of supporting mechanisms to divide time and energy between the family and farm''. KI.6, opines, "By focusing on land ownership, the research will address the ''branches and roots'' of the transformation problem". In South Africa, one cannot talk about development and leave the land out of the equation. Informants concur, government must demonstrate that the country has a grand vision for a just, more equitable society, functioning to safeguard that the transformation it promises is not transient but irrevocable. To do that, it must reform the country's entire agrarian framework, with a view to future growth and income distributions.

7.4. Struggle for Land and Development

7.4.1 New Old Order: (Re)Colonisation of Land, Farms and Food Systems

Conqueror and settler colonialism disrupted and interrupted societal institutions and arrangements, such as land ownership, production and distributions systems, in favour of the colonial superpower. This historical obligation constitutes an enduring centre–periphery contradiction, draining surpluses systematically from the periphery to the centre (Rodney, 1973). The inherent economic workings of this relationship have been conceptualised and expounded, especially over the last half-century. They entail an array of mechanisms, from unequal exchange to profit repatriation, payments of interest, dividends and royalties, and generally the imposition of monopoly rents (Amin, 1976, 2010; Patnaik, 1999; Patnaik & Patnaik, 2017; Rodney, 1973). Colonies were recreated to mirror western images and to serve their vested interest; with coercive colonial aid and financial incentives, colonies adopted foreign farming

practices and abandoned their traditional farming methods (Rodney, 1973). The historic colonial pattern of land ownership, production and distribution resulted in a greater impetus for monocultures and more intensive industrial farming techniques to generate greater foreign returns (Moyo, 2000, 2008). With land ownership concentrated in fewer foreign hands, domestic agriculture was externally prioritised and commodified for foreign markets and consumers. As has happened in many other social sectors with the confiscation of ancestral land, there was less land for the landless to plough and sow. More than this, the legacy of colonialism is very much alive within developing countries. The link between colonialism and contemporary social conditions in former colonies persists in various forms and relations. The fixation of colonialism with privatisation and accumulation by exploitative dispossession of communally owned land and property led to underdevelopment and dependency in former colonies.

An informant who is a non-beneficiary told me, the Agripark has designated the rise of a black commercial farming class that serves as minor associates in white industrial farmers (see, Chapter 6.5.1). An Agripark programme that puts up the visibility of these black farmers as evidence of agrarian reforms is part of the problem, not the solution. Agripark invariably helps white industrial farmers legitimise their existence and increase their political influence in policy decisions. KI.4 comments on developing countries, including South Africa, saying, "[Agriparks] resort to the very same approaches of greed, consumption and extraction, and alienation of rural communities that were inflicted by colonial invaders years ago. In South Africa, the governing elites have completely assimilated and institutionalised the settler colonial models and are now trying to impose them upon rural dwellers". KI.4. says, "Agriculture is never politically neutral; it leads people to accept its assumptions about power, reality, and morality, as well as the constructions of knowledge that the societal institutions and structures pose". In Africa, neoliberal principles and knowledge shape the agriculture system, (Moyo, 2008). KI.4 explains African ways of farming are ignored, the knowledge and ethos that constitute it are lost. We need to retain our cultural identity to fight poverty and hunger that have come with western systems. In arguing for transformation farmers are committed to building solidarity and power among black farmers and marginalised peoples. An informant comments that: small farmers can no longer financially depend on private investors. They must reform their practices to survive with raising input costs and little prospect of government support, small-scale farmers' only long-term hope lies in radical change. The aim should be to achieve this within the African development system.

7.4.2. Post-Colonial Reconfiguration of Rural Farms and Development

As shown in sections 5.2 and 5.3, globalisation and neoliberalism malign sustainable agrarian processes that work around family farming (Akram-Lodhi & Kay, 2009; Escobar, 2010; Suess-Reyes & Fuetsch, 2016; Woods, 2014). The work of Bernstein (2001, 2016), Escobar (2010) and Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2009) indicates that industrialisation and mechanisation of agriculture cannot be considered benevolent externalities bereft of social and political substance (See, 6.5.3.1. on land and farming, 6.5.3.2. on

livelihoods, and 6.5.3.3. on support and extension Services). Escobar (2010) and Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2009) argue that the complexity of agriculture industrialisation and mechanisation requires an interdisciplinary set of discourses in order to resist the domestication of food systems within developing countries. The farming practices, institutional mechanisms, infrastructure and access to markets of post-colonial countries are still inextricably linked to pervious colonisation, affecting domestic food sovereignty (Moyo, 2008). Scholars such as Bernstein (2001, 2016), Escobar (2010) and Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2009) state that farming is always programmatic, intended to produce a specific productive outcome for the populaces that it serves. By the early 1960s, most Global South colonial countries, developing states which are mostly low-income developing countries had gained nation autonomy but the ''economic decolonisation'' they pursue is unfeasible without equal participation in global economic round tables such as the World Bank, IMF, the International Finance Corporation, the United States Agency for International Development, Britain's Department for International Development, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. While the former colonial super powers enjoyed a fossil fuel ''Golden Age'' of capitalism, inequality between rich and poor countries grew to new historical heights.

7.4.3. State as Catalyst of Reforms

Scholars highlight the apartheid government's racially segregated land and agrarian structures and relations, on the one hand, and the post-apartheid state's efforts to reconstruct and desegregate the racial imbalances of the past, on the other (Aliber, 2009; Backenberg, 2018; Visser & Ferrer, 2015). A key assertion is that the state can acquire the capacities necessary to implement land and agrarian reform and to engage in effective coordination and policy alignment across the various agrarian sectors (Clarke, 2018; Cousins, 2015, 2018). The issues underscore the socio-economic and political sensitivities the state faces surrounding historic redress, which is flagged as a serious priority to black farmers on the one hand, and a boost to the agriculture sector on the other (Devereux, Levendal & Yda, 2017; Genis, 2008). A key challenge for both the state and policymakers is to decide the classes of agricultural production by black farmers to be supported through land reform and agricultural development. As argued by Cousins, (2013a) there are three central options: (a) small to medium-scale black commercial farmers; (b) market-oriented smallholder farmers who employ family labour; and (c) subsistence-oriented smallholders who produce surplus food for their own household consumption. The role of the state and neoliberalism in change, however, should not be oversimplified and overgeneralised (see,6.1). The Agriparks programme should start broad debates on the state and cooperates interaction and the future relationship between the state and corporate. The ascendency of corporate influence in agriculture reforms should start a debate about the relationship between corporate and state. This interaction may be fit for corporate profits, but it's certainly not fit for equality. An informant assert communities must oppose letting corporates use the state to legitimise profits.

The discourses on agrarian and agriculture reforms are often mutually dualistic, with a broad spectrum of narrative within each discourse, and can vary dramatically from one model to another. In the arena of land and food sovereignty, strands of political economy thinking can be seen in the work of Bernstein (2013), Hall (2009a), Cousins (2013b), Escobar (2010) and Akram-Lodhi and Kay (2009) who take the empirical perspective that programmes occur in social, economic, and political environments. In tackling the question over the source of knowledge within the context of social inequality, Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) contend that the knowledges of the upper and middle classes are considered valuable to a hierarchical society. On the one hand, the neoliberal policies' basic principle is less state participation, reduced public spending and budget deficit. Based on the free-market systems, it is subject to stringent economic perspective of profit rather than redistributive reform (see Akram-Lodhi, 2007, 2009; Amanor, 2009). In farming and agriculture reforms, the approach is defined by the ideal of embracing the economically viable beneficiaries — the most economically efficient and financially competitive peasants. On the other hand, the state-led agrarian and agriculture reform is based on a political economy perspective of agrarian structures and relations, considering power relations between different social classes within the state and in society, and emphasising an egalitarian distribution of property rights over land and resources (see Aliber ,2009; Araghi, 1995, 2000). Often, a state-driven reform approach is developed within an internal historical perspective, attempting to correct historical injustices committed against landless peasants. Frequently, free market operations in developing countries are distorted, mainly by pre-existing conglomerates and monopolies. Most state-driven approaches have varying degrees of inbuilt market-oriented mechanisms; consequently, a simplistic, homogenous narrative is unhelpful. Development and political economists acknowledge that neoliberal development conditions significantly amplify the economic risks linked with farming and negatively affect farm operations and land-based livelihoods. The structural adjustment policies and austerity measures foisted on the Global South by the IMF and the World Bank throughout the 1990s not only curtailed state support for family farming but also reduced the stability of local markets, which became significantly more unstable (Ellis, 2006; Kydd & Dorward, 2001; Stiglitz, 1998). The state's repositioning has also constricted the political pathway for family farmers to seek protection for their rights to land, access to markets and fair commodity prices (Borras & Franco, 2010; Hazell et al., 2010).

In the South African context, KI.1 lament that emerging black farmers' rights to state support are more often described in non-contradictory relations, that do not take into consideration issues of class formation under apartheid. Similarly, KI.4 and KI.5 note that the state's activities may not fit its neoliberal agendas. The 1996 Constitution, obligates government to overhaul pre-existing racial land dispossessions and alienation of rights in land and resources, an acknowledgment of the deficits that exist across society. The Constitution implores the government to take all the necessary legislative and administrative measures to correct the inequalities of apartheid. Hence, government adopted a three-pronged land

reform programme of redistribution, restitution and security of tenure to address the inequalities. Government's three land reform programmes, crafted under the patronages of the World Bank, propound neoliberal market-based land reform built on WSWB principles (Bernstein, 2013). The main goal of market-based land reforms, beyond protecting existing property rights, is to reduce the role of the state, increase productivity and integrate producers into global markets (Akram-Lodhi, 2007; Araghi, 2000). Scholars argue that neoliberal market-based approaches rely on deregulation and decentralisation of decision-making, privatisation of assets and the 'unfettering' of market transactions, and the promotion of free trade to generate growth and prosperity (Harvey 2005; Liverman & Vilas, 2006). In the market-based land reform programmes, issues of food sovereignty, poverty, hunger and environmental protection are driven by market processes as a way of redistributive provision. In South Africa, the restructuring of agriculture programmes reflects neoliberal policies (Hall,2009a, 2009b; Moyo, 1995). The wide-ranging effects of the neoliberal character of the state's macroeconomic policy on the agricultural sector and on rural development are contested in the literature (see, Cousisn,2013b). The negative impact of these neoliberal policies and programmes threaten smallholder livelihoods and prospects for smallholder food production. Bernstein (2013) concludes successive South African agricultural policies since 1994 have failed to ''transform'' the circumstances of the dispossessed, namely rural and urban classes of labour whose crises of social reproduction remain grounded in the inheritances of racialised inequality.

7.4.4. Apartheid Legacy: Still Separate and Unequal

This section is set against a background of significant challenges, as outlined in sections, 2.3 and 2.4, following land and rural development reforms and the socio-economic and political construction of farming models. The section also looks at how racist state constructions have shaped farmer practices over decades. Decades of colonialism and settler colonialism, based on the ideology of white supremacy, systematically dispossessed blacks of their ancestral land (Aliber et al., 2009; Bernstein 2010). Discriminatory laws and practices worsened widespread disenfranchisement and subjugation and almost exterminated black farmers (Aliber, et al., 2009; Hall, 2011b). There are many narratives on the role of the state (MERG, 1993, 1994; Lipton, 1996; Wegerif et al., 2005; Walker, 2008; Aliber et al., 2009; Vink & Van Rooyen; 2009; Bernstein, 2010; Greenberg, 2010a; Lerche, 2010; Hall, 2011b) which account for the origin of black farmers' diverse backgrounds. South Africa has a broad historical spectrum of racially defined farming (Kirsten & van Zyl, 2014). As explained above, apartheid policies of separate development perpetuated intergenerational expropriation and exploitation of land along racially discriminatory lines (Aliber et al., 2009; Bernstein, 2010; Lerche, 2010; Lipton, 1996). Farming and agriculture under apartheid policies aggravated injustices and inequality (see Wegerif et al., 2005), legitimatising rich white property landowners and black landless labourers on white farms. Unequal access to resources, extension services and land banks promoted white farmers while blacks became

sharecroppers and labour tenants on the farmland they previously owned or had access to (Van Onselen, 2019). As Van Onselen, (2019) suggests, black farmers were turned into sharecroppers and labour tenants through the confiscation of land and large productive farms, subdivision and conferring ownership to white farmers. Paradoxically, the landless sharecropper and poor labour tenants were not merely victims of land dispossession but became cheap black labour that bolstered white farms.

7.4.5. Separate Togetherness

An overview of the types of farming practices offered in the rural areas reveals that apartheid had a grave role in perpetuating and entrenching the models of farming evident in a racially segregated society. "South Africa needs a much more robust agriculture and rural development policy", says KI.5, referring to the failed post-land reform settlement programmes. Hall and Cliffe (2009: 13-14) argue that cogent land and agrarian reform policies must give answers to three ''foundational questions'': (a) land reform for what? (justifying its social and economic rationale, incorporating issues of investment, productive land use, farming systems and employment); (b) land reform, how and for whom? (signifying the nature of the demand for land, identifying intended beneficiaries, and ordering how the land is to be acquired); and (c) land reform with what rights? (detailing how property rights within land reform settings are to be secured). These three components of policy are interrelated and interdependent. An obvious policy gap is a focus on 'small-scale production by poor households on their own land' (Hall 2009a: 35). During a go-along in Westonaria and interviews with KI.1 and KI.5, informants raised apartheid issues of racially segregated agricultural systems, institutionalised racism and bias free-market reforms in an unequal society. For farmers, disparities in funding, resources, capital and investment as well as development along racial lines are perpetual reminders of the salience of race and its correlation to inequality. KI.1 tells me, "The question of agriculture desegregation and the value of single sector sites is not merely one of historical significance but of great contemporary importance as the realignment of our nation's sectors". K.1 speaks of the need for resistance of the status quo, ''Resistance of the reproduction of black farmers means redefining what is desired in the farm and by society. Instead of forcing black farmers into capitalist free-markets, South Africa must search for what practices and institutions reproduce marginalised black farmers". Throughout the decades, marginalised black farmers have fought back against systemic inequities, risking their lives for justice. Marais (2011) assert that both agricultural and economic policy, since 1994, have done little to ''transform'' the circumstances of South Africa's dispossessed majority, who remain enmeshed in the inherited racialised inequality. This was notwithstanding substantial policy advances in addressing segregation in and by the state, the role of race and its implications for farm alignment and reforms. KI.5 says, "A colour-blind analysis, the racial ideology of avoiding conversations about race and racism in agriculture, furthers the reproduction of racially inequitable outcomes."

7.4.6. Race Dynamics

Discourses about racism as a factor in integration programmes, backed by differing social histories, reflect the divergent perspectives, ideologies, and assumptions that frame the desegregation and race-conscious agriculture policy debates. An informant argues that agriculture has in-built prejudice against black farmers, women, and people from poorer backgrounds. A beneficiary asserts the importance of identifying issues of social justice and intersectional inequalities for a "democratise agriculture system". A non-beneficiary stresses that the main mission is to achieve equality, and to achieve diversity, and make the agriculture space as inclusive as possible. He highlights the importance to avail information and redistribute resources as far and wide as possible to those most in need. In section 2.12, I introduce CRT to contextualise perspectives of change. CRT serves the dual purpose of providing a race-based interdisciplinary theoretical framework of analysis (Parker, 2003: 152).

Based on historical sources, an informant mentions that black farmers were not always submissive and passive. Some individual farmers resisted institutional marginalisation. Other farmers even challenged and disrupted the imposition of colonial systems. I relate agrarian race approaches with CRT to uncover the ways of black disempowerment in farming practice on racial contours in the areas of transformation as well as popular discourse. I am informed by scholars who grow the literature and space of dialogues on race and racism. In agrarian change, CRT as a theoretical and analytical framework challenges the ways race and racism impact agrarian structures, practices, and discourses. I use the tenets of CRT as explained in section 2.12 which recognise (a) permanence of racism, (b) whiteness as property, (c) critique of liberalism, and (d) interest convergence, and I counter narratives (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). I recognise that oppressive race, gender, and class hierarchies interlock to create distinct structures of oppression which are differentially experienced, and best comprehended by using an intersectional analysis (Crenshaw, 1991). I use CRT to assert that a colour-blind ideology is unpersuasive in shaping agrarian racial social meanings. In the main, a coloured categorisation of farms by scale and scope in the study does not entrench race.

The collateral costs of racial policies were detrimental for South Africa's capitalism; a contracted domestic market was hindered by sluggish black wages, small-scale agriculture collapsed, and together with the racially exclusive character of social welfare, these measures restricted the prospect for import-substituting growth in the manufacturing sector (Arrighi, et al., 2010). Moyo (2010) posits that, in Southern Africa, race was a deliberate white social construction administered through state and other historical institutions fixed to affairs of nation building. Racial structures shaped the racially oppressed and racial oppressors' identities, turning them into racialised agents (see Walker, 2008). In many instances, white commercial farmers' organisations use the ''threat'' of land reform in their rhetoric often with reference to the ''disaster'' of neighbouring Zimbabwe (see Hall, 2011b). The biggest oversight that is prevalent throughout the literature is a belief that the South African government has at any point

adopted an approach that could be considered a comprehensive agrarian ideology rather than a programme, as explained in section 4.11. Such a coherent ideology has not been framed, or has now fallen off the radar, at least for now within the neoliberal framework.

7.5. Force for Change: Small-Scale Farmers

In 2019, the UN General Assembly made history and passed the first ever declaration for peasant rights, approving the Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UN, 2019). The UN declaration upholds the rights of all peasants, including small-scale farmers, rural workers, indigenous people, fishing communities, pastoralists and landless agriculture workers, as well as every person who lives off of artisanal or small-scale agriculture, either for subsistence or for the markets. It likewise applies to both individuals as well as collectives. In addition, the UN Declaration recognises the right to access to land; the right to an adequate income which guarantees fair market prices for farm products; and the emphasis on civil rights to protect small-scale farmers from increased aggressions, displacements and criminalisation. The UN declaration accepts that smallholder farmers in developing countries are often caught in a vicious cycle of low-intensity, subsistence-oriented farming, low yields, and not enough profits to make valuable investments. The declaration protects peasant rights to land, seeds, and adequate incomes with an emphasis on civil and social rights. By protecting peasant rights, the declaration aims to help reduce climate change and protect biodiversity. Connecting poor farmers to markets is one channel to break this vicious cycle but it demands overcoming various barriers and market imperfections. The declaration states that smallholder farmers may face high risks while lacking the skills, technologies, and financial services to produce a marketable surplus, or to supply the quality, quantity, and types of commodities demanded by buyers. These factors contribute to high levels of poverty in many rural areas. As indicated in Chapters 1.1; 2.5; 4.7, 6.1.; 6.2.2 and 8.1, fulfilling the UN SDGs remains a challenge in many developing countries, especially in rural areas. Significantly, the vital role of smallholder farmers is recognised in many international agreements. The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and SDG 2 (2030) obligate member states to “End hunger, achieve food security and improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture”.

SDG Target 2.3 includes the rights of small-scale food producers it states: ‘’By 2030, double the agricultural productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers, in particular women, indigenous people, family farmers, pastoralists and fishers, including through secure and equal access to land, other productive resources and inputs, knowledge, financial services, markets and opportunities for value addition and non-farm employment’’. SDG 2 requires member states to speak to the structural obstacles that position rural women and girls at a disadvantage in their fulfilment of food security and nutrition. In terms of SDG 2, the implementation constitutes an unrivalled opportunity to achieve gender equality and realises the rights and empowerment of women and girls in rural areas (FAO,2022). IFAD, FAO and the World Food Programme discussed challenges and opportunities in achieving gender equality and the

empowerment of rural women and girls' including an environment that accelerates a just and equitable transition towards a sustainable future for rural women and the obstacles to be overcome to achieve this. In 2016, The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, General Recommendation 34 regarding the rights of rural women, recommends that state parties "ensure that rural women and their organizations can influence policy formulation, implementation and monitoring at all levels and in all areas that affect them", and ensure that rural women and their representatives "participate directly in the assessment, analysis, planning, design, budgeting, financing, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of all agricultural and rural development strategies" (UN, 1979).

7.5.1. Conundrum of Emerging Black Farmers

Scholars assert that South Africa's land and agrarian conundrum poses a complex historical background and context (Bernstein, 2013). Racially discriminatory laws and practices alienated Africans from their land (Cousins, 2013a; Hall, 2009), while dispossession visited colossal losses and destruction upon African farmers (Hall, 2011) and established an agriculture sector with both incredible racial diversity and disparities. The apartheid state aided, abetted and directly facilitated many of the racial injustices and inequalities. The minority state created white wealth and power which subjugated powerless Africans. In its mechanisation, the apartheid system not only denied Africans access to productive agriculture but also annulled ideals of self-determination, autonomy, rights, rule of law, respect for property rights and the value of individual human life. White farmers became forerunners for an exclusive form of free market ideology in which a small group stole the nation's assets, used it to consolidate their own wealth and power and upheld how the free market was supposed to work. Understandably, then, the apartheid system was instrumental in creating racial identities which impacted on land rights', security of tenure and farm labour relations, relegating many black farmers into family or subsistence rural farmers (Cousins, 2013a; Hall, 2009).

Kirsten and Van Zyl (2014) argue that the land historically offered to black farmers has kept white farmers in a condition of wilful collusion with white patriarchal socio-political power structures. Engaging with the term ''smallholder'', Cousins (2013a) argues that the term does not enable an analysis of dynamics of differentiation within populations of small-scale farmers, in other words the causal processes through which inequalities emerge. According to Cousins (2013a) the term smallholder distracts attention away from internal tensions within households (often gender-based) over the use of land, labour and capital. In addition, the term can misdirect the formulation of land and agrarian reform policies aimed at addressing structural inequality, and result in misleading stresses on common interests in attempts to organise and mobilise small-scale farmers when divergent (class and gender) interests, together with other forms of social differentiation, are often real obstacles to such attempts. A class-analytic perspective on small-scale farming, centred on the key concepts of ''petty commodity production'' and ''accumulation from below'', is necessary for grasping the differentiated character and diverse

trajectories of small-scale agriculture under the capitalist systems. White supremacist ideologies have alienated black farmers from the right to self-determination. Among others, Wegerif (2005), Lahiff (2007), Hall (2009a, 2009b, 2011) and Cousins (2013b) give insight that allows an analysis for the inconsistencies and contradictions in the implementation of post-apartheid land reforms which may assist in developing sustainable farming practices. KI.1 assert that without the wisdom of our history, land struggles and resistance against racist separate development policies, black farmers reforms have been transformed without a historical context.

7.6. Agro-Clusters: Agriparks Sites for Change

The section covers: a) the importance of perceiving Agriparks as strategic sites of ongoing contestation and change; b) small-scale farmers and civil society formations as catalysts for change; and c) the paradox that strategies for improving practices and outcomes for small-scale farmers can (only) be achieved mainly through collaborative efforts, and the outcome of these efforts benefit all society and environment. An informant recommends government further deepen the mutual partnership between the private sector and state, at the national, provincial, and local levels, to enable the budding of small farmers and rural economies. The informant calls for the Agriparks to embrace an ambitious and expansive vision for the role of agriculture in achieving equality. The vision should include: "the adoption of new sustainable approaches, which provide opportunities for women and youth to develop their farming practices, through well-organized pathways to change". Also, "By creating and embedding strategic partnerships between farmers and communities so as to create system-wide changes".

7.6.1. Re/Inventing and Re/Constructing the Future

In this analysis, I firstly recognise a multimodal characterisation of Agriparks which are not mutually exclusive, and as contested sites which are necessary or inevitable in the remodelling of agriculture into a labyrinth of competitive networks for private wealth accumulation (see FAO, 2019; US AID, 2008). In this instance, multilateral financial agencies posit privatisation and markets as presenting 'opportunities' for investments in Africa (Cotula et al., 2009; World Bank 2008). Secondly, I recognise a global imperial stratagem restructures the content and methodology of land ownership and production, a global win-win position through deregulations, free trade and free movement of capital, information, as well as non-state interference with free markets. Agri-clusters exist in both a public and private capacity, serving as transition or buffer zones between urban and rural agricultural uses. As KI.1 says, "So when agents are saying ''agri-cluster'', people conjure up the idea of a mega-exploitative structure on our villages and that's the destruction of our indigenous farming practices and environment". KI.1 elaborates on agri-clusters as a development model, "In agriculture and financial terms, from seedling to shelf, from livelihoods to commercial profits, agri-clusters are the exemplary models, the template of how to build global hubs. All the more reason, then, to attach importance to this global alignment of the fates that tells us not merely where agriculture is right now, but where it might be heading". KI.1 commenting on

Levubu says: the cluster system is failing ordinary farmers. On the other hand, global corporates and agriculture companies that dominate the value chain have sky-high profits and their agents receive exorbitant compensation packages, on the other hand.

7.6.2. Agriparks: Catching Up or Levelling Up

As argued in Chapter 7.4.5, in South Africa being a black farmer is historically both a political and neoliberal act. KI.1 state, "Agriparks are ahistorical without class and race analysis. When reform frameworks ignore social gaps and inequality, they fail to achieve their goals". KI.9, an emerging livestock farmer, mourns that emerging black farmers' rights to support are often expressed in non-class, gender and race phrases. Similarly, B.8, an emerging crop farmer, and NB.3, an emerging livestock farmer, note that the partnership pursuits may not fit the farmers' egalitarian agendas. KI.17, the chairperson of an agri-hub, says, "The challenge is with strengthening the global economy, and upholding a free, open, rules-based order to bolster food security, democracy, and prosperity in the world". This is underscored by KI.18, an academic organising local food programmes and talks, who describes it as a way to improve outcomes for poor communities. He argues, "Agriparks, if not properly funded and managed, would endanger the livelihoods and incomes of women and set back standards for women's welfare and food safety". KI.12, an Agripark manager, explains further, the decline of government support for the agriculture industry over the past years has angered farmers, since the sector remains fragile. Staff shortages, delays and rising prices are playing havoc with farming, inputs and markets. In many cases, the Agripark has tried to switch to alternative methods of delivering support, such as farm-based services. Agriculture programmes must enable national support toward a different subsidy policy for small-scale agriculture. The state must use resources to create a natural resource-saving, advanced agriculture sector, which will benefit social welfare, environmental protection and sustainability.

KI.1 talk about the discrimination that is deeply rooted in the South African farm industry. Like other land activists, he calls for restorative justice around a community-controlled financial cooperative. The single biggest thing that came up was that black farmers need access to state support. He says, "People go to black farmers asking them what they need. It has been like this for years. The answer is, we need productive land, we need capital and investment. We need justice and equality in the programmes that are being put up for agriculture. How about a programme of protecting the knowingly vulnerable, rather than blanket coverage"? NB.7, a teacher who has to foot the bill for his farming, adds, "One problem is that with such a programme, it was not clear who its target was, who were vulnerable, apart from the obvious smallholder farmer. Of course, there will always be people who fall outside the "knowingly vulnerable" group who will be seriously affected". NB.4 comments, "Small-scale and large-scale, for example. Who defines that? Vulnerable groups in rural areas are not typically isolated but live in larger communities from whom it is both difficult and undesirable to isolate. The claim that black farmer support exacerbates inequality is a red herring; it doesn't, with the right state support."

7.6.3. The Configuration of Agriculture

Findings confirm, across many countries of the world, states together with global development institutions and entrepreneurs employ comprehensive agri-cluster projects as an inventive paradigm shift to remodel glolocal agrarian relations, developing joint ventures and strategic alliances and supporting farmers (FAO, 2006a, 2017; Galvez-Nogales, 2010). Scholars and researchers suggest that this occurs for several reasons within the glolocal consolidation of agribusiness value-chain networks. The first reason is the advent of imperial globalisation in the twentieth century that gave impetus to universal agriculture industrialisation, characterised by standardisation, mass production, and specialisation. It not only altered the ways in which agricultural production occurred but it also impacted the decisions farmers made in critical farming ways (Hendrickson & James, 2005). The industrialisation of agriculture, constrained by the economic environment of farming, curbed what options a farmer had available given that constrained economic options impacts farmer practices. The second reason is the over concentration of agriculture industry markets. A handful of oligarchs own the networks and the sector loses characteristics of a competitive market (Heffernan et al., 1999). With the agricultural commodity markets losing its competitive character, there is a global emergence of integrated food chain clusters that dominate food and agriculture, from seed genes to the shelf. As Hendrickson et al. (2002) argue, the economic power in food and agriculture – hence the power to make decisions about where and what food is produced, who grows it, and where it is marketed – is shifting in the direction of a fewer global firms embedded in a labyrinth of relationships in food production, from genetics to grocery retailing. Furthermore, those who make the decisions tend to be financially rewarded by the economic system, steering to a point where many farmers find themselves in economically marginal jobs (see Hendrickson et al., 2002). Thirdly, with cluster food manufacturing, food retailing has witnessed the biggest changes since the mid-1990s (Hendrickson & James, 2005). These retail changes have serious bearing on what happens to the agricultural marketplace and by extension what happens to farms and the variety of the crops and animals that make up those farms; every continent has seen the mass penetration of the giants of food retailing, including the poorest of the poor regions (Reardon & Berdegué, 2002).

The major implications of the changes in food retailing for production is in the restructuring of supply and distribution chain networks, and development of standards enforced by the retailers (Reardon & Berdegué, 2002). Also, farmers engage in group marketing by establishing linkages with direct marketers, exporters, processors and retail chain operators. However, often, influential producer organisations control the production and distribution processes. Food retail patterns are changing rapidly in favour of supermarkets to maximise economic efficiency and profits by global shareholders and food empires (Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2010a). Supermarkets have impelled the growth of corporate super farms. For maximum profit making, supermarkets favour well recognised ‘’networks of preferred suppliers’’ which considerably reduce transaction costs in the value chain and increase trustworthiness of supply in relation

to the quantity, quality and timing (Proctor & Lucchesi, 2012). As strongly argued by, among others Weatherspoon and Reardon (2003), Reardon et al. (2007, 2012), Louw et al. (2007), and Manyelo et al. (2015), family farms are typically not and prefer not to be part of these global retail networks.

B.12 says, "Above and beyond everything, we need to all be working to the same objectives and aiming for the same outcome. There needs to be a universal plan, a plan which enables Africa to keep on farming and to continue to be world challengers in high quality, safe and sustainable food". The South African government has been running black farmer support schemes for ten or twenty years, yet we still have seen huge declines in success rates for black farmers. We need the state support schemes to be bolder and more ambitious, not just producing more of the same with minor improvements. B.12 and KI.17 say, "We need to see a bit more strategy from the government as to how its various policy strands fit together into a consistent whole". Agriparks are only one part of an array of initiatives including support for new entrants, farming elasticity, food policy, standards in trade, regulation and enforcement and supply chain measures which, at best, continue to be developed in silos. Presently, it feels like there are few yarns joining the initiatives together. Farmers need to plan for the long term and want to be in line with wider public policy. However, until that becomes evident, we run the risk of an absence of alignment.

7.7. Global Corporatisation of Agriculture

As shown in sections 5.2, 5.3, and 5.4, long and complex global agriculture supply chains have developed, along with privatisation, deregulation and less government involvement with the markets. Sector after sector, a handful of giant agriculture corporations' control what is produced and how much people pay for it. This is all part of a well-developed global system where responsibility for dealing with farming, production and distribution is increasingly taken on by private interests. And, as we see with Levubu, it is an empowered elite who call the terms, the UIGC. Informants of this study confirm and argue that the agri-cluster focus is on PPPs. Since neoliberalism eschews state regulation of private practices, other institutions have to provide regulation. The World Trade Organisation, as part of free-market globalisation, has supported the arrival of agricultural monopolies practising intensive farming and the creation of agribusiness supply chains which has directed global food systems at extreme cost to the environment. The World Trade Organisation was founded in the 1990s, at the dawn of free-market capitalism, when the development anthem was more markets, more private sector and less government red tape. It has backed agriculture manufactures to offshore production wherever labour power is basest, and regulations are lowermost (Harvey,2005).

Since the 2000s, with the adoption of agro-clusters, agriculture production has become more concentrated in a few hands, giving corporations the power to control and raise prices since it makes it effortless for them to coordinate price increases with the handful of other companies in their same industry, without risking the possibility of losing customers who have no other choice (see chapter 2.3.8).

KI.2, an academic and veteran social researcher, explaining failed land reform and the urgency of sustainable farming, says the agrarian situation demands rebuilding the capability of the state to perform the essential functions required of it by its citizens. Furthermore, with the concentration of agricultural production in the hands of a small, very productive nucleus of white capitalist farmers, only a few black farmers have entered commercial farming (Cousins, 2013b). As a result, income and wealth are being redistributed upward from average working people (many of whom live in rural areas) to oligarchs and shareholders. Rural farmers do not have too much power; corporations do. This is, in essence, the foundation of the agri-clusters. The state is constrained to entice investments into the rural economy. NB.12, explaining the challenges of tackling markets and agents, says, "With these worsening abuses of economic power by large corporations and the super-rich, the rising imbalance of economic power is bad for most black farmers and for the economy as a whole".

7.7.1. Land Grabs and Alienation: Agro-Industrialisation

A beneficiary talked about the growing land grabbing rates and their implications for development in most African countries, for example, Angola and Mozambique, which were higher than in most parts of the continent. A non-beneficiary drew the study's attention to the injustices and inequalities gap between the North and South countries as a result of land grabs. A key informant, probably from a political perspective, says, most of the development disparities between the Northern and Southern countries are attributable to the over-concentration of land and resource in a few hands. KI.2 says, "The agri-clusters' agriculture paradigm is to blame for supporting intensive commercial farming that is both environmentally harmful and economically wasteful, leading farmers dumping produce to maintain high prices. The global value chains pay farmers to grow more, heading to overproduction with the result that the market price scarcely covers the cost of production. We need to wake up to that reality, the farmers are digging their own graves". Generally, trade liberalisation and multi-nationalisation of the retail sector have led to the consolidation and concentration of large supermarkets in various parts of the world (Reardon & Berdegué, 2002). Globally, agriculture is progressively being industrialised, causing a disconnect between farming, nature and locality (Gliessman, 2012; Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2010a; 2010b, 2016). The encroachment of capitalism on a global scale continuously (re)configures agricultural production and reproduction processes and investment and consumption patterns. This shapes the forces at play at the level of the farm, family and rural and land-based livelihoods to the extent that the reproduction of family farming is jeopardised (Van der Ploeg, 2008, 2010a). Nature's growth factors are progressively more being replaced by artificial factors produced by means of industrial processes. These external inputs are commoditised factors of production. Not only do they raise the input cost of production but they also make it more inflexible, therefore contributing to the constriction on farm margins. This makes farming extensively dependent on external inputs, new technology, expert knowledge and industrial and financial capital (Gliessman, 2012). The control over land, labour and capital

by corporate structures is fundamentally dissimilar from that in family or peasant farming (Hirsch, 2012; Van der Ploeg, 2010b). As such, farmers' reliance on external resources is generally dissimilar. Through the overall expansion of agro-industrial farming and contract farming, decisions about how to use these factors of production are increasingly taken in faraway locations removed from the producers and the land on which crops are grown and livestock is reared (Hirsch, 2012; Van der Ploeg, 2010b). Search for higher economic efficiency and profits by investors and food conglomerates (Van der Ploeg, 2010a, 2008) have given impetus to the spread of corporate super farms.

Rolf Steppacher (2008) contends that private property encompasses two distinct aspects – possession and property. Discerning the different potentialities between the two aspects illustrates the role that property wields, enabling economic actors to direct control over the innovation process (see Gerber & Steppacher, 2012; Van Griethuysen, 2010). The growth of a world market in search of agricultural commodities leads to land grabbing, difficulties with intergenerational transfers of family farm assets, the ongoing limits on farm income, and agro-industrialisation which spur agrarian transformations that are termed ''accumulation by dispossession'' (Bernstein, 1996, 2010a, 2010b; Harvey, 2005, 2009; Glassman, 2006). Also, accumulation by dispossession means the ongoing commoditisation of goods that were not previously perceived as part of the global paths of exchange. Harvey (2005, 2009) and Glassman (2006) assert that when commodities are incorporated in markets, they are capitalised, that is controlled by capital groups such as speculators and supermarket chains. Accumulation by dispossession leads to commoditisation, which is allied with capitalist competition and the loss of control over the distribution of the added value that is realised when goods are traded by independent producers, such as smallholders. The various forms of accumulation by dispossession and land concentration are considered instruments for major agrarian transformations that certainly lead to deagrarianisation and depeasantisation and extreme marginalisation of rural classes of labour (Bernstein, 2010b).

7.8. Ideology Matters

Research scrutinises the ways in which small-scale black farmers are inseparable from prior and continuing histories of colonialism, nationalism, gender, race and class (see Aliber et al., 2009; Bernstein, 2010; Lerche, 2010; Lipton, 1996), and critiques the insularity of some strands of agrarian research by centering the research of black farmers as fundamental to an anti-imperialist and anti-race project (Moyo, 2010). For working class, rural people, and those who may have been dispossessed and divested, state interventions are the only way they will ever be able to play on a somewhat even field. Even then, there are obstacles in many cases. Without state intervention, farming and agriculture are becoming the sole preserve of the privileged few. KI.1, KI.4 and KI.6 concur that land ownership and distribution issues, especially food security and sovereignty, are basically ideological. Expanding on McLaren (1989), ideology is something more potent and emotional than just a vision for a good society or a policy manifesto; ideology is about the production of meaning and purpose, social practices and representations ordinarily

accepted as natural; it is about social relations of power, producing ideological hegemony. Ideology "is not only theoretical or abstract as in an idea or patterns existing outside individuals, rather it is ''lived'' [experiences]" (Kickbusch & Everhart, 1985).

KI.1 says, Ideology obfuscation prevails in a mire of superficiality, tribalism and finer granularity. As such, ideas and cultures associated with the dominant class or race are incorporated into broader societal institutions, overlooking other social dynamics and contradictions. Ideology permits domination and discrimination during which the central values, moral and vested interest of the social class or race controlling the material and symbolic wealth of the society gets embedded in social systems resulting in the social reproduction of hierarchies. However, ideologies can also be aiding and empowering (McLaren, 1989:), like the struggle for liberation ideologies that informed anti-colonial struggles and rights of nations for self-determination. Race-based ideology is a social construct, which, in colonies and neo-colonial countries, is an invention and intervention that predetermines how power held by the white race continues. KI. 4 explains that for a governing party that had been losing its political and moral governing ideology for many years, Agriparks have become a substitute for their ideology. KI.4 says, "Such a framing allows for reflective and consistent understanding of structural sources of ideology. Injustice and inequality arise from people as moral agents as well as from institutions and structures".

7.9. Conclusion

This chapter indicates that agro-clusters or Agriparks – by whatever name – are intended to be local-based, rural institutions providing an assortment of infrastructure and support services to small-scale farmers and agriculture entrepreneurs. However, they are linked in various ways to global value networks. I proffer, firstly, that agri-clusters are ideologically constructed on the contemporary reality of the global interconnectedness of the modern economy, altering land ownership and property relations significantly, reconfiguring the nature of the use of resources and restructuring the accumulation trajectory. I show that the neoliberal trajectory focuses agriculture development towards rapid privatisation of the agribusiness sector. Secondly, although agri-clusters as labyrinths of networks sound developmental on the surface, it undermines small-scale farming, which is commonly practised by the rural poor and, in the South African context, means small-scale black farmers. Thirdly, agro-clusters shape policymaking and development. They involve the liberalisation of agriculture, and the expansion of biotechnologies and intellectual property rights regarding agricultural technologies. Not only are foods and energy sources globally distributed but so too are technical services that keep economies functioning. Fourthly, this stratagem largely ignores historic economic inequality. While the state claims privatisation is needed, the people posit collective kinship based on family, spiritual alliances, shared causes, shared values, and participation of life in a village. Fifthly, if agri-clusters are a public good or in the public's interest, they should be under various forms of public ownership or control, not to be paid for by the public for the private sector to reap huge profits. Otherwise, they continue the inequalities and injustices

of the past, as well as compromise the food security of future generations and harm the environment. There is also a great likelihood that issues of race, gender, and class are being ignored.

Chapter 8 Summary and Conclusion: Forging a New Path

8.1 Introduction

This study contributes to discourse on emerging farmer practices and state approaches to small-scale farmer support in Agriparks that can add value to policymakers and small-scale farmers themselves. The findings and analysis reveal several dynamics and complexities at district, national and global levels. My conclusions are by and large congruent with the political economy discourse on neoliberal land grabs, PPPs, agro-industrialisation, global food systems, deagrarianisation, depeasantisation as well as contestations over small-scale and large-scale farming. A few large global companies' rights to profit trump people's human rights and threatens planet earth. The approach seen in the Agriparks furthers, rather than challenges, this status quo. Under the CRDP, Agriparks are rolled-out as government's flagship programme to fast-track agriculture transformation by providing support services to emerging black farmers. Political economy writers such as Bernstein (2013), Cousins (2013b), Hall (2009) and Moyo (2010) assert that to understand black agriculture, land ownership and practices it is critical to examine how the state supports farmer production, markets and extension services to small-scale farmers. As shown in Chapter 6, findings, and Chapter 7, analysis, I agree that the main challenge is to outline the scale and types of agricultural production by black farmers to be supported through land reform and agricultural development interventions (see Cousins 2015). Cousins (2013a) explains that there are three major possible categories: (a) small to medium-scale black commercial farmers; (b) market-oriented smallholder farmers who use mostly family labour; and (c) subsistence-oriented smallholders who produce additional food for their own use. This study is clearly of more direct relevance in South Africa, which has its own peculiar context, but the lessons might also be of interest to people working on farmer development and applying different forms of Agriparks, or agro-clusters, in other parts of the world.

The study focuses on emerging black farmer practices and state support services delivered to them through the Agriparks. My aim is to consider new interpretations and the underlying configurations of agrarian structures but it is also about understanding emerging farmers as protagonists for change. I pondered emerging farmers' agency, considered who decides what is fundamental and what is peripheral to the discourse that manifests in the Agriparks and in the farmer's own practices. Small-scale farmers are analytically posed as being a potential counterweight to global corporations and neoliberalism. As such, a better understanding of how best to support these emerging farmers will become more beneficial in future in the context of growing global inequalities, climate change and other environmental hazards linked to corporate and industrial modes of agriculture. For this study, emerging black farmers are key stakeholders – their views and ideas are crucial to their own development and advancement. Enquiring about and valuing their views is essential for the state to have an empowering approach to emerging black farmer support. Overlooking their experiences and perspectives will invariably lead to the state intervening in ways that just do not work. In addition, to centring the views of farmers, effectively

addressing far-reaching agrarian reform questions requires a longitudinal, multidisciplinary, mixed methods and iterative methodological design. It requires attention to the local and micro factors, the particular national context and farmer development interventions, as well as the global drivers and agendas that impact national and local outcomes.

As argued in this thesis, the agrarian structure of a society represents the manner in which land relationships are institutionally governed (see Chapter 4.6, Boone, 1994; Evans, 1995; Kohli, 1996). The agrarian structure includes the rights and privileges enjoyed by different categories of people who have access to land, as well as how land is held and cultivated. As broadly indicated in chapters 4 and 5, society, including the economic and political system is a subjective social construction. Society is constructed by humans, and it can be reshaped into a more intelligent, efficient and inclusive system that benefits everyone and all life on planet earth. Upon this argument, I assert that, in every political and economic system, patterns of land holding and land use have a significant influence on socio-economic development (Bernstein, 2010, 2013; Cousins, 2013b; Hall, 2009). The form of land distribution and land use promoted by Agriparks therefore needs to be critically appraised based on the socio-economic and developmental objectives it is promoting. Farming serves basic human needs – it produces the food we need, creates jobs and livelihoods we need and has to be carried out in ways that preserve the environment we depend on. I assert that the corporate model of the Agripark does not serve the wider public good or set a good foundation for an equitable, dynamic and autonomous black farming sector in South Africa.

“The issues at hand”, says KI.1, a land and rural development activist, “is who is going to script the grand narrative of agrarian transformation”. Black farmers position themselves as scripting their own narrative and driving transformation. As shown in various narratives, there are controversies involved in defining an emerging black farmer and their range of practices (see Aliber, 2010; Cousins, 2013a; Hall, 2009; Bernstein 2013). Bernstein (2010, 2013), Hebinck (2010), Cousins (2013b) and Hall (2009) show that most black farmers were marginalised, amid histories of systematic and racially based land dispossessions, into subordinate auxiliaries to white commercial farmers. Many of the black farmers interviewed in this study, as shared in chapter 6, still have these feelings of being marginalised. Since the dawn of democracy in 1994, based on justice and equality for all, black farmers have challenged marginalisation and demanded equal status for themselves. In the context of free enterprise and laissez-faire economic policies, black farmers with minimal state support find alternative ways to support their practices, negotiating sustainability and environmental and economic challenges. As part of moves to integrate all agriculture into corporate dominated global trade, states are embracing agro-clusters focussed on promoting production of cash crops for supermarkets, arguing they are more profitable. In South Africa, the state has embraced and actively promotes its version of agro-clusters in the form of Agriparks. In its reporting, FIAN (2010), a human rights organisation advocating for the right to adequate food and nutrition, notes

that the ''ongoing narrative'' raises concerns about the status of food sovereignty in developing countries and the independence of the state to carry out its social mandate.

As pointed out by one of my research respondents (K1), agro-industrialisation is a major humanitarian and environmental matter. Several developing countries rather represent the interests of corporations and the oligarchy instead of the needs of the people and the earth. In support of far-reaching universal changes, I argue the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development appeals to countries to begin efforts to achieve the 17 SDGs. The Sustainable Development Agenda addresses the three dimensions of sustainable development, namely social, economic and environmental, as well as issues of peace, justice and effective societal institutions. The 17 SDGs are critical as a collective vision of humanity and a social contract between the world's leaders and the people. They were adopted unanimously by 193 heads of state and other top leaders. More importantly, the 17 SDGs are a to-do list for people and the planet and a blueprint for success. The 17 goals and 169 targets aim to eradicate poverty, fight inequality and tackle climate change by 2030. Also, the 17 goals address the needs of people in both developed and developing countries, emphasising that no one should remain behind. For me, the mobilisation of resources for implementation, such as financial resources, technology development, skills transfer, and capacity-building, as well as the role of partnerships, are critical.

8.2 Agriparks: Unravelling the Myths

The agricultural policy alignment in South Africa and its support of neoliberalism has characteristically involved restructuring and integrating programmes to manifest neoliberal economic objectives, rather than the formulation of a distinct agricultural growth and development path for South Africa (see, Chapter 7). The CRDP, launched in 2010, has its own configuration through the universalisation of the global agri-cluster concept. The CRDP, through Agriparks, places significant weight on minimal state intervention, low taxes, PPPs, privatisation of prime agriculture land, industrialisation and commercialisation of food production as well as markets for food distribution. In South Africa, based on my analysis, the future of farming practices is being shaped by two global forces. Firstly, Agriparks are state driven efforts to globalise agriculture through the agro-cluster model and to facilitate the integration of local farmers into national and global corporate supply chains and markets. The ongoing movements of agriculture and food systems towards globalisation and commoditisation is copiously documented in agro-food studies (e.g. McMichael, 1989, 1994). The mobilising forces in the global agriculture markets is in the self-interest of agriculture corporates and oligarchs. Global monopolies openly source cheap labour from developing countries for aspects of their production, supply, distribution and retail pipelines. Modern technology intensifies the globalisation of farming by enabling agents and farmers to more easily connect and transact across geographies, through exchange of seeds and fertilisers. Secondly, through collaboration and networks, farmers are interconnected, interacting through various channels with global supermarkets who impose standards for production. Dominant

exporters avoid contracting with small-scale producers, mainly because small-scale growers cannot afford production facilities of their own that can produce at the scale that meets the uniform standards which overseas supermarkets demand (van der Meer, 2006). Many small-scale producers in the Global South have limited or no access to credit and they cannot keep a range of production facilities, such as pesticide, spraying equipment and waste pesticide disposal facilities. Thus, exporters would minimise their costs by self-procuring all the required production assets on their own land and employ workers, instead of seeking out individual growers for contracts (Dolan & Humphrey, 2000).

The Agriparks in South Africa are premised on the approach of integrating small-scale black farmers into these corporate structures, but few can make it and none on beneficial terms. In the meantime, the efforts of farmers to find other approaches, such as selling in local markets, are not supported by the Agriparks. The farmers remain in an unsatisfactory limbo – notably no farmer in the case studies has managed to graduate from the Agripark to farm independently - where they cannot succeed in the way the Agriparks want them to and their own initiatives go without support so also do not realise their full potential. Policymakers and the governing elite will have to abandon neoliberal and anti-poor narratives spun by global corporates to rather build on options farmers take themselves and that better fit their circumstances. Doing so is essential not only for supporting fair markets but for preserving small-scale farmer and democracy itself.

I uphold the position that industrialisation and consolidation of global agriculture have increased vulnerability for many small-scale farmers and communities and reduced the options for adaptation. As shown by Kay (2008), I contend that, as a result of globalisation, the relationship of peasants to product and labour markets has changed. Markets are structured by the operation of corporatised financial relations, and are thus carriers of power and privilege. In Agriparks, the industrialisation and commercialisation of practices pressure small-scale farmers and rural agriculture. In South Africa, the historically privileged and industrialised white farmers influence practices towards their own interests, thus reinforcing the continued marginalisation of the already marginalised black farmers. Over the past decades, state support is increasingly linked to industrialisation and commercialisation which is increasingly onerous and driven by value chain demands, pushing would-be farmers into urban jobs and depeasantisation. Agriparks perpetuate the economic and social challenges that rural communities face - extraordinary levels of income and wealth inequality - and the growing concentration of land ownership. Agriparks thus oversee the long-term decline of small-scale farmers and the evolution of global agriculture into one controlled by a powerful oligarchy. At the beginning of my study, I had pragmatically given Agriparks the benefit of the doubt. Upon finalising the study, I struggle with the awkward and incongruous concept.

My broad reflections and conclusions from this research on the CRDP as a policy and on Agriparks as a programme, are that they both promote poorly evidenced assertions about what motivates emerging black farmers, incorrectly present black farmers practices as largely uniform, and depicts emerging black farmer practices as backward and controversial. Further, Agriparks lack a contextual framework to help farmers understand the global development of the farming sector and the challenges faced by small-scale farmers at both the national and global level. As indicated in previous sections, 7.2.3; 7.2.4; and 7.3, the economic underpinning of, and justification for, the Agriparks is ''trickle-down economics''; the notion that if some are able to generate great wealth for themselves some of this wealth trickles down to benefit everyone else who is at the bottom. However, informants argue, and I concur, that the current model is wedded to maximum profits, which has meant that corporates are not investing their profits back into the system but extracting them through practices that boost share prices and stock options for executives. The argument for state support comes from decades of marginalisation of any viable opposition to the globally dominant corporate and industrial approach to agriculture, liberalism and the policy hypocrisy of the agriculture elite. The support is geared to incorporate emerging black farmers into a dominant market system.

8.3 Unbundling Challenges and Issues

For change to be more than the disjointed deeds of once-off reforms, state programmes must address the basic epistemological and ideological beliefs that inform the state approach to support of emerging black farmers. The challenge is the state's agri-cluster approach, not the individual Agriparks. The state must build the necessary political infrastructure to counter challenges of unequal access to productive agriculture land and investments. As Piketty (2014) asserts, no government programme can succeed without an apparatus of justification, the corporate press, lobbyists, think-tanks, and an infrastructure of persuasion or a justifying narrative. Without these aspects, government austerity measures will be politically unsustainable (Piketty, 2014). Over the past few decades, many rural villages have either been overlooked and isolated because of their geographic location far away from infrastructure or been depopulated by years of depeasantisation of the rural population who search for jobs and opportunities in urban areas. Government implemented Agriparks for agricultural sustainability in the farming and rural development sectors. However, authorities often seem to prefer bigger, more productive industrialised farms that can support global agriculture value chains. The role of the Government is to create an enabling environment for the development of agriculture in a way that the overall economic, social and environmental objectives can be achieved (see KI.1). However, the role of the Government in regulating the markets and determining agriculture has been reduced, which impacts competitiveness and efficiency.

Together with the neoliberal approach of government, global corporates and large-scale industrial farmers are strongly supporting agro-commercialization, high-value cash crops, and agribusiness

opportunities. The collaborative efforts of restructuring are redirecting scarce agricultural lands and resources from national food production for the people to commercial agro-production for-profit and wealthy global consumers. In South Africa, the ideology of commercial farming is inseparable from ''white'' commercial farming. As explained by Cousins (2013a, b), the large commercial farms were and still are largely white owned, as are the corporate suppliers and buyers they deal with. These large ''white'' commercial farms were deliberately created and are just as much an outcome of colonial and apartheid land dispossession as black landlessness is. Post-apartheid land reforms have failed to deliver substantive changes to this situation and it was found that difficulties in accessing their own land was one of the main reasons that no black farmers graduated from the Agriparks to go it alone. With this has come an entrenched belief among white and black farmers and policy makers in the superiority of this ''white'' model. But of course, it was a model that was only built to serve the interests of a minority and cannot hope to serve the majority unless fundamentally changed.

A new imagination is needed that transcends the interwoven ideologies of neoliberal economics and race-based notions of superiority. I contend, the success of district municipalities implementing programmes that address farmers' practices depends to a large extent on beneficiaries' access to land (along with water), security of tenure, and effective land use. This requires state service providers to go beyond their primary tasks of services provision, and to work together with local actors to process information and knowledge to improve implementation. As argued by political economy scholars, I concur that Agriparks, have implications for key and unresolved questions in South Africa that all have implications for production efficiency and equity, such as the most appropriate: (i) size of land holding; (ii) land tenancy arrangements; (iii) farm employment arrangements; and (iv) technological changes involving mechanisation and modernisation.

8.4 State Closing the Gaps

South Africa has to maintain a delicate balance between addressing past injustice and inequality on the one hand and on the other hand, advancing the neoliberal capitalist development agenda (see, 6.1; 7.4.3). Through the CRDP, the government argues, Agriparks enrich the agriculture ecosystem, serve farmers and create opportunities for rural communities. I agree with Wolford (2005) about the negative impacts of neoliberal agriculture restructuring on nations reliant on small-scale farming. I assert that in supporting change and transformation the state requires a supportive, advanced, and flexible approach. The state's concerns about global economic competitiveness are increasingly driving particular large-scale reform agendas designed to address problems of production and market access. However, these reforms are often not favourable to small-scale farmers and the majority of people. In the relentless pursuit of neoliberal policies, reform agendas mostly incorporate concepts of competition and consumer choice. Agriparks as sites of change don't have to follow this approach. Instead they could, for example, experiment with agroecology in production and local and territorial markets for distribution. They could

embrace food sovereignty and other more sustainable frameworks better suited to the needs and aspirations of black farmers and explicitly orientated to building a better society, rather than narrowly focusing on profits. The Agriparks programme provides an environment of situated learning and the potential for meaningful participation and the rebuilding of communities that have been unsettled, dislocated and marginalised. I recognise that insufficient land holding is a major barrier in the development of small and marginal farmers that will have to be addressed to achieve such potential. Investing in poor communities is not seen as profitable, so the state cannot rely on corporations and will need to make available public resources. In a challenging and modernising globalising environment, small-scale farmers need the necessary knowledge base to develop. I argue for the development of a knowledge base of farmers, various forms of sustainable and environmentally clean agriculture practices, and the participation of civil society organizations. To further widen social justice, equality and good governance the role of non-organizations organisations is important to promote public accountability and transparency. As land reform and rural development programmes become more multifaceted and complex the role of non-government organisations becomes increasingly important.

8.5. Possibilities and Opportunities for Farmers

The study shows that the Agriparks provide emerging black farmers with farming plots and basic facilities such as water, greenhouse tunnels, fertiliser and seeds. State extension services have provided economic incentives for small-scale farmers to increase crop yields and incomes. Also, Agriparks help beneficiaries to have a positive impact on farming outcomes in areas such as problem solving, crop nurturing and standardisation of production. Some of this innovation has been driven through interns who emphasise creative thinking on things like nursery development that can reduce dependence on bought seeds and seedlings. For example, farmers in both Levubu and Westonaria have started nurseries for seedlings. Other innovations have focused on targeted interventions to address issues related to farmers' welfare, often organised by the farmers themselves. For example, a number of participants share resources and provide produce for improving the income of farmers with poor yields. Often, bringing additional rural labour and resources contributes to capital accumulation and improves livelihoods. I support the idea that social entities such as universities and non-governmental organisations help in the development of collective efficiency through helping farmers to buy supplies in bulk and sell their produce in bulk. As argued by farmers, the state should work closely with the farmers in identifying new products and markets and assist in the marketing of produce. The state should explore local market arrangements that create autonomy from corporate controlled markets, and support investment in agro-processing at a scale that works for smaller-scale black farmers and local entrepreneurs.

Farming may not be a miracle cure for everyone, but farming institutions must equip those who want to farm with the skills and opportunities needed for development. Private institutions must engage with farmers, communities and government to create synchronised and flexible methods to access agriculture

investment and funding. Government's funding to trigger transformation is critical and incentives are needed for tertiary institutions to do more to develop the broad skills that drive efficiency and innovation in globalised spaces, including cross-sectoral competencies and communication. The theorist, Karl Polanyi (1957) warned many years ago that trying to convert the entire world into a massive marketplace would end in the ''demolition of society''. I am of the view that farmer development should not be left to the market place, rather huge budgets need to be directed toward small farms through investing in water and soil conservation, offering low-interest loans and access to markets, and enhancing productivity. Furthermore, tackling poverty, food insecurity, and the financing of food systems needs to start with a long-term rural transformation agenda that brings small-scale producers to the front. However, I assert that many emerging farmers are currently not even able to produce their own food. Many of them have to sell their assets as they do not have enough means to feed themselves. Also, more broadly, climate shocks such as droughts and flooding have made it worse. The fact that we have not paid enough attention to how food is produced, how food is distributed, how food is stored, and the creation of jobs in many of the rural areas is leading to a food and livelihood emergency. While regressive programmes have led to rural poverty, progressive programmes should create opportunities for market reforms that will allow agriculture to make a significant contribution to poverty alleviation and improve household food security.

8.6. Idealism and Pragmatism

Globally, capitalism is enacted through minimising the role of the state, supporting privatisation and relying on free market mechanisms (see Bernstein, 2013). In the Agripark case studies, I found the hybrid coexistence of a broad spectrum of small-scale and large-scale farmers. I am cognisant that the proposed 'coexistence' of farmers with different farming scales and styles can lead to commercial and capitalist farmers marginalising peasant farmers out of the market. Also, the prevalent dominant discourse offers the necessity for 'small' and 'large farms' (peasant and corporate farms) to coexist next to each other (see IFAD, 2010). Clearly, the privileged and industrialised farmers influence practices towards their own interests, thus reinforcing the continued marginalisation of the already marginalised farmers (see Oya, 2009). I agree with Wolford (2007) who argues for a comprehensive approach to tackle the causes of agricultural dualism and to create opportunities to build infrastructure and a sustainable ecological system. I support that both 'small' and 'large' farmers need to contribute to food sovereignty (see Cousins, 2013). I argue that agriculture-led growth should be a result of well-marshalled and strategically fixed investment by the public and private sectors in an interdependent relationship not making wealth creators even richer via generous tax cuts. However, political economy analyses must consider the particular racial character of capitalism in the South African context. Not only do market forces and market-based ideologies work against black farmers but race based networks and patterns of discrimination (even if subtler these days) also discriminate against them in markets and undermine their

contribution to the creation of a different vision and policy framework for agriculture and the wider agri-food system.

Stock et al. (2014) indicate that, in the struggle for survival and livelihoods, the situation on the ground among struggling farmers is much more nuanced in contrast with prevailing narratives that see farmers as either legitimators or resistors of a neoliberal status quo. Stock et al. (2014) proffer that farmers react to neoliberal exposures by overlapping between ‘’neoliberal autonomy’’ or ‘’actual autonomy’’. Neoliberal autonomy is predicated on farmers achieving autonomy because of entrepreneurial and individual traits associated with neoliberal logic (see Guthman, 2008). ‘Actual autonomy’ is, hence, predicated on combined strengths to realise mutual interests (Stock et al., 2014). In addition to serving the needs of a communities’ economy by building its financial and human capital, small-scale farming plays a critical role in preserving social cohesion, enabling individuals to contribute to and participate fully in civil society. I argue that financial sustainability could be addressed in a number of ways. Taxation could be imposed on the extraordinary profits in the agriculture sector to level the playing field. There should be state-led initiatives of building bulk agriculture infrastructure and facilities for collection, packaging and storage – the fastest and lowest cost route to boosting local markets – along with accelerating the land acquisition programme.

Countries investing in agriculture are among those enjoying sustained economic growth (see Bernstein, 2010; Cousins, 2013b). However, the main challenge for every country is to find financing models that are just, reasonable and sustainable within their particular contexts. I contend that a proper agrarian policy for a country requires a long-term vision and successive governments working to implement such a vision as the world changes. The South African government system is not set up for long-term visionary planning for things that take a long time to change or are always present for a government to take care of, such as agriculture, research and development, and the environment. Sadly, the government or politicians are concerned about the next election cycle and getting re-elected. Undeniably, redirecting attention away from powerful corporates is difficult. But, one of the reasons these monopolies succeed with their agenda to remake agriculture for profit, not the public good, is that most people have come to believe the dominant narrative that unrestrained capitalist interests cannot be overcome. However, popular resistance is possible. It can come through food strikes, landless people’s movements, and the expansion of community-led models of agriculture development, such as cooperatives. To succeed, it is necessary that there should be a united, powerful, and appropriate solidarity of the landless and rural poor across the country. I contend that the intrinsic quality and worth of a programme like Agriparks cannot be fairly judged by economic statistics, or by produce and market outcomes. As indicated by my various assertions, it is not just income and wealth inequality that is plaguing our society, it is the maldistribution of economic and political power.

To take forward these complex debates and find workable solutions, I posit that the following issues need further consideration and research:

1. Race dynamics and constraints black farmers in particular face. Although racism was not the starting point of my study, black farmers raised race as an issue that could not be ignored. My analysis shows that access to land, institutions, investment, and markets shapes the discourse of black farmers. A deeper analysis of race, rooted in CRT, will enhance understanding about how racial inequality is reproduced through government policies.
2. How state price regulation and market support can create better opportunities and stability for small-scale farmers.
3. How Agriparks can be turned into sites of struggle and change. Addressing complex social, political, and economic dilemmas that confront our society can be challenging in the Agriparks context. Agriparks provide a platform for officials to engage with civil society organisations and farmers about local and global issues of sustainable agriculture, such as agroecology, and the environment. It is a huge challenge for emerging black farmers to have their voices heard, let alone to proffer alternatives to the corporatisation of agriculture. It is important to explore through participatory methods how Agriparks can be used to address this challenge.
4. Synergies between land and agrarian reform programmes and civil society organisations to facilitate implementation. The entire agrarian system is relevant: who decides, who benefits and who profits.
5. The significance of emerging black farmers for economic growth and political stability of society as well as the environment. Examine the dynamic paradox that strategies to advance the agricultural practices and outcomes for emerging black farmers can be achieved mainly through state support but the outcome of these efforts benefit transformation.

8.7. Conclusions

In a post-apartheid era with pre-existing dual and parallel farming systems, a major challenge for the democratic state is empowering emerging black farmers to become viable, sustainable and resourced. The introduction of the Agriparks in 2010 could have been a vital step in assuring access of the rural poor to a critical state intervention. Agriparks where intended to provide a platform for the state to meaningfully engage with emerging black farmers, the private sector, and other partners to address local and global challenges. However, Agriparks, and their particular racial form in South Africa, emerge within a context of, on the one hand, global neoliberal agro-industrialisation and commercialisation and, on the other hand, growing inequality, land dispossession, environmental stresses, and counter movements such as food sovereignty. Under these neoliberal conditions, it was found in practice that three options are available for black farmers in Agriparks. The first two options are to either stay in fairly marginal production roles as subsidised beneficiaries of poorly run projects or be one of a very limited number

who more fully enters the corporate value chains on the wrong end of unequal power relations. Neither of these options has the potential for a wider transformation of the current highly unequal land relations or the agricultural sector in South Africa. The third option, which still needs to be developed in practice, is for farmers to leverage the space the Agriparks create for them to link to wider peasant social movements and to organize for a more fundamental transformation. At the heart of such a transformation would be different modes of production and more autonomy from the corporate production and distribution systems.

An overarching issue is the way that South Africa's race-based inequities continue to manifest in unequal land ownership and resource distribution. Black farmers believe that the apartheid tenet of separate and discriminatory development is still prevalent in private and public institutions. Farmers talk of situations where they felt they were dismissed because of the colour of their skin. Constraints include discrimination, especially against black women, lack of access to investment opportunities, bias such as ''blacks cannot farm'', and practices that maintain and perpetuate white supremacist stereotypes. Emerging black farmers often face various forms of overt and covert racism that impose constraints and inhibit them from advancing in the sector. I introduce CRT of agrarian reform to frame and give the required attention to the influence of race in the Agriparks and farmer's experiences. It turns out that inequality and the loss of farming mobility are not, as claimed, the result of black people's ''mindset, perception and culture'' but rather are rooted in racially discriminatory practices. Amid growing international socio-economic concerns, Agriparks rewrite but do not fundamentally negate economic liberalism.

References

Adams, M., & Howell, J. (2001). Redistributive land reform in Southern Africa. Natural Resource Perspectives, no. 64. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Adedeji, A., ed. (1993). Africa within the World: Beyond Dispossession and Dependence, London: Zed books.

Adelman, I., (1984). "Beyond Export-led Growth." World Development, 12(9): 937-949.

Adger, N., (2006). "Vulnerability." Global Environment Change. gloenvcha (Accessed 04-05-2021).

AfDB, (2016). Feed Africa: strategy for agricultural transformation in Africa 2016- 2025. Available at: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/ (Accessed 02-04-2021).

AfDB, (2017). Staple Crops Processing Zones. A Flagship Program of the Feed Africa Strategy. Available at: https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/ (Accessed 25 Feb. 2022).

Akram-Lodhi, A.H., (1998). *The agrarian question, past and present*. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 25, no. 4: 134–49.

Africa Agriculture, Trade and Investment Fund, AATIF (2015). Annual report 2014/15. (Accessed 04 -05-2021).

Agarwal, B., (1994). A field of one's own: gender and land rights in South Asia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Agarwal, B., (2011). Food Crises and Gender Inequality (Working Paper No. 107). United Nations, Department of Economics and Social Affairs.

AgriSETA (2007). Annual report 2006/07. Available at: http://www.pmg.org.za (Accessed 11-11-2021).

Akram-Lodhi, S., Borras & C Kay (eds), (2007). *Land, Poverty and Livelihoods in an Era of Globalization: Perspectives from Developing and Transition Countries*, London: Routledge.

Akram-Lodhi A., (2007). Land, markets and neoliberal enclosure: An agrarian political economy perspective. *Third World Quarterly* 28(8): 1437–1456.

Akram-Lodhi, a. Haroon, and Cristóbal Kay, eds. (2008). *Peasants and Globalization: Political Economy, Rural Transformation and the Agrarian Question*. Routledge.

Akram-Lodhi, A.H., (2008). *"(Re)Imagining Agrarian Relations? The World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development.*" Development and Change 39(6):1145-1161.

Akram-Lodhi, A., Haroon & Kay, C., (2009). 'The agrarian question. Peasants and rural change', in: A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi and Cristobal Kay, (eds) Peasants and Globalization. Political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question, pp. 3-34. London and New York: Routledge.

Akram-Lodhi, A., Kay, C., (2010). *Surveying the agrarian question (part 2): current debates and beyond*. J. Peasant Stud. 37, 255–284.

Alcock, R., (2013). 'The Curious Case of the Unknown Farmers' (Paper presented to conference on 'Land Divided: Land and South African Society in Comparative Perspective', Cape Town, 24–27 March 2013).

Alesina, A.; Dollar, D., (2000). *Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?* In: Journal of Economic Growth (Vol. 5, No. 1), S. 33–63.

Allen, W., & Solórzano, D., (2001). *Affirmative action, educational equity, and campus racial climate: A case study of the university of Michigan law school*, Berkeley La Raza Law Journal, 12(2), 237–363.

Aliber, M., M. Baiphethi, R., de Satge, J., Denison, T. Hart, P. Jacobs and W. van Averbeke, eds, (2009). *Strategies to Support South African Smallholders as a Contribution to Government's Second Economy Strategy*. Vol. 1: *Situation Analysis, Fieldwork Findings and Main Conclusions.* Vol. 2: *Case Studies*. PLAAS.

Aliber, M & Hall, R., (2010a). Working Paper 17 The Case for Re-Strategising Spending Priorities to Support Small Scale Farmers in South Africa April 2010 Ruth Hall and Michael Aliber Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS) University of the Western Cape

Aliber, M & Hall, R., (2010b). Development of Evidence-Based Policy around Small-Scale Farming. Report commissioned by the Programme to Support Pro-Poor Policy Development, on behalf of the Presidency. Pretoria: Government of the Republic of South Africa.

Aliber, M., Baipethi, M. & Jacobs, P., (2009). 'Agricultural employment scenarios', in: Hall, R. (ed.), *Another countryside. Policy options for land and agrarian reform in South Africa*. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape (121-163).

Altieri, M. A., & Toledo, V. M., (2011). *The agroecological revolution in Latin America: rescuing nature, ensuring food sovereignty and empowering peasants*. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(3):587-612.

Altieri, M. A., (1987). Agroecology: the scientific basis of alternative agriculture. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.

Altieri, M., A., (1995). Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture. Boulder: Westview Press.

Altieri, M., A., (2002). Agroecology: The science of natural resource management for poor farmers in marginal environments. Agriculture Ecosystems and Environment 93 (1-3): 1-24.

Alvesson, Mats; Sköldberg, Kaj., (2013): Reflexive methodology. New vistas for qualitative research. 2nd ed. London [etc.]: Sage.

Ainslie, A., (ed.) (2002). Cattle ownership and production in the communal areas of the Eastern Cape, South Africa. Research Report No. 10, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Amanor, K. S., (2009). *'Global Food Chains, African Smallholders and World Bank Governance'*, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 9:2, April, pp. 247-262.

Amanor, K.S., (2013). South-South Cooperation in Context: Perspectives from Africa. FAC Working Paper 54.

Amin, S., (1976). Unequal development: An essay on the social formations of peripheral capitalism (trans. B. Pearce). New York, NY.

Amin, S., (2003). "World Poverty, Pauperization and Capital Accumulation." New York, NY: October, 55(5).

Aminzade, R., (2003). *From race to citizenship: The indigenization debate in post-socialist Tanzania. Studies in Comparative International Development*, 38(1), 43–63.

African National Congress, (1978). Strategy and Tactics of the ANC, in ANC: Speaks Documents and Statements of the ANC (1955-1976) ANC. Lusaka.

African National Congress, (1994). The Reconstruction and Development Programme: A Policy Framework. Johannesburg. ANC.

Anderson, T., Schwaag, S., Sörvik J. & Wise, E. (2004). The Cluster Policy White book. International Organization for Knowledge and Enterprise Development. IKED, Malmö, Sweden.

Anseeuw, W., Alden Wily, L., Cotula, L., & Taylor, M., (2011). Land Rights and the Rush for Land: Findings of the Global Commercial Pressures on Land Research Report. Rome: International Land Coalition.

Anseeuw, W., M. Boche, T. Breu, M. Giger, J. Lay, P. Messerli, & K. Nolte. (2012). Transnational Land Deals for Agriculture in the Global South: Analytical Report Based on the Land Matrix Database. Bern: CDE; Montpellier: CIRAD; Hamburg: GIGA.

Anzaldúa, G., (1990). Haciendo Caras/making face, making soul: creative and critical perspectives by women of color San Francisco, CA, Aunt Lute Press.

Anzaldúa, G., (2002). Now let us shift … the path of conocimiento … inner work, public acts, in: G. Anzaldúa & A. Keating (Eds) This bridge we call home: radical visions for transformation, 540–578. New York, Routledge.

Appendini, K., (2014). Reconstructing the Maize Market in Rural Mexico. Journal of Agrarian Change,14(1), pp1-25.

Araghi, F., (1995). *Global depeasantization, 1945–1990*. The Sociological Quarterly 36(2): 337–368.

Araghi, F., (1999). The great global enclosure of our times: Peasants and the agrarian Question at the end of the twentieth century. In: F. Magdoff, J. B. Foster & F. H. Buttel (Eds), Hungry for profit: The agribusiness threat to farmers, food and the environment (pp. 145–160). New York.

Farshad. 2003. "*Food Regimes and the Production of Value: Some Methodological Issues." Journal of Peasant Studies* 30(2):41–70.

Araghi, F., (2000). The great global enclosure of our times: Peasants and the agrarian question at the end of the twentieth century. In Hungry for profit, eds. F. Magdoff, J.B. Foster, and F.H. Buttel, 145–60. New York.

Araghi, F., (2003). *"Food regimes and the production of value: Some methodological issues." Journal of Peasant Studies 30, 2: 337-68.*

Arrighi, G., (2007). Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century. London & New York: Verso.

Araghi, F., (2009). Accumulation by displacement: global enclosures, the food crisis, and the ecological contradictions of capitalism, Review, 32(1), pp. 113–146.

Arrighi, G., Aschoff, N., & B., Scully, B., (2010). Accumulation by Dispossession and Its Limits: The Southern Africa Paradigm Revisited. *Studies in Comparative International Development,* 45(4), 410-438.

Asante, M., K., (1987). The Afrocentric idea Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press.

Auer, C., (2010): Global Partnerships for Agriculture and Food Security: Actors, missions and achievements. In: Rural 21, 44 (5): 11-16

AUC, ECA, AfDB., (2010). Framework and Guidelines on Land Policy in Africa. Land Policy in Africa: A Framework to Strengthen Land Rights, Enhance Productivity and Secure Livelihoods. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia: AUC-ECA-AfDB Consortium.

Backeberg, G., (2013). Priorities for agricultural water management, small business development and job creation. Presentation to a Water Imbizo, Standard Bank Global Leadership Centre, Johannesburg, 14 October 2013.

Bair, J., & Hough, P., (2012). The legacies of partial possession: From agrarian struggle to neoliberal restructuring in Mexico and Colombia. sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav. http://www (Accessed 15. 03. 2022).

Baker, A., (2010). *The Market and the Masses in Latin America: Policy Reform and Consumption in Liberalizing Economies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Barker, J.B., Bell, P., Duggan, A, Horler, V., Leroux, V., Maurice, P., Reynierse, C. & Schafer, P., (1988). Illustrated history of South Africa: the real story. New York: Reader's Digest. 51 1 p.

Barkin, D., (2002). *"The Reconstruction of a Modern Mexican Peasantry."* Journal of Peasant Studies 30 (1): 73–90.

Barnes, R., (1990). Race consciousness: the thematic content of racial distinctiveness in critical race scholarship, Harvard Law Review, 103, 1864–1871.

Barry, A; Osborne, T. & Rose, N., (1996b), Introduction, in Barry et al (1996a), pp. 1-17. Beck, U; Giddens, A; & Lash, S. (1994), Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order, Cambridge, Polity.

Barry, A; Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (Eds.) (1996a), Foucault and political reason: Liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government, London, UCL Press.

Bates, R., Berkeley, C., (1981). California University Press, 1984. Robert Bates' Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies (1981).

Bates, R., (1984). Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies, Berkeley, CA: California University Press, 1984, p 102.

Bate, S. P., (1997). What happened to organizational anthropology? A review of the field of organizational ethnography and anthropology studies. Human Relations, 50(9), 1147-1175.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S., (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. The Qualitative Report, 13(4), 544-556.

Bell, D. A., (1995). "Brown V. Board of Education and the Interest Convergence Dilemma." In Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement, edited by K. Crenshaw, N. Gotanda, G. Peller and K. Thomas,20 – 29. New York: The New Press.

Berg, B.L. (1998). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. (3rd Edn.) Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bernard HR., (2002). Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches. 3rd Alta Mira Press; Walnut Creek, CA: 2002.

Bernstein, H., (1996a). How White Agriculture (Re)positioned Itself for a "New South Africa"', Critical Sociology, 22 (3): 9–36.

Bernstein, H., (1996). *South Africa's Agrarian Question: Extreme and Exceptional?* Journal of Peasant Studies 23 (2–3): 1–52.

Bernstein, H., (1996b). The political economy of the maize filiere'. In: Bernstein, H. (Ed.), The Agrarian Question in South Africa. Frank Cass, London, pp. 120–145.

Bernstein, H., (2001a). 'The Peasantry' in Global Capitalism: Who, where and Why? Socialist Register. pp. 25–52.

Bernstein, H., (2001b). ''The peasantry'' in global capitalism: who, where, and why? In Socialist Register 2001: Working classes global realities, eds. L. Panitch and C. Leys, 25–51. London: Merlin.

Bernstein, H., (2005). Rural land and land conflicts in sub-Saharan Africa. In: S. Moyo and P. Yeros, eds. Reclaiming the land: the resurgence of rural movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America. London: Zed Books, pp. 67–101.

Bernstein, H., (2006). *Is there an agrarian question in the 21st century?* Canadian Journal of Development Studies XXVII, no. 4: 449–60.

Bernstein, H., (2008). Agrarian questions from transition to globalisation. In: H. Akram Lodhi and C. Kay, eds. Peasants and globalisation: political economy, rural transformation and the agrarian question. London: Routledge, pp. 239–61.

Bernstein, H., (2009). '*V.I. Lenin and A.V. Chayanov: looking back, looking forward Journal of Peasant Studies* 36 (1): 55-81.

Bernstein, H., (2010a). *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood.

Bernstein, H., (2010a). *Introduction: some questions concerning the productive forces. Journal of Agrarian Change, 10(3), 300–314.*

Bernstein, H., (2013). Commercial Agriculture in South Africa since 1994: 'Natural, Simply Capitalism' *Journal of Agrarian Change, Vol. 13 No. 1, January 2013, pp. 23–46.*

Bernstein, H., (2016). *Agrarian political economy and modern world capitalism: the contributions of food regime analysis*. Journal of Peasant Studied. 43, 611–647.

Birks, M, & Mills, J., (2011). Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide. London: CA: Sage.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K., (1998). Qualitative research for education; an introduction to theory and methods (3rd Ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bookchin, M., (1982). The ecology of freedom: The emergence and dissolution of hierarchy. Palo Alto, CA: Cheshire Books.

Boone, C., (1994). ''States and ruling classes in postcolonial Africa: the enduring contradictions of power'', in Joel Migdal *et al* (eds), *State Power and Social Forces: Domination and Transformation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Borras, S.M. Jr., (2005). Can redistributive reform be achieved via market-based land transfer schemes? Lessons and evidence from the Philippines. Journal of Development Studies, 41(1), 90–134.

Borras, S.M. Jr., (2006). *The Philippine land reform in comparative perspective: some conceptual and methodological implications*. Journal of Agrarian Change, 6(1), 69–101.

Booth A., Papaioannou, D. & Sutton, A., (2011). Systematic approaches to a successful literature review, Sage.

Borras, S., (2003). *Questioning the market-led agrarian reform; experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa. Journal of Agrarian Change, 3(3), 367–94.*

Borras, S., Edelman, M, & C. Kay, C., (2008). *Transnational Agrarian Movements. Origins and Politics, Campaigns and Impacts*, *Journal of Agrarian Change, 8 (2, 3), 169-204.*

Borras, S.M., & Franco, J.C., (2010). *From threat to opportunity? Problems with the idea of a 'code of conduct' for land-grabbing*. Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal, 13(2), 507–23.

Borras, S., & Franco, C., (2010). Contemporary discourses and contestations around pro-poor land policies and land governance. J. Agrar. Change 10, 1–32.

Borras, S., Franco, J., Kay, C. & Spoor, M., (2011). Land Grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean Viewed from Broader International Perspectives Chile: FAO Regional Office.

Borras, S. M., Jr., Franco, J. C., Gome´z, S., Kay, C. & Spoor, M. (2012) *Land grabbing in Latin America and the Caribbean, Journal of Peasant Studies, 39(3/4), pp. 845–872*.

Borras, S., Hall, R., Scoones, I., White, B., & Wolford, W., (2011). *Towards a better understanding of global land grabbing: an editorial introduction. J. Peasant Stud. 38, 209–216.*

Borras, Saturnino M. Jr. & Jennifer C. Franco. (2012). *A 'Land Sovereignty' Alternative? Towards a Peoples' Counter-Enclosure*. TNI Agrarian Justice Programme. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Transnational Institute.

Borras, S., Jennifer, F., & Chunyu, W., (2012). *Competing Political Tendencies in Global Governance of Land Grabbing*. TNI Agrarian Justice Programme. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Transnational Institute.

Borras, S., & Franco, J., (2012). *Global Land Grabbing and Trajectories of Agrarian Change: A Preliminary Analysis. Journal of Agrarian Change, 12(1), 26*.

Borras Jr, S., Kay, C., Gómez, S., & Wilkinson, J., (2012). *Land grabbing and global capitalist accumulation: key features in Latin America, Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue Canadienne d'études du development, 33:4, 402-416*

Borras, S., & Franco, J., (2013). *Global land grabbing and political reactions 'from below'. Third World Quarterly, 34(9), 1723–1747.*

Borras, S., & Franco, J., (2018). *The challenge of locating land-based climate change mitigation and adaptation politics within a social justice perspective: Towards an idea of agrarian climate justice. Third World Quarterly, 39(7), 1308–1325.*

Borras Jr., Elyse, N., Mills, Philip Seufert, Stephan Backes, Daniel Fyfe, Roman Herre & Laura Michèle (2020). Transnational land investment web: land grabs, TNCs, and the challenge of global governance, Globalisation.

Bosworth, B. & Broun, D., (1996). Connect the Dots: Using Cluster-Based Strategies to Create Urban Employment. Firm Connections 4(2): 1–6.

Bosworth, G., (2010). *Commercial Counterurbanisation: An Emerging Force in Rural Economic Development. Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space, 42(4), 966–981*

Boucher, M., (1991). Die eeu van ontdekkingsreise. Kaapstad: Human & Rosseau. 55-74p.

Brendan, B., (2000). *A Revolution in the Market: The Deregulation of South African Agriculture* (Oxford, 2000), p. 108.

Brenner, N. & Theodore, N., (2002). 'Cities and the Geographies of "Actually Existing Neoliberalism"'. Antipode, 34 (3): 349–79.

Brenner, N., & Stuart, E., (2009). *Henri Lefebvre on State, Space, Territory1*, 3 International Politics. Sociology. 353–377.

Bretton Woods Project. (2014). Follow the money: http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org (Accesses 2021-07-22).

Brewer, C.A., (2013). Historicizing in critical policy analysis: The production of cultural histories and microhistories. International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27(3), 273-288.

Broad, R., (2004). The Washington consensus meets the global backlash: Shifting debates and policies. *Globalizations* 1(2): 129–154.

Bromberger, N. & Hughes, K., (1987). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in South Africa,* David Philip, Cape Town.

Brookfield, H. & Parsons, H., (2007). *Family farms: survival and prospect: A world-wide analysis*. Routledge.

Brown, A., L., & K. Brown, K., (2010). "Strange Fruit Indeed: Interrogating Contemporary Textbook Representations of Racial Violence towards African Americans." Teachers College Record 112 (1): 31 – 67.

Brown, K., D., (2010). "Is This What We Want Them to Say? Examining the Tensions in What U.S. Preservice Teachers Say about Risk and Academic Achievement." Teaching and Teacher Education 26: 1077 – 1087.

Brown, A., L., (2011). "Pedagogies of Experience: A Case of the African American Male Teacher." Teaching Education 22 (4): 363 – 376.Brown, K. D. 2011. "Elevating the Role of Race in Ethnographic Research: Navigating Race Relations in the Field." Ethnography and Education 6 (1):97 – 111.

Brown, A., L., (2012). *"On Human Kinds and Role Models: A Critical Discussion about the African American Male Teacher." Educational Studies 48 (3):296 – 315*.

Brown, K., D., (2012). “Trouble on My Mind: Toward a Framework of Humanizing Critical Sociocultural Knowledge for Teaching and Teacher Education.” Race Ethnicity and Education 3: 1 – 23.

Brush, B., Bellon, M., & Schmidt, E., (1988). “Agricultural Development and Maize Diversity in Mexico.” Human Ecology 16 (3).

Bruhn, K., (1996). Social spending and political support: The ‘lessons’ of the National Solidarity Program in Mexico. *Comparative Politics* 28(2): 151–177.

Bryant, T., & Charmaz, K., (2007). The Sage Handbook of Grounded Theory. CA: Sage.

Bryceson, D., F., (1999). African rural labour: income diversification and livelihood approaches: A long-term development perspective. Review of African political economy No 80:171-189

Bryceson, D., F., (2002a). The scramble in Africa: reorienting rural livelihoods. World Dev. 30, 725–739.

Bryceson, D.F., (2002b). Multiplex livelihoods in rural Africa: recasting the terms and conditions of gainful employment. African. Studies. 40, 1–28.

Bryceson, D., F., (2004). Agrarian Vista or Vortex: African rural livelihood policies. Review of African Political Economy 31(102) 617-629.

Buchanan, I., & Colebrook, C., (2000). “Deleuze’s Bergson: Duration, the Virtual and a Politics of the Future”, in Buchanan, I. and C. Colebrook (eds.) Deleuze and Feminist Theory, Edinburgh: Edinburgh university Press: 214-234.

Buras, K., (2011). “Race, Charter Schools, and Conscious Capitalism: On the Spatial Politics of Whiteness as Property (and the Unconscionable Assault on Black New Orleans).” Harvard Educational Review 81 (2): 296 – 330.

Burns, R.B., (1997). Introduction to research methods. (3rd edn.). South Melbourne: Longman.

Butler, J, Rotberg, R, I &, Adams, J., (1977). 'The black homelands of South Africa. The political and economic development of Bophuthatswana and KwaZulu'. Berkeley.

Byres, T., (1977). “*Agrarian Transition and the Agrarian Question*.” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 4 *(February 2013): 258–74.*

Byres, T., (1981). *The new technology, class formation and class action in the Indian countryside*. *Journal of Peasant Studies, 8(4), 405–59.*

Byres, T.J., (1991). The agrarian question and differing forms of capitalist transition: an essay with reference to Asia. In: J. Breman and S. Mundle, eds. Rural transformation in Asia. Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp. 3–76.

Byres, T.J., (1996). Capitalism from above and capitalism from below. An essay in comparative political economy. London: Macmillan.

Byres, T.J., (2005). Neoliberalism and Primitive Accumulation in less Developed Countries, in Alfredo Saad Filho and Deborah Johnston, Neoliberalism, A Critical Reader Pluto.

Campbell, M. L., (2004). Mapping social relations: A primer in doing institutional ethnography. AltaMira Press.

Campbell, H., & LeHeron, R., (2007). Supermarkets, producers and audit technologies: The constitutive micro-politics of food, legitimacy and governance. In Supermarkets and agri-food supply chains: Transformations in the production and consumption of foods, eds. D. Burch and G. Lawrence, 131–53. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Caracas, Venezuela, 24–28 April (2006). *Trends and Challenges in Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries* and *Food Security in Latin America and the Caribbean.* http://www.rlc.fao.org/larc06/pdf/inf06e.pdf (Accessed 31-05-2022).

Carrim, Y., (2009). Why the co-operative governance system needs to change? Delivery, October: 16 19.

Cassman, K.G., (1999). "Ecological Intensification of Cereal Production Systems: Yield Potential, Soil Quality, and Precision Agriculture". Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 96: 5952–5959.

Castree, N., (2006). 'From neoliberalism to neo liberalisation: Consolations, confusions and necessary illusions', Environment and Planning A 38: 1–6.

Castree, N., (2008). "Neoliberalising Nature: Processes, Effects, and Evaluations." Environment and Planning A 40 (1): 153–73.

Chambers, R., Pacey, A., & Thrupp, L., A., (1989). Farmer First: Farmer Innovation and Agricultural Research. London: IT Publications.

Chapman, T., (2011). "A Critical Race Theory Analysis of past and Present Institutional Processes and Policies in Teacher Education." In Studying Diversity in Teacher Education, edited by A. S. Ball and C.

Charmaz, K., (2006). Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Charmes, J., (2006). A review of empirical evidence on time use in Africa from UN-sponsored surveys. In: Blackden CM, Wodon Q (eds) Gender, time use, and poverty in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank working paper no 73. World Bank, Washington, DC, pp 39–73.

Clapp, J., & Isakson, R., (2018). Speculative harvest: Finalization, food and agriculture. Halifax: Fernwood.

Clarke, J., (2018). ‘An analysis of employment trends, opportunities and constraints in the forestry and wood products industries’, PLAAS Working Paper 52. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Cobbett, M., (1988). The land question in a post-apartheid South Africa: A preliminary assessment in Cross, C. and Haines, R. (Eds) Towards Freehold? Options for land and development in South Africa's black rural areas, Juta & Co. Ltd, Johannesburg.

Colchester, M., Aik Pang, W., Chuo, W., & Jalong, T., (2007). Land is Life: Land Rights and Oil Palm Development in Sarawak Bogor: Sawit Watch & Moreton-in-Marsh: Forest Peoples Programme.

Collier, D., & Mahoney, J., (1996). Insights and pitfalls: Selection bias in qualitative research. World Politics, 49(1), 56-91.

Cooper, D., (1988). Working the Land: Review of Agriculture in South Africa, Environmental and Developmental Agency, Johannesburg.

Cotula, L., (2011). The Outlook on Farmland Acquisitions. Commercial Pressures on Land Series. Rome: International Land Coalition.

Cotula, L. (2012). *The international political economy of the global land rush: A critical appraisal of trends, scale, geography and drivers*. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39(3–4), 649–680.*

Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, (2015). Report 2015. Pretoria.

Cousins, B., (2004). What is a ‘smallholder farmer’ in South Africa today? Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Cousins, B., (2007). ‘Agrarian reform and the two economies: transforming South Africa’s countryside’, in: Lungisile Ntsebeza and Ruth Hall (eds.), The Land Question in South Africa: The Challenge of Transformation and Redistribution, Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Cousins, B., (2013a). Smallholder Irrigation Schemes, Agrarian Reform and “Accumulation from Above and from Below” in South Africa’, Journal of Agrarian Change, 13, 1 (2013).

Cousins, B., (2013b). ‘’Land and Agriculture Uncoupled: The Political Economy of Rural Reform in Post-apartheid South Africa’’, in Paul Hebinck and Ben Cousins (eds.), In the Shadow of Policy: Everyday Practices in South Africa’s Land and Agrarian Reform (Johannesburg, 2013).

Cousins, B., (2014). What is a smallholder farmer in South Africa today? Paper for a workshop on ‘Opportunities, constraints and innovative approaches in small-scale agriculture in South Africa’, C3 Initiative on Strategies to Overcome Poverty and Inequality, Goedgedacht, Western Cape, 6th -8th August 2014.

Cousins, B., (2015). "'Through a glass darkly': Towards agrarian reform in South Africa", in: Cousins, B. and Walker, C. (eds.), 2015. Land divided, land restored. Land reform in South Africa for the 21st century. Auckland Park: Jacana (250-269).

Cousins, B., (2018). ''Employment in informal-sector agriculture in South Africa'', in: Fourie, F. (ed.), The informal sector in South Africa: Enabling a promising sector. Cape Town: HSRC Press (353-831).

Cousins B & Chikazunga D (2013) Defining smallholder farmers in South Africa. A briefing note for SAFL Innovation Lab, 13–14 August.

Cousins, B., Genis, A., & J., Clarke, (2018). The potential of agriculture and land reform to generate jobs. PLAAS Policy Brief 51, Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Cousins, B., Genis, A., & Clarke, J., (2018). POLICY BRIEF 51, October 2018, The potential of agriculture and land reform to generate jobs. PLAAS, University of the Western Cape.

Cousins, B., & Scoones, I., (2009). 'Contested paradigms of 'viability' in redistributive and reform: perspectives from southern Africa'. Working Paper 15. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Cousins, B., & Scoones, I., (2010). 'Contested Paradigms of "Viability" in Redistributive Land Reform: Perspectives from Southern Africa', Journal of Peasant Studies, 37, 1 (2010).

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K., (eds.). (1995). Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement. New York: The New Press

Crenshaw, K., (2002). The first decade: critical reflections, or 'a foot in the closing door', in: F. Valdes, J. McCristal Culp & A. Harris (Eds) Crossroads, directions and a new critical race theory (Philadelphia, PA, Temple University Press), 9–31.

Creswell, J. W., (2003). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell J, W., & Plano Clark VL., (2011). Designing and conducting mixed-method research. 2nd Sage; Thousand Oaks, CA: 2011.

Cristóbal K., (2009). Development strategies and rural development: exploring synergies, eradicating poverty, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36:1, 103-137.

Croll, E., & Parkin, D., (1992). Bush base: Forest Farm. Culture, Environment and Development. Routledge, London.

Crotty, M., (1998). The foundation of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

DAFFnews, (2017). Official News Letter Of The Department Of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries. April 2017. Pretoria.

Daniel, S., (2012). *Situating private equity capital in the land grab debate*. *The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39(3–4), 703–729.*

Davis, M., (2004). Planet of slums: urban involution and the informal proletariat. New Left Review, 26, 5–34.

DeCuir, J. T., & Dixson, A. D. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher, 33*(5), 26-31.

Deere, C., (2005). The feminization of agriculture? Economic restructuring in rural Latin America. Occasional paper 1. UN Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.

Deininger, K. (1999). Making negotiated land reform work: initial experience from Colombia, 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. Policy Research Working Paper 2451. Washington, DC: World Bank

Deininger, K., Derek Byerlee, Jonathan, Li., Norton, A., Selod, H., & Stickler, M., (2010). *Rising Global Interest in Farmland. Can it yield sustainable and equitable benefits?* Washington: World Bank.

Deininger, K., & Byerlee., D., (2011). *Rising Global Interest in Farmland: Can it Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits?* Washington, DC: World Bank.

Deininger, K., (2011*). Challenges posed by the new wave of farmland investment. Journal of Peasant Studies. 38, 217–247.*

Deininger, K., & Byerlee, D., (2012). The rise of large farms in land abundant countries: do they have a future? World Dev. 40, 701–714.

Denscombe, M., (2010). The Good Research Guide for Small-Scale Social Research Projects. Miadenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S., (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, (2012). Integrated Growth and Development Plan (IGDP) 2012. Pretoria.

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, (2014). Agricultural Policy Action Plan (APAP) 2015–2019. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2013). Land Lease and Disposal Policy of 2013. Pretoria.

Department of Agriculture Land Reform and Rural Development, (2022). Agriculture and Agro-Processing Master Plan. Pretoria.

Department of Land Affairs. (1997). White Paper on South African Land Policy. Pretoria.

Department of Land Affairs, (2008). Annual Report 2007/08. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2005). Framework for the rural economic transformation Model: One district, One Agripark / Every Municipality A CRDP Site 26 January 2015. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2009). The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme Framework. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2010). Comprehensive Rural Development Programme South Africa, April 2010. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2010). White Paper, 2010. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2011). Green Paper, 2010. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2015). The Rural Economy Transformation Model: One District, One Agri-Park/Every Municipality, Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2016). Agri-parks Presentation, 02 JUNE 2016. Pretoria.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform, (2017a). Towards Inclusive Economic Development: AGRI-PARKS Programme As A response, National LED Conference 9 November 2017.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2017b). Land Audit Report: Phase II: Private Land Ownership By Race, Gender And Nationality (November 2017, Version 2.

Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (2018). Minister Maite Nkoana-Mashabane: Rural Development and Land Reform Dept Budget Vote 2018/19. Pretoria.

De Schutter, O., (2008). “Building Resilience: A Human Rights Framework for Food and Nutritional Security.” (http://www.refworld.org/docid/48cf71dd2.html). (Accessed 02-22-2021).

De Schutter, O., (2010). Responsibly destroying the world’s peasant. http://farmlandgrab.org/13528. (Accessed 04-04-2021).

De Schutter, O., (2010). General Assembly, Human Rights Council, Report submitted by the Special Rapporteur on the right to food, Olivier De Schutter, A/HRC/16/49.

De Schutter, O., (2011). The World Trade Organization and the post-global food crisis agenda, Briefing Note 04, November Rome: FAO/United Nations.

De Schutter, O., (2011). *How not to think of land-grabbing: three critiques of large-scale in- vestments in farmland. Journal of Peasant Studies, 38(2): 249–279.*

De Schutter, O., (2012). Submission to the consultation on the First Draft of the Global Strategic Framework for Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, 8 May Rome. United Nations.

De Schutter, O., (2014). The transformative potential of the right to food. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to food. Human Rights Council, 25th Session. New York: U.N. General Assembly.

De Schutter, O. (2011a). *How not to think of land-grabbing: three critiques of large-scale investments in farmland. Journal of Peasant Studies*, *38*(2), 249–279.

Desmarais, A., (2007). La Vía Campesina. Globalization and the power of peasants. Halifax: Fernwood Press.

Desmarais, A., (2008). *The power of peasants. Reflections on the meaning of La Via Campesina*. *Journal of Rural Studies 24 (2) pp. 138–149*

Desmarais, A., (2002). *Peasants speak – The Vía Campesina: Consolidating an international peasant and farmer movement. Journal of Peasant Studies 29, no. 2: 91–124.*

Desmarias, A., Marta G. Rivera-Ferre, & Beatriz G., (2014). "Building Alliances for Food Sovereignty: La Vía Campesina, NGOs, and Social Movements." Pp. 89-110 Alternative Agrifood Movements: Patterns of Convergence and Divergence, Research in Rural Sociology and Development, Volume 21 edited by Douglas H. Constance, Marie-Christine Renard, Marta G. Rivera-Ferre. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA). (2011). DBSA Development report, 2011. Web access: http:// www.dbsa.org (Accessed 27-5-2022).

Devereux, S., Levendal, G. & Yda, E., 2017. 'The farmer doesn't recognise who makes him rich'. Understanding the labour conditions of women farm workers in the Western Cape and Northern Cape, South Africa. Stellenbosch.

Dikötter, F., (2011). *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958-1962*. New York: Walker & Company.

Dixson, D., & C. Rousseau, C., (2006). Critical Race Theory in Education: All God 's Children Got a Song New York, NY: Routledge.

Dolan, C., & Humphrey J., (2000). *Governance and trade in fresh vegetables: The impact of UK supermarkets on the African horticulture industry. Journal of Development Studies 37(2):147-176.*

Dolan, C. & Humphrey, J., (2004). Changing governance patterns in the trade in fresh vegetables between Africa and the United Kingdom, *Environment and Planning A*, 36(3), pp. 491–509.

Domenico, L., (2007). "Lenin and Herrenvolk Democracy." In Sebastien Budgen, Stathis Kouvelakis, and Slavoj Zizek, eds., Lenin Reloaded: Toward a Politics of Truth. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007, 239-252

Donnor, J., (2005). "African-American Football Student Athletes in Major College Sports." Race Ethnicity and Education 8 (1): 45 – 67.

Donmoyer, R., (1990). Generalizability and the single case study. In E. W. Eisner, & A. Peshkin (Eds.), Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate (pp.175-200). New York: Teachers College Press.

Dore, R., (2012). *Land Reform in Japan*. London: Bloomsbury Academic 734-739.

Dörnyei, Z., (2007). Research methods in applied linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dorward, A., Kydd, J., Morrison, J. & Urey, I., (2004a). "A Policy Agenda for Pro-poor Agricultural Growth", World Development, 32(1): 73-89.

Doucouliagos, H.; & Paldam, M., (2007). The aid effectiveness literature: the sad results of 40 years of research. In: Working Paper 15, Department of Economics, University of Aarhus.

Dreher, A., Nunnenkamp, P., & Thiele, R., (2008). Does US Aid Buy UN General Assembly Votes? A Disaggregated Analysis. In: Public Choice Vol. 136 (No.1/2), S. 139–164.

Du Toit, A., & Neves, D., (2007). In search of South Africa's ''second economy'', Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Du Toit, A., & Neves, D., (2014). *The government of poverty and the arts of survival: mobile and recombinant strategies at the margins of the South African economy. Journal of Peasant Studies. 41, 833–853.*

Eakin, H., (2006). *Weathering Risk in Rural Mexico: Climatic, Institutional, and Economic Change*. University of Arizona Press.

Eakin, H., & Bojórquez-Tapia, L., (2008). 'Insights into the Composition of Household Vulnerability from Multicriteria Decision Analysis'. Global Environmental Change, 18: 112–27.

Easterly, W., (2007). Inequality does cause underdevelopment: Insights from a new instrument. Journal of Development Economics, 84 (2007) 755-776.

Easterly, W., (2013). Tyranny of Experts. New York: Basic Books.

Edelman, M., (1999). Peasants against globalization: rural social movements in Costa Rica. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Edelman, M., (2003). Transnational peasant and farmer movements and networks. In Global civil society 2003, eds. M. Kaldor, H. Anheier, and M. Glasius, 185–200. London: Oxford University Press.

Edelman, M., (2008). *Transnational organizing in agrarian Central America: histories, challenges, prospects.* Journal of Agrarian Change 8 no. 2–3: 229–57.

Edelman, M.; (2009). *Synergies and tensions between rural social movements and professional researchers. Journal of Peasant Studies 36, no. 1: 245–65.*

Edelman, M., & C. James. (2011). *Peasants' rights and the UN system: quixotic struggle? Or emancipatory idea whose idea has come? Journal of Peasant Studies 38, no. 1: 81–108.*

Edelman, M., Oya, C., & Borras, S., (2013). Global Land Grabs: historical processes, theoretical and methodological implications and current trajectories. Third World Q. 34, 1517–1531.

Edelman, M., Wies, A., Baviskar et al. (2014). *Introduction: Critical perspectives on food sovereignty. Journal of Peasant Studies 41 (6) pp. 911–931.*

Edelman, M., (2014). Food sovereignty: Forgotten genealogies and future regulatory challenges. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, *41*(6), 959–978. (Ed.). (2015). *Critical perspectives on food sovereignty: Global Agrarian transformations*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Edelman, M., & Borras M., (2016). Political dynamics of transnational agrarian movements. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Ellis, F., (2000). Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, F., (2006). Agrarian change and rising vulnerability in rural sub-Saharan Africa. N. Polit. Econ. 11, 387–397.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L., (1995). Writing ethnographic fieldnotes. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, R., & Shaw, L., (2011). Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes. University of Chicago Press.

Escobar, A., (2010). Histories of development, predicaments of modernity: thinking about globalization from critical development studies perspectives. In: Long, N., Ye, J., Yihuan, W. (Eds.), Rural Transformations and Development - China in Context: The Everyday Lives of Policies and People. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 25–53.

EU, (2004). EU Land Policy Guidelines: Guidelines for support to land policy design and land policy reform processes in developing countries. http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/what/developmentpolicies/(Accessed 13-06-2022).

Evans, P., (1995). *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, p 29.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation) (2002): African Countries Urge World Leaders to Attend World Food Summit: five years later. FAO Press Release 02/12. Rome, FAO.

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), (2000). The State of Food Insecurity in the World. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2004). Programme Implementation Report 2002-2003. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2005). Agricultural censuses and gender: lessons learned in Africa. Rome, FAO.

FAO. (2005). Voluntary guidelines to support the progressive realization of the right to adequate food in the context of national food security. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2006a). Agro-industrial parks. Experience from India. Laxminarayana Rao, K. *Agricultural and Food Engineering Working Document No 3.* Rome, FAO.

FAO**, (**2006a). Twenty-Ninth FAO Regional Conference for Latin America and the Caribbean. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2006b). Food Outlook: Global Market Analysis, No. 2. *Food Outlook* – GIEWS (2). Rome, FAO.

FAO., (2006c). Agro-industrial parks. Experience from India. Laxminarayana Rao, K. *Agricultural and Food Engineering Working Document No 3.* Rome, FAO.

FAO**, (**2008). Grape Exports with GLOBALGAP Certification: Case Study of Mahindra & Mahindra Initiative in India (Draft). Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2009a). http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/20568/icode/.(26-10-2021)

FAO, (2009b). How to Feed the World in 2050. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (1999c). Organic farming demand for organic products has created new export opportunities for the developing world. Agriculture 21. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2010). "What Is Sustainable Crop Production Intensification?" Rome, FAO.

FAO., IFAD, UNCTAD, & WBG., (2010). *Principles for Responsible Agricultural Investment that Respects Rights, Livelihoods and Resources*. A discussion note to contribute to an ongoing global dialogue. Rome, FAO.

FAO & GOB, (2011a). Country Programming Framework for Belize: 2011-2015. Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. Belmopan, Belize: Government of Belize Printing Office. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2011b). The state of food and agriculture 2011. Women in agriculture: closing the gender gap for development. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2012). Trends and impacts of foreign investment in developing country agriculture – Evidence from case studies. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2012). The State of Food Insecurity in the World. Rome, FAO.

FAO, (2014). The State of Food and Agriculture Innovation in family farming. Rome, FAO.

FAO., (2017). Territorial tools for agro-industry development. A Sourcebook, by Eva Gálvez Nogales and Martin Webber (eds.). Rome, FAO.

FAO., (2019). Agricultural Transformation Centres in Africa. Practical guidance to promote inclusive agro-industrial development. OF THE UNITED NATIONS and the AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK. Rome, FAO.

Fanon, F., (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*, London: Penguin.

Fairhead, J., Leach, M., & Scoones, I., (2012). Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature? J. Peasant Stud. 39, 237–261.

Fairbairn, M., (2011). Indirect dispossession: how domestic power imbalances mediate foreign demand for land in Mozambique, Presentation to LDPI Land Grab conference, University of Sussex.

Fairbairn, M., (2014). ‘’*Like gold with yield’’: Evolving intersections between farmland and finance. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 41(5), 777–795.*

Ferguson, K.E., (1984), The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ferguson, J., (2010). “The Uses of Neoliberalism.” Antipode 41 (January): 166–84.

Ferguson, J., (2013). ‘’*How to Do Things with Land: A Distributive Perspective on Rural Livelihoods in Southern Africa’’. Journal of Agrarian Change* 13 (1): 166–174.

FIAN Germany. (2010). German investment funds involved in Land Grabbing. FIAN International.

FIAN International. (2014). G8 New Alliance for Food security and Nutrition in Africa: a critical analysis from a human rights perspective. Heidelberg: FIAN International.

Fieldman, G., (2011). “Neoliberalism, the Production of Vulnerability and the Hobbled State: Systemic Barriers to Climate Adaptation.” *Climate and Development* 3 (February 2015): 159–74.

Fisher, C., (2007). Selling coffee, or selling out? Evaluating different ways to analyse the fair-trade system. Culture & Agriculture 29, no. 2: 78–88. Fisher, C., (2007). Selling coffee, or selling out? Evaluating different ways to analyse the fair-trade system. Culture & Agriculture 29, no. 2: 78–88.

Flyvbjerg, B., (2001). Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E., (1993). How to design and evaluate research in education. New York: McGraw- Hill.

Freire, P., (1970). "Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York," Continuum 72 (1970). Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples Zed Books Ltd.

Friedmann, H., & McMichael. P., (1989a). Agriculture and the state system: the rise and fall of national agricultures, 1870 to the present. Sociologia Ruralis, 29(2), 93–117.

Friedmann, H., & McMichael, P., (1989b). Agriculture and the State System, Department of Sociology, Vol.XXXIX-2. University Of Toronto Canada.

Friedman, H., (1993). "The political economy of food: A global crisis." New Left Review 197: 29-57.

Friedland, L. Gouveia & Mingione, E., (eds) (1994). *From Columbus to ConAgra: The Globalization of Agriculture and Food*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Friedmann, H., (2005). From colonialism to green capitalism: social movements and emergence of food regimes, in: F.H. BUTTEL and P. MCMICHAEL (eds) *New Directions in the Sociology of Global Development*, Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fridell, G., (2013). Alternative trade: Legacies and the future. Halifax: Fernwood.

Fuller, A. & Bollman, R., (undated). “Pluriactivity among farm families: Some Western European, U.S. and Canadian comparisons.” In Contemporary rural systems in transition, eds. I. R. Bowler, C. R. Bryant and M. D. Nellis, 201-211. Oxon, UK: CAB International.

Galvez-Nogales, E., (2010). Agro-based clusters in developing countries: staying competitive in a globalized economy. FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS. Rome, FAO.

Garcia, C. M., Eisenberg, M. E., Frerich, E. A., Lechner, K. E. & Lust, K., (2012). Conducting Go-Along Interviews to Understand Context and Promote Health. Qualitative Health Research, 22, 1395-1403.

Gee, J.P., (1999). An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and practice. New York: Routledge.

Gee, J., (1990). Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Genis, A., (2013). ‘The Changing Nature of Large-scale Commercial Farming and Implications for Agrarian Reform: Evidence from Limpopo, Western Cape and Northern Cape’. PLAAS.

Gerber, J.-F. & Steppacher, R., (2012). *Towards an integrated paradigm in heterodox economics: alternative approaches to the current eco-social crises*, Hound mills, Basingstoke, Hampshire; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ghose, A.K., (Ed.). (1983). Agrarian Reform in Contemporary Developing Countries: A Study Prepared for the International Labour Office within the Framework of the World Employment Programme (1st ed.). Routledge.

Gibson, J., (2009). Overcoming Historical Injustices. Land Reconciliation in South Africa. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Giridharadas A., (2018). Winners Take All: The Elite Charade of Changing the World. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Glassman, J., (2006). Primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession, accumulation by 'extra-economic' means. Prog. Hum. Geogr. 30, 608–625.

Gliessman, S., (2012). Agroecology: growing the roots of resistance. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems 37, 19–31.

Gleckman, H., (2012). "Readers' Guide: Global Redesign Initiative." Center for Governance and Sustainability at the University of Massachusetts Boston.

Gliessman, S., (2012). Agroecology: growing the roots of resistance. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems 37, 19–31.

Grosz, E. A., (1994). Volatile bodies: toward a corporeal feminism / Elizabeth Grosz Allen & Unwin St. Leonards, N.S.W.

Goldberg, E., & Vans, L., (2009). The Prison Industrial Complex and the Global Economy. Oakland: PM Press.

Government Gazette, (1996). Act No. 47, 1996 Marketing of Agricultural Products Act, 1996. Pretoria.

Government of South Africa. (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, No. 108 of 1996. Pretoria.

Graham, C., & Kane, C., (1998). Opportunistic government or sustaining reform? *Latin American Research Review* 33(1): 67–104.

GRAIN. (2007). *Agrofuels*. Special issue of *Seedling*, July. www.grain.org/seedling/?type1/468&l1/40). (Accessed 20 – 7- 2021)

GRAIN. (2012). Responsible farmland investing? Current efforts to regulate land grabs will make things worse. Available at: http://www.grain.org/e/4564 [Accessed 28 – 3 - 2021].

GRAIN, (2012). GRAIN releases data set with over 400 global land grabs, 23 February, http://www.grain.org (Accessed 20 -07- 2021).

Greenberg, S., (2010a). *Status Report on Land and Agricultural Policy in South Africa, 2010*. PLAAS Research Report 40. Belville: PLAAS.

Greenberg, S., (2010b). *Contesting the Food System in South Africa: Issues and Opportunities*. PLAAS Research Report 42. Belville: PLAAS.

Green Paper on Land Policy, (1995). Published for comment and consultation during 1996. Pretoria Printers.

Grewal, I., & Kaplan, C., (1994). Scattered hegemonies: Postmodernity and transnational feminist practice. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Grosz, E., (1990). Jaques Lacan. A Feminist Introduction, London and New York: Routledge.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S., (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), The landscape of qualitative research (pp. 195-220). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S., (1981). Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Guereña, A., (2016). Unearthed: land, power, and inequality in Latin America. Oxford, UK: Oxfam.

Guereña, A. & Wegerif, M., (2019). Land Inequality: Framing Document. Rome: ILC, Land Inequality Initiative. *https://www.landcoalition.org/en/resources/ land-and-inequality/*

Gupta, A., (2004). Origin of agriculture and domestication of plants and animals linked to early Holocene climate amelioration. Current Science, 87(1), 54–59.

Gusterson, H., (2017). From Brexit to Trump: Anthropology and the rise of nationalist populism. American Ethnologist 44, no. 2: 209–14.

Guthman, J., (2004). *Agrarian dreams: The paradox of organic agriculture in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Guthman, J., (2007). "The Polanyian Way? Voluntary Food Labels as Neoliberal Governance." Antipode 39 (3): 456–78.

Guthman, J., (2008). "Thinking inside the Neoliberal Box: The Micro-Politics of Agro-Food Philanthropy." Geoforum 39: 1241–53.

Gwynne, R.N., (2003). Transnational capitalism and local transformation in Chile, 94(3), pp. 310–321.

Hall, S., (1980). Popular-democratic versus authoritarian populism. In Marxism and democracy, ed. A. Hunt, 157–87. London: Laurence and Wishart.

Hall, S., (1985). Authoritarian populism: A reply to Jessop et al. New Left Review 151: 115–2.

Hall, R., Jacobs, P., & Lahiff, E., (2003). Final Report. Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa Series, Report 10. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies,

Hall, R., (2004). Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa: A Status Report 2004. Research Report 20. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape. PLAAS. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies,

Hall, R., (2007). The impact of land restitution and land reform on livelihoods. Research Report 32. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies,

Hall, R., (2009a). Another Countryside? Policy Options for Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Hall, R., (2009b). ''Land reform for what? Land use, production and livelihoods'', in: Ruth Hall (ed.), Another Countryside. Policy Options for Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape (pp 23-61).

Hall, R., (2009c). A fresh start for rural development and agrarian reform? Policy Brief 29. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Hall, R., (2009a). ''Land reform how and for whom? Land demand, targeting and acquisition'', in: Ruth Hall (ed.), Another Countryside. Policy Options for Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape (pp. 63 -91).

Hall, R., (2010). ''The Politics of Land Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa, 1990 to 2004: A Shifting Terrain of Power, Actors and Discourses''. D Phil, Oxford: Oxford.

Hall, R., (2011a). ''Land Grabbing in Southern Africa: The Many Faces of the Investor Rush''. Review of African Political Economy, 38 (128): 193–214.

Hall, R., (2011b). The Next Great Trek? South African Commercial Farmers Move North. PLAAS Working Paper 21. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Hall, R & Kepe, T., (2016). The Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy in the Eastern Cape: Research findings from Sarah Baartman District. Field notes.

Hall, R., & Kepe T., (2017). Elite capture and state neglect: New evidence on South Africa's land reform. Review of African Political Economy 44: 122–30.

Hall, R., Scoones, I., & Tsikata, D., (2017). *Plantations, outgrowers and commercial farming in Africa: agricultural commercialisation and implications for agrarian change. Journal.* Journal of Peasant Studies. 1–23.

Hall, R., (2011a). Land grabbing in Southern Africa: The many faces of the investor rush. Review of African Political Economy, 38(128), 193–214.

Hall, R., (2011b). *The Next Great Trek? South African Commercial Farmers Move North*. PLAAS Working Paper 21. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Hall, R., & Cliffe, L., (2009). "Introduction", in: Ruth Hall (ed.), Another Countryside. Policy Options for Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, School of Government, University of the Western Cape.

Happe, K., (2013). *The body of race: Toward a rhetorical understanding of racial ideology. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 99(2), 131–155.*

Haque, T. & Sirohi, A.S, (1986) 'Agrarian Reforms and Institutional Changes in India,' Concept Publishing Co., New Delhi.

Harris, C., (1993). "Whiteness as Property." Harvard Law Review 106 (8):1710– 1791.

Hatanaka, M., Bain, C., & L. Busch, L., (2005). Third-party certification in the global agri-food system. Food Policy 30: 354-369.

Hartwich, F., Tola, J., Engler, A., González, C., Ghezan, G., Vázquez-Alvarado, J., & Gottret, M. V. (2008). Building public-private partnerships for agricultural innovation. IFPRI. http://www.ifpri.org (Accessed 20-05-2022).

Harvey, D., (2003). The new imperialism. New York: Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D., (2005). A Brief History of Neoliberalism. Oxford University Press

Harvey D., (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 610: 22–44.

Harvey, D., (2009). The 'new' imperialism: accumulation by dispossession. Social. Regist. 40, 40.

Hazell, P., Poulton, C., Wiggins, S., & Dorward, A., (2010). The future of small farms: trajectories and policy priorities. World Dev. 38, 1349–1361.

Hebinck, P., & van Averbeke, W., (2007). 'Livelihoods ad Landscapes: People, Resources and Land Use', in: Hebinck, P., & Peter, C., Lent (eds), Livelihoods and Landscapes. The People of Guquka and Koloni and their Resources. Leiden and Boston.

Hebinck, P., (2010) *De-/re-agrarianisation: Global perspectives, Journal of Rural Studies*, *Journal of Rural Studies 61 (2018) 227–235.*

Hebinck, P., Mango, N., & Kimanthi, H., (2015). Local maize practices and the cultures of seed in Luoland, West Kenya. In: Dessein, J., Battaglini, E., Horlings, L. (Eds.), Cultural Sustainability and Regional Development: Theories and Practices of Territorialisation. Routledge, London, pp. 206–219.

Heffernan, D., (1998). Agriculture and Monopoly Capital. Monthly Review, 50(3), 46–59.

Hegel, G., (1956). The Philosophy of History, New York

Hellin, J., Groenewald, S., & Keleman, A., 2012. "*Impact Pathways of Trade Liberalization on Rural Livelihoods: A Case Study of Smallholder Maize Farmers in Mexico*." *Journal of Development Studies* 1 (1): 59–83.

Hendrickson, K., (2015). *"Resilience in a Concentrated and Consolidated Food System."* Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences 5 (3): 418–31.

Henry, G. T., (1990). Practical sampling. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herdt, R., & Steiner, R., (1995). "Agricultural sustainability: Concepts and conundrums." In Agricultural sustainability: economic, environmental and statistical considerations, eds. V. Barnett, R. Payne and R. Steiner, 3-14. New York, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore: John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.

Herring, J., (199). ''Embedded particularism: India's failed developmental state'', in Meredith Woo-Cumings (ed), The Developmental State, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999, p 334.

Hertel, T.W., M.B. Burke, & Lobell, D. B., (2010). The poverty implications of climate- induced crop yield changes by 2030. Global Environmental Change, 20(4): 577– 585.

Hewitt de Alcantara, C., (1976). Modernizing Mexican agriculture: socioeconomic implications of technological change, 1940–1970. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.

High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis. (2008). Comprehensive Framework for Action. New York.

Hilden, C., (1988). India and the Green Revolution. http://eric.ed.gov/?q=india +and+ the+ green+ revolution &id= ED322073. (Accessed 3 -5 -2022)

Hirsch, E., (1986). Apartheid's Great Land Theft: The Struggle for the Right to Farm in South Africa, Pathfinder Press, New York.

Hirsch, P., (2012). Reviving agrarian studies in South-East Asia: geography on the ascendancy. George. Res. 50, 393–403.

Hofman, I., & Ho, P., (2102). *China's ''developmental outsourcing'': a critical examination of Chinese global 'land grabs' discourse, Journal of Peasant Studies, 39(1).*

Holt-Gimenez E., & Patel R., (2009a) Food rebellions: the real story of the world food crisis and what we can do about it. Fahumu Books and Grassroots International, Oxford.

Holt-Gimenez, E., & Patel, R., (2009b). Food Rebellions! Crisis and the Hunger for Justice, Cape Town, Dakar, Nairobi and Oxford, Pambazuka Press.

Holt Giménez, E. & Shattuck, A., (2011). *Food Crises, food regimes, and food movements: rumblings of reform or tides of transformation? The Journal of Peasant Studies, 38(1), pp. 109-144.*

Holt-Giménez, E., (2001). Scaling up sustainable agriculture: lessons from the Campesino a Campesino movement. URL: http://www.agricultures (Accessed 21-1- 2021).

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. Data management and analysis methods. In N.K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln. (Eds.). Handbook of qualitative research. (pp. 428 – 443). Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.

Human Sciences Research Council, (2006). Assessing the alignment of South Africa's land reform policy to people's aspirations and expectations: A policy-oriented report based on a survey in three provinces. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

IAASTD, (2009). Agriculture at a Crossroads. Washington DC: Island Press.

IFAD (International Fund for Agricultural Development). (2010). Rural Poverty Report 2011, New realities, new challenges, new opportunities for tomorrow's generation, Rome: IFAD.

Ikerd, J., (1992). "Sustainable agriculture: Synchronizing agriculture and the ecological system." In Sustainable agriculture: Enhancing the environmental quality of the Tennessee Valley region through alternative farming practices, ed. L. A. Johnson. The University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture.

infoDev, (2009). A Model for Sustainable and Replicable ICT Incubators in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington, DC.

Ingram, P., Qingyuan Yue, L., & Hayagreeva R., (2010). *"Trouble in Store: Probes, Protests, and Store Openings by Wal-Mart, 1998–2007." American Journal of Sociology 116 (1): 53–92.*

Jansen, K., (2015). *The debate on food sovereignty theory: Agrarian capitalism, dispossession and agroecology. Journal of Peasant Studies 42 (1).*

Jeffrey, B., (2008). —Characterising social settings as the basis for qualitative research in ethnography. In: G. Walford (Ed.), How to do educational ethnography. London, UK: The Tufnell Press (pp. 141-164).

Jensen E., (1991). "J.M. Keynes's Theory of the State as a Path to His Social Economics of Reform in "The General Theory" Vol. 49, No. 3 (FALL 1991), pp. 292-316. Published By: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Ji-Hyeon, C., Jang, H. & Byung-Joon, W. 2007. *Agro-industry Cluster Development in Five Transition Economies. Journal of Rural Development, 29(6): 85–119.*

Jones, E., (1974). Agriculture and Industrial Revolution, Oxford Kerridge, E (1967) The Agriculture Revolution, London: Unwin.

Jooste, C.J., (1972). Group Areas: history. In Standard encyclopaedia of South Africa, 5:375-384.

Joshi, P., (1975). Land Reforms in India: Trends and Perspectives. Allied Publishers, New Delhi.

Joyce, P., (1990). The rise and fall of Apartheid: the chronicle of a divided society as told through South Africa's newspapers. Cape Town: Struik. 16p.

Jussaume, R.A. JR., Hisano, S., KIM, C.K., McMichael, P., Otsuka, S., Taniguchi, Y. & Zhibin, L., (2000). *Preliminary Investigations into the Local Impacts of East Asian Agri-Food Restructuring*. Paper presented at the 10th World Congress of Rural Sociology, Rio de Janeiro: Brazil, 30 July–1 August 1, 2000.

Jussaume, R.A. JR., (1994). An introduction to the Japanese juice industry, in: A. Bonanno, L. Busch. W.H.

Katznelson, I., (2001). notes on keynote speech at a conference on Karl Polanyi held at Columbia University on 27 April 2001, p 2.

Kaufman, F., (2010). The food bubble: how Wall Street starved millions and got away with it, Harper's Magazine, July, pp. 27–34.

Kautsky, K., [1899]. 1988. *The agrarian question*. London: Zwan Publications.

Kay, C., (2008). Reflections on Latin American rural studies in the neoliberal globalization period: a new rurality? Development and Change, 39(6), 915–43.

Kearny, R., (2005). A Conversation with Richard Kearney. Boston University. York College of Pennsylvania.

Kebede, M., (2003). *"Eurocentrism and Ethiopian Historiography: Deconstructing Semitization", International Journal of Ethiopian studies.*

Kepe, T., & Hall, R., (2016). Land Redistribution in South Africa. Commissioned report for High Level Panel on the assessment of key legislation and the acceleration of fundamental change, an initiative of the Parliament of South Africa. University of the Western Cape.

Keswell, M., Carter, M., & Deininger, K., (2010). January, 2010, Poverty and Land Redistribution: Quasi-Experimental Evidence from South Africa's LRAD program.

Keswell, M. & Carter, M. (2011). Poverty and Land Redistribution: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. UNU -WIDE R Working Paper. Helsinki: United Nations University.

Khor, M., (2000). Globalization and the South: Some critical issues. Geneva: United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, Discussion Paper No. 147.

Kickbusch, W., & Everhart, B., (1985). Curriculum, Practical Ideology, and Class Contradiction. Volume 15, 1985 - Issue 3.

Kleinbooi, K., (Ed.). (2011). Umhlaba Wethu 13, Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Kleinbooi, K., Lahiff, E., & Boyce, T., (2006). Land Reform, Farm Employment and Livelihoods. Western Cape Case Study. Cape Town.

Kimbrell, A., (Ed.). (2002). Fatal Harvest: The Tragedy Of Industrial Agriculture (1st ed.). Foundation for Deep Ecology.

King, C., (2008). "Community resilience and contemporary agri-ecological systems: Reconnecting people and food, and people with people." Systems Research and Behavioral Science 25:111-124.

Kohli, A., (1996). 'Embedded autonomy: states and industrial transformation', The American Political Science Review, 90 (3), 1996, p 670.

Konefal, J., Mascarenhas, M., & Hatanaka, M., (2005). Governance in the global agro-food system: Backlighting the role of transnational supermarket chains. Agriculture and Human Values 22: 291-302.

Kotze, D., (1978). The Government and politics of South Africa. Cape Town: Juta. 1 l7p.

Kurtz, M., (2004). *Free Market Democracy and the Chilean and Mexican Countryside*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kurtz, M., & Brooks, S., (2008). Embedding neoliberal reform in Latin America. *World Politics* 60: 231–280.

Kusenbach, M., (2003). Street Phenomenology: The Go-Along as Ethnographic Research Tool. Ethnography, 4, 455-485.

Kydd, J., & Dorward, A., (2001). The Washington consensus on poor country agriculture: analysis, prescription and institutional gaps. Dev. Pol. Rev. 19, 467–478

Laakso, L. & Olukoshi, A., (1996). "The Crisis of the Post-Colonial State Project in Africa," Chapter 1. In Adebayo Olukoshi and Lisa Laakso (eds.), Challenges to the Nation-State in Africa. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrika institute.

Ladejinsky, W., I. (1977). *Agrarian Reform as Unfinished Business: The Selected Papers of Wolf Ladejinsky*. New York: Published for the World Bank by Oxford University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W., (1995). "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education." Teachers College Record 97 (1): 47 – 68.

Ladson-Billings, G., (1999). "Preparing Teachers for Diverse Student Populations: A Critical Race Theory Perspective." Review of Research in Education 24:211 – 247.

Lahiff, E., (2007). 'Willing Buyer, Willing Seller': South Africa's failed experiment in market-led agrarian reform. Third World Quarterly, 28(8), 1577-98.

Lahiff, E. (2001). Land reform in South Africa: Is it meeting the challenge? Debating land reform and rural development, Policy Brief No. 1. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Lahiff, E., (2001). Land reform in South Africa: Is it meeting the challenge? Debating land reform and rural development, Policy Brief No. 1. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Lahiff, E., (2007). 'Willing Buyer, Willing Seller': South Africa's failed experiment in market-led agrarian reform. Third World Quarterly, 28(8), 1577-98.

Lahiff, E., Maluleke, T., Manenzhe, T. & Wegerif, M., (2008). Land redistribution and poverty reduction in South Africa. Research Report 36. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Lahiff, E., (2009). Land redistribution in South Africa. In Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., Bourguignon, C., & van den Brink, R. (Eds.) Agricultural land redistribution: Toward greater consensus. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Lahiff, E., & Li, G., (2012). Land Redistribution in South Africa: A Critical Review. University of Western Cape. PLAAS.

Lahiff, E., Nerhene, D., & Manenzhe, T., (2012). *Joint Ventures in Agriculture: Lessons from Land Reform Projects in South Africa.* Cape Town.

Lahiff, E., (2014). *Land Reform in South Africa 100 Years after the Natives' Land Act. Review Essay. Journal of Agrarian Change, 14(4), 586-592.*

Lang, T., & Heasman, M., (2004). *Food Wars: The Global Battle for Mouths, Minds and Markets: Earthscan*. James & James.

Lather, P., (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern. New York: Routledge.

La Via Campesina, (2003). Main Issues: Food Sovereignty and Trade. Available at: http://viacampesina.org (Accessed-3-6-2022).

La Vía Campesina (LVC). (2010). *Sustainable peasant and family farm agriculture can feed the world.* La Vía Campesina, Jakarta, Indonesia.

La Via Campesina. (2013). La Via Campesina's Open Book: Celebrating 20 Years of Struggle and Hope. Retrieved from http://viacampesina.org (3-4-2022)

Lawson, M.; Schnepf, R.; & Cook, N., (January/2016): The Obama Administration's Feed the Future Initiative. CRS Report, January 29, 2016. Hg. v. Congressional Research Service. Washington, D.C.

Lawrence-Lightfoot, S., & Davis, J. H., (2002). The art and science of portraiture. Jossey-Bass.

Leichenko, R., & O'Brien, K., (2008). *Environmental Change and Globalization: Double Exposures*. *Environmental Change and Globalization: Double Exposures*.

Lenin, V.I., Collected Works. Vol. 20. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972, 393-454.

Leonardo, Z. (2013). Race frameworks: A multidimensional theory or racism and education. Routledge.

Lerche, J., (2010). 'From "Rural Labour" to "Classes of Labour": Class Fragmentation, Caste and Class Struggle at the Bottom of the Indian Labour Hierarchy'. In *The Comparative Political Economy of Development: Africa and South Asia*, eds B. Harriss-White and J. Heyer. London: Routledge.

Letsoalo, P., (1987). Land Reform in South Africa. Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers. 24p.

Levien, M., (2013). "The Politics of Dispossession: Theorizing India's 'Land Wars.'" Politics & Society 41(3): 351-394.

Levitsky, S., & Way, L., (2010). Competitive authoritarianism: Hybrid regimes after the Cold War. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lowis, P., (1995). Die jongste nuus van Suid-Afrika. Cape Town: Leo Boeke.

Li, T., (2009). *"Exit from agriculture: a step forward or a step backward for the rural poor?" The Journal of Peasant Studies* 36, no. 3 (2009): 629-636.

Li, Tania M., (2011). *Centering labor in the land grab debate. The Journal of Peasant Studies, 38-2.*

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G., (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lipton, M., (1993). "Land Reform as Commenced Business: The Evidence against Stopping." World Development 21(4): 641–57.

Lipton, M., (1996). 'Rural Reforms and Rural Livelihoods: The Contexts of International Experience'. In *Land, Labour and Livelihoods in Rural South Africa*, Vol. 1, eds M. Lipton, M. de Klerk and M. Lipton. Durban: Indicator Press.

Lipton M., (2009). Land reform in developing countries; properties right and properties wrong. New York, Routledge.

Little, D., (2007). Marxism and method. In D. Glaser & D. M. Walker (Eds.), *Twentieth-century Marxism: A global introduction* (pp. 239–245). London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.

Liverman, D, M., (1990). "Vulnerability to Global Environmental Change." In *Understanding Global Environmental Change: The Contribution of Risk Analysis and Management*, 27–44.

Liverman, D., & Vilas, S., (2006). 'Neoliberalism and the Environment in Latin America'. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 2006 (31): 327–63.

Lobley, M., (2014). *Leaving Farming*, Centre for Rural Policy Research. University of Exeter.

Long, N., & Ploeg, J., van der, D., (1988). 'New Challenges in the Sociology of Rural Development: A Rejoinder to Peter Vandergeest', *Sociologia Ruralis*, XXVIII, 1: 30–41. 1989) 'Demythologising Planned Intervention: An Actor Perspective', *Sociologia Ruralis*, XXIX, 3/4: 226–49.

Long, N., & Ploeg, J., (1994). Heterogeneity, actor and structure: towards a reconstitution of the concept of structure. In D. Booth (Ed.), Rethinking Social Development: Theory, Research and Practice.

Lonsdale, J., (1992). "The moral Economy of Mau Mau: Wealth Poverty and Civic Virtue in Kikuyu Political Thought" in Bruce Berman and Johan Lonsdale (eds.,), Unhappy Valley: Conflict in Kenya and Africa, London.

Louw, A., Vermeulen, H., Kirsten, J., & Madevu, H., (2007). Securing small farmer participation in supermarket supply chains in South Africa. Dev. South Africa. 24, 539–551.

Lugones, M., & Price, J., (2003). The inseparability of race, class, and gender in Latino studies. Latino Studies,1(2), 329–332.

Lugones, M., (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. Hypatia, 4 (3), 742–759.

Lui, P., (2014). Impacts of Foreign Agricultural Investment on Developing Countries. Evidence from Case Studies. Hg. v. FAO. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Rome, Italy FAO Commodity and Trade Policy, Research Working Paper No. 47.

Luthuli, A.J., (1962). *Let my people go,* Fontana Books, London, p.78-79

MacKinnon, A., (1989). Toward A feminist Theory of the State. Harvard University Press.

Magubane, Z., (2002). 'Globalization and the South African Transformation: The Impact on Social Policy'. Africa Today 49 (4): 89–110.

Mamdani, M, Mkandawire, T, & Wamba-dia-Wamba, W., (1988) "Social movements, social transformation and struggle for democracy in Africa." Economic and Political Weekly 23(19): 973-981.

Mamdani, M., (1992). "Conceptualizing the State and Civil society Relations: Towards a Methodological Critique of Contemporary Africanism" in Claude, Auroi, 1992, The Role of the State in Development Process.

MALA (Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs), (2001). *Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development: A Sub-programme of the Land Redistribution Programme.* Pretoria.

Mamdani, M., (1996). Citizen and subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Mamdani, M., (2008). Lessons of Zimbabwe. London Press.

Mandizadza, S., (2009). The impact of FTLRP on livelihoods for resettled households on Athlone Farm A1 Scheme. A proposal submitted to the 'Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe' programme.

Mangal, S. K., (2002). Statistics in psychology and education. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Mann, S. A. & Dickinson, J.M., (1978). *Obstacles to the Development of Capitalist Agriculture. Journal of Peasant Studies 5, 4:466-481*

Manyelo, K., Van Averbeke, W., & Hebinck, P., (2015). Fields, Roads and Streets: Petty Fresh produce Production and Trade in Thohoyandou, South Africa, Rural Development and the Construction of New Markets. Routledge, London, pp. 131–148.

Marais, H., (2011). *South Africa Pushed to the Limit: The Political Economy of Change*. Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.

March, J. G. & Olsen, J. K., (1984). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *The American Political Science Review, 78*(3).

Marais, H., (2001). South Africa Pushed to the Limit: The Political Economy of Change (Cape Town, 2011), p. 124.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B., (1999). Designing Qualitative Research. 3rd Edition, International Educational and Professional Publisher, California, 35.

Martin, P., (2005). 'Comparative Topographies of Neoliberalism in Mexico'. Environment and Planning A, 37 (2): 203–20.

Maycult, P., & Morehouse, R., (1994) Beginning Qualitative Research, A Philosophic and Practical Guide, London: Falmer.

Mayson, D., (2003). Joint Ventures. Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa Series, Report 7. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape. PLAAS.

Mazzucato, M., (2016). From market fixing to market-creating: a new framework for innovation policy. Industry and Innovation. 23:2,140-156

Mbembe, A., (2001). On the Post colony. Berkeley: University of California press.

McCarthy, J., (2005). Rural geography: Multifunctional rural geographies – reactionary or radical? Progress in Human Geography 29(6): 773-782.

McLaren, P., (1989). The Field of Critical Theory. Educational Researcher, 25(4), 28–32.

McMichael, P., (2005). Global Development and The Corporate Food Regime. Research in Rural Sociology and Development. 11-265-299.

McMichael, P., (2006). Peasant prospects in the neoliberal age. *New Political Economy* 11(3): 407–418.

McMichael, P., (2007). *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

McMichael, P., (2007). Reframing development: global peasant movements and the new agrarian question. Revista Nera, 10(10), 57–71.

McMichael, P., (2008). *Peasants make their own history, but not just as they please…. Journal of Agrarian. Change 8, 205–228.*

McMichael, P., (2009a). *A food regime genealogy, Journal of Peasant Studies, 36(1), pp. 139–170.*

McMichael, P., (2009b). ''Banking on Agriculture: A Review of the *World Development Report 2008*'', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *9:2, April, pp. 235–246.*

McMichael, P., (2009c). *"A Food Regime Genealogy." The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36, 139-169*.

McMichael, P., (2009d). The World Food Crisis in Historical Perspective: 61(03).

McMichael, P., (2012). The land grab and corporate food regime restructuring. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39, no. 3–4: 681–701.

McMichael, P., (2012). Depeasantisation, the Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Globalization. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester; New York, pp. 681–701.

McMichael, P., (2013). Globalizations, Vol. 10, No. 1, 47–64, Land Grabbing as Security Mercantilism in International Relations Cornell University, New York, USA.

McMichael, P., (2013). Land Grabbing as Security Mercantilism in International Relations a Cornell University, New York, USA Version of record first published: 15 Feb 2013.

McMichael, P., (2014a). comment on Henry Bernstein's way with peasants, and food sovereignty. The Journal of Peasant Studies: http://www.tandfonline.com (Accessed 6-7-2021).

McMichael, P., (2014b). "*Historicizing food sovereignty." Journal of Peasant Studies 41(6): 933.*

McWhorter, J., (2000). *Losing the race: Self-sabotage in Black America*. New York: Free Press.

Mellor, J., (1976). The new economics of growth: A strategy for India and the developing world. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

MERG., (Macroeconomic Research Group), (1993). *Making Democracy Work: A Framework for Macroeconomic Policy in South Africa*. Bellville: University of the Western Cape. PLAAS.

Merriam, S. B., (1998) Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S.B., (2009). Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mertens, D.M., & Wilson, A.T., (2012). Program evaluation theory and practice: A comprehensive guide. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Merton, R. K., Fiske, J., & Kendall, P. L., (1990). The focused interview: A manual of problems and procedures, 2nd edition. NY, NY: The Free Press.

Meyer, D., (2011). The New Growth Path (NGP) for South Africa Can the policy be applied in the local government sphere? Volume 6 number 1 Department of Public Management North West University South Africa.

Michael, B., (2011). *The Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP)–An Assessment of a Pan-African Attempt to Revitalise Agriculture. Quarterly Journal of International Agriculture 50 (2011), No. 1: 79-106.*

Mignolo, W., (2011). The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M., (1994). Qualitative data analysis, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, (2005). "Ecosystems and Human Well-being: A Synthesis". Island Press, Washington DC.

Mirón, & Inda, J., (2000). Race as a kind of speech act. Cultural Studies, 5, 85–107.

Mitchell, D., (2008). A note on rising food prices, Vol. 1 of 1 Policy Research Working Paper No. WPS4682.

Mkandawire, T., (2001). *Thinking about developmental states in Africa, Cambridge Journal of Economics, 25: 289-315.*

Moberg, M., (1992). "Structural Adjustment and Rural Development: Inferences from a Belizean Village." Journal of Developing Areas. 27(1): 1-20.

Moore, J., (2012). Cheap food & bad money: Food, frontiers, and financialization in the rise and demise of neoliberalism, Review, 33(2–3).

Moyo, S., (1995). The land question in Zimbabwe. Harare: SAPES Books.

Moyo, S., (1998a). Land Entitlements and Growing Poverty in Southern Africa, Sapem, Vol. 11, No. 5, pp. 15-22.

Moyo, S., (1998b). The Land Acquisition Process in Zimbabwe (1997/8). United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Harare.

Moyo, S., (1999). *The political economy of land acquisition in Zimbabwe, 1990–1999. Journal of Southern African Studies, 26(1), 5–28.*

Moyo, S., (2000). Land reform under structural adjustment in Zimbabwe: Land use change in the Mashonaland Provinces. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrika institutet.

Moyo, S., (2001). The land occupation movement and democratization in Zimbabwe: contradictions of neo-liberalism. Millennium Journal of International Studies, 30(2), 311–30.

Moyo, S., (2005). Land policy, poverty reduction and public action in Zimbabwe. In: A. Haroon Akram-Lodhi, S.M. Borras Jr., and C. Kay, eds. Land, poverty and livelihoods in an era of globalisation: perspective from developing and transition countries. London and New York: Routledge.

Moyo, D., (2010). Dead aid. Why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa. London: Penguin Books.

Moyo, S., (2011a). *Three decades of agrarian reform in Zimbabwe. Journal of Peasant Studies 38(3):493-531.*

Moyo, S., (2011b). Agrarian reform and prospects for recovery. In: Hany Baseda (ed) Zimbabwe: Picking Up The Pieces. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 129–155.

Moyo, S., & Yeros, P., eds., (2007). Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America, London & Cape Town: Zed Books and David Philip.

Moyo, S., (2008). African land questions, agrarian transitions and the state: Contradictions of neoliberal land reforms. Dakar: CODESRIA.

Moyo, S., Yeros, P., & Jha, P., (2012). *Imperialism and primitive accumulation: Notes on the new scramble for Africa. Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy, 1(2), 181–203.*

MRDLR (Ministry of Rural Development and Land Reform) (2009). The Comprehensive Rural Development Programme Framework (ver. 1), 22 July. Pretoria: MRDLR.

Murgai, R., & Bank, W., (1999). The Green Revolution and the Productivity Paradox: Evidence from the Indian Punjab. World Bank Publications.

Myhre, D., (1998). 'The Achilles' Heel of the Reforms: The Rural Finance System'. In The Transformation of Rural Mexico: Reforming the Ejido Sector, eds W.A. Cornelius and D. Myhre, 39–65. La Jolla, CA: Center for US–Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego.

Natrass, N., (1993). Economic aspects of the construction of Apartheid. Johannesburg: Wits University Press. 43p.

Nattrass, J., (1988). *The South African Economy: Its growth and change,* Oxford University Press, London.

Naylor, R., (2008). "Managing food production systems for resilience." In F. S. Chapin, G. P. Kofinas, and C. Folke (eds.), Principles of Natural Resource Stewardship: Resilience-Based Management in a Changing World. New York: Springer.

National Department of Agriculture, (2005). CASP draft progress report, 2003–2005. Pretoria.

National Department of Agriculture, (2006). Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Transformation Charter for Agriculture (AgriBEE). Pretoria.

National Department of Agriculture, (2007). Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP): Background on CASP. Presented at the National Review Meeting, Pretoria, 20 February 2007. Pretoria.

Netting, R., (1993). Smallholders, Householders: Farm Families and the Ecology of Intensive, Sustainable Agriculture. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Neves D., & Du Toit A., (2013). *Rural livelihoods in South Africa: Complexity, vulnerability and differentiation. Journal of Agrarian Change 13(1): 93–115.*

New York: Teachers College Press, (2016). Journal of Urban Learning Teaching and Research, 2016 Vol. 12, pp. 184-186. Reviewed by Marcus Croom, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Nicol, A., (2000). Adapting a sustainable livelihoods approach to water projects: Implications for policy and practice. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.

Nkuzi Development Association and Social Surveys Africa. (2005, August 30). Briefing to the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee for Agriculture and Land Affairs.

Nkrumah, K., (1963). Africa must Unite. New York: International Publishing.

Nkwinti, G., (2009). Comprehensive Rural Development Programme: The Concept. Department of Rural Development and Land Reform.

Nyéleni, (2007). Declaration of Nyéleni. https ://nyele ni.org (Accessed 7-8-2021).

OECD, (2014). Does income inequality hurt economic growth? Focus on Inequality and Growth. Paris, France: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Okali, C., (2011). Integrating Social Difference, Gender and Social Analysis into Agricultural Development Policy Brief 39, Futures Agricultures Consortium. University of Sussex: Brighton.

Okali. C., Sumberg, J., & Farrington, J., (1994). Farmer Participatory Research: Rhetoric and Reality. London: IT Publications.

Olesen, V., (2005). —Early millennial feminist qualitative research: Challenges and contours. In: N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), The Sage handbook of qualitative research, 3rd edition (pp. 235-278). Thousand Oaks, CA.

Olssen, M., Codd, J. & O'Neill, A-M., (2004). Education policy. Globalization, citizenship and democracy. London: Sage.

Omer-Cooper, J., (1988). History of Southern Africa: London: Villiers Publications Ltd London. 22&70p.

Olssen, M., Codd, J. & O'Neill, A-M., (2004). Education policy. Globalization, citizenship and democracy. London: Sage.

Ouma, S., (2014). Situating global finance in the land rush debate: A critical review. Geoforum; Journal of Physical, Human, and Regional Geosciences, 57, 162–166.

Ouma, S., (2016). From financialization to operations of capital: Historicizing and disentangling the finance–farmland-nexus. Geoforum; Journal of Physical, Human, and Regional Geosciences, 72, 82–93.

Oxfam International. (2015). The suffering of others. The human cost of the International Finance Corporation's lending through financial intermediaries. April 2015.

Oya, C., (2009). *'Introduction to a Symposium on the World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development?', Journal of Agrarian Change, 9:2, April, pp. 231-234.*

Palinkas, L., (2015). *Qualitative and Mixed Methods in Mental Health Services and Implementation Research November 2014 Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology 43(6)*

Pampallis, J., (1991). Foundations of the New South Africa: Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman Press. 46p.

Pankhurst, D., (1996). A Resolvable Conflict? The Politics of Land in Namibia, Peace Research Report No. 36, University of Bradford, UK.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M., (2009). What's race got to do with it? Critical race theory's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. In E. Taylor, D. Gillborn, & G. Ladson-Billings (Eds.), *Foundations of critical race theory in education* (pp. 148–162). New York: Routledge.

Parker, L., (2003). Critical race theory and its implications for methodology and policy analysis in higher education desegregation. In G. R. Lopez & L. Parker (Eds.), *Interrogating racism in qualitative research methodology.* New York: Peter Lang.

Pascale, C., (2008). Talking about race: Shifting the analytical paradigm. Qualitative Inquiry, 14(5), 723–741.

Patnaik, U., (1999). Export-oriented agriculture and food security in developing countries and in India. In Utsa Patnaik (Ed.), The long transition (pp. 351–416). New Delhi: Tulika.

Patnaik, U., & Patnaik, P., (2017). A theory of imperialism. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Patton MQ., (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods. 3rd Sage Publications; Thousand Oaks, CA: 2002.

Pienaar, K., (2009) Draft comments on the concept/vision of the CRDP, 7 October. Pretoria.

Platzky, L & Walker, C., (1985). The surplus people: forced removals in South Africa: Johannesburg: Ravan. 446p.

Peemans, Jean-Philippe. (2013). *A political economy of rural development in South East Asia in relation with the many versions of the disappearance of the peasantry. Working Paper, No 6, Groupe de Recherche Asie de l'Est et du Sud Est (GRAESE). Journal of Peasant Studies 38(1):161-191*.

Piketty, T., (2014). Capital in the Twenty-First Century, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Polanyi, K., (1944). The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time. Vol. 59. New York: Farrar & Rinehart Inc.

Polanyi, K., (1957). The Great Transformation. www.britannica.com. (Accessed 12-2-2022).

Porter, M. & Schwab, K**. (**2002). *The Global Competitiveness Report 2002–2003.* World Economic Forum, Oxford University Press, New York.

Posal, D., (1991). The making of Apartheid 1948 to 1961: conflict and compromise. Oxford: Claredon: 61p.

Prinsloo, L., (2011). Economists lay into SA's New Growth Path (NGP) framework. http:// engineeringnews.co.za (Accessed 27-05-2022).

Proctor, F., & Lucchesi, V., (2012). Small-scale Farming and Youth in an Era of Rapid Rural Change. IIED/HIVOS, London, The Hague.

Punch, K., (2000). Developing Effective Research Proposals, London, California, New Delhi: Sage.

Reardon, T., & Berdegué, J., (2002). The rapid rise of supermarkets in Latin America: Challenges and opportunities for development. *Development Policy Review* 20 (4): 371-388.

Richardson, L., (2000). Skirting a pleated text: De-disciplining an academic life. In: E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), Working the ruins: Feminist post structural theory and methods in education (pp. 153-163). New York: Routledge.

Rizzo, M., (2009). *''The Struggle for Alternatives: NGOs'' Responses to the World Development Report 2008*', *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 9:2, April, pp. 277-290.

Rochefort, A. & Cobb, R., (1994). The Politics of Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas.

Rodney, W., (1973). How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. Jointly prepared by Joaquin Arriola. London, Dar-Es-Salaam: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Rose, N., (1999). Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosset, P., (2008). Food sovereignty and the contemporary food crisis, Development, 51(4), pp. 460–463.

Rosset, P., (2009). Fixing our Global Food System. Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine, [e-journal] 61(3), pp. 114-128.

Rosset, P. M., B. Machín Sosa, A. M. Roque Jaime, & Ávila Lozano, D., R., (2011). The *Campesino-to-Campesino* agroecology movement of ANAP in Cuba: social process methodology in the construction of sustainable peasant agriculture and food sovereignty.

Reardon, T., Henson, S., & Bèrdegue, J., (2007). "Proactive fast-tracking" diffusion of supermarkets in developing countries: implications for market institutions and trade. J. Econ. Geogr. 7, 399–431.

Reardon, T., Timmer, C., & Minten, B., (2012). Supermarket revolution in Asia and emerging development strategies to include small farmers. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. Unit. States Am. 109, 12332–12337.

Reisch, L., (2006). Food-chain politics: realignment of agricultural policy. German Journal of Agricultural Economics 55(7):310– 322.

Rigg, J., (2006). Land, farming, livelihoods, and poverty: rethinking the links in the Rural South. World Dev. 34, 180–202.

Rodney, W., (1973). How Europe underdeveloped Africa. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House.

Rogoff, B., & Angelillo, C., (2002). Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 33, 415-440.

Russell, C., Gregory, D., Ploeg, J., DiCenso, A., & Guyatt, G., (2005). Qualitative research. In A. DiCenso, G. Guyatt, & D. Ciliska (Eds.), Evidence-based nursing: A guide to clinical practice (pp. 120 -135). St. Louis, MO: Elsevier Mosby.

Sachs, W., (1993). "Global Ecology and the Shadow of 'Development.'" Pp. 3–22 in Global Ecology: A New Arena of Conflict, edited by W. Sachs. London, England: Zed Books.

Sanderson, S., (1986). The Transformation of Mexican Agriculture: International Structure and the Politics of Rural Change. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sassen, S., (2014). Expulsions. Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy. Cambridge-London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Schmidt, L., (1997). "A Marxist Theory of Class Struggle." Acta Sociologica, vol. 20, no. 4, 1977, pp. 385–92.

Schlesinger J., (2013). Agriculture along the urban-rural continuum: A GIS-based analysis of spatiotemporal-temporal dynamics in two medium-sized African cities. Albert-Ludwig-Universität Freiburg.

Schneider, S., Salvate, N., & Cassol, A., (2016). Nested markets, food networks, and new pathways for rural development in Brazil. Agriculture 6, 61.

Schumpeter, J. A., (1934). The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle. Harvard University Press.

Scoones, I., (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: A framework for analysis. IDS Working Paper # 72. London, UK: Institute for Development Studies.

Scoones, I., & Thompson, J., (eds) (1994). Beyond Farmer First: Rural People's Knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practice. London: IT Publications

Scoones, I., Marongwe, N., Mavedzenge, B., Murimbarimba, F., Mahenehene, J., & Sukume, C., (2010). Zimbabwe's land reform: myths and realities. Harare: Weaver Press.

Scoones, I., Leach, M., & Newell, P., eds. (2015). The politics of green transformations. London: Routledge.

Scott, J.C., (1998*). Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Seekings, J., & Nattrass, N., (2006). *Class, Race, and Inequality in South Africa* (Scottsville, 2006), p. 254.

Sen, A., (1999). Development as freedom. 1st ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sender, J., (2013) Sender, ''Backward Capitalism in Rural South Africa: Prospects for Accelerating Accumulation in the Eastern Cape'' (Paper presented to ECSECC dialogue, East London, 2014).

Shackleton CM., Shackleton SE., & Mathebela F., (2005). *The contribution and direct use value of livestock to livelihoods in the Sand River catchment, South Africa. African Journal of Range and Forage Science* 22(2): 127–140.

Shattuck, A., Schiavoni, C., & Van Gelner, Z., (2015). Translating the politics of food sovereignty: digging into contradictions, uncovering new dimensions. *Globalizations* 12 (4) pp. 421–433.

Shepherd, J., & Taylor, I., (1993). "True voices and real people: The ''problem'' of the autobiographical in cultural studies" in Blundell, V., Shepherd, J. and I. Taylor (eds.)

Shivji, I. G., (2003). ―Three Generations of Constitutions and Constitution-making in Africa: An Overview and Assessment in Social and Economic Context‖ in Mihaela Şerban Rosen ed. *Constitutionalism in Transition: Africa and Eastern Europe*, Warsaw: Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights, pp. 74-92.

Shivji, I. G., (2006). *Let the People Speak: Tanzania down the road to neo-liberalism*, Dakar: CODESRIA.

Simons, A.E., Hoogerwerf, A. & Reinders, M.P., **(**1992). *Management of agribusiness complexes.* Paper presented at the European Workshop on Integrated Systems in Agricultural Informatics, 13–14 Feb 1992. ILB. Bonn, Germany.

Sinha, A., (2016). *Why has "development" become a political issue in Indian politics? Brown Journal of World Affairs 23, no. 1: 189–203.*

Sleeter, C., (2001). *"Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Schools: The Overwhelming Presence of Whiteness." Journal of Teacher Education 52 (2):94– 106.*

Snyder, R., (2001). Politics after Neoliberalism: Reregulation in Mexico. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sölvell, Ö., Lindqvist, G. & Ketels, C. **(**2003). *The Cluster Initiative Greenbook.* Paper prepared for the 6th Global TCI Conference, Gothenburg, Sweden, 17-19 September 2003.

Soper, R., (2019). *From protecting peasant livelihoods to essentializing peasant agriculture: problematic trends in food sovereignty discourse. The Journal of Peasant Studies* Published Online pp. 1–21.

South Africa. The Native Land Act, No 27 of 1913. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. The Native Areas Act, of 1923. Pretoria: Government Printer.

South Africa. The Bantu Trust and Land Act, No 18 of 1936. Pretoria: Government Printer.

State of The Nation Address, SONA, (2009). Pretoria: Government Printer.

Steinmo, S., Thelen, K., & Longstreth, F., (Eds.). (1992). Structuring politics: Historical institutionalism in comparative analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steppacher, R., (2008). Property, Mineral Resources, and "Sustainable Development". In Steiger, O., ed. *Property Economics: Property Rights, Creditor's Money and the Foundations of the Economy*. Marburg: Metropolis, pp. 323–354.

Stern, N.H., (2007). *The economics of climate change: the Stern review,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Stevans, L.K., (2012). Income inequality and economic incentives: Is there an equity–efficiency trade off? Research in Economics 66: 149-160.

Stiglitz, J., (1998). Towards a New Paradigm for Development: Strategies, Policies and Processes. UN, Geneva.

Stiglitz, J., (2002). Globalization and its Discontents, New York: Norton.

Stiglitz, J.E. (2012). The Price of Inequality: How Today's Divided Society Endangers Our Future. New York: W.W. Norton.

Stock, P.V., Forney, J., & Wittman, H., (2014) Journal of Rural Studies, Elsevier.

Suess-Reyes, J., & Fuetsch, E., (2016). The future of family farming: a literature review on innovative, sustainable and succession-oriented strategies. J. Rural Stud. 47 (Part A), 117–140.

Sutherland, A., (1998). The Making of Belize: Globalization in the Margins. Westport, CT: Bergen & Garvey.

Svensson, G**.** 2001. "Glocalization" of business activities: a "glocal strategy" approach. *Management Decision Journal* 39(1): 6–18. 2001.

Swaminathan, M., (2009). Science and Sustainable Food Security: Selected Papers of M S Swaminathan. (M. S. Swaminathan, Ed.) (1st ed.). World Scientific Publishing Company.

Tandon, Y., (1982). University of Dar es Salaam: debate on class, state & imperialism, Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House.

Tatz, C.M., (1961). Shadow and substance in South Africa. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press. 13p.

Taylor, B., & Gans-Morse, J., (2009). Neoliberalism: From New Liberal Philosophy to Anti-Liberal Slogan. Studies in Comparative International Development, 44(2), 137–161.

The World Social Report, (2021). Released on 20 May 2021 as part of DESA's annual reporting on global socio-economic trends. [Publication: World Social Report 2021: Reconsidering Rural Development] (Accessed 14-3- 2022).

Thompson, J., & Scoones, I., (2009). Addressing the Dynamics of Agri-Food Systems: An Emerging Agenda for Social Science Research. Environmental Science & Policy 12, 386–397.

Thompson, J., & Sumberg, J., (eds) (2012). Contested Agronomy: Agricultural Research in a Changing World. London: Routledge.

Torraco, J., (2005). Writing Integrative Literature Reviews: Guidelines and Examples. September 2005. Human Resource Development Review 4(3):356-367

UNCTAD & The World Bank. (2018). Respecting Land Rights and Averting Land Disputes. Responsible Agricultural Investment: Knowledge into Action Note, no. 11. 2018.

United Nations, (1956). Progress in Land Reforms. United Nations

United Nations, (1966). World Land Reform Conference. United Nations.

United Nations, (1979). Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. UN.

United nations, (2022). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2022. United Nations.

Unterhalter, E., (1986). Forced Removal: The division, segregation and control of the people of South Africa, IDAF, London.

USAID, (2008). Presidential Initiative to End Hunger in Africa: http://usunrome.usmission.gov (Accessed 6-7-2022).

Van den Brink, R., Thomas, G., & Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., (2009). Land reform in South Africa: Additional data and comments. In Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., Bourguignon, C., and van den Brink, R. (Eds.) Agricultural land redistribution: Toward greater consensus (201-214). Washington, DC: World Bank.

Van der Meer, C. L. J., (2006). "Exclusion of smallholder producers from coordinated supply chains: Market failure, policy failure or just economies of scale?" In *Agro-food chains and networks for development*, eds. Ruben, R., M. Slingerland, and H. Nijhoff, 209-217. Netherlands: Springer.

Van der Ploeg, J.D., (2006). Agricultural production in crisis. In: Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P. (Eds.), Handbook of Rural Studies. Sage, London, pp. 258–277.

Van der Ploeg, J. D., (2008). *The new peasantries: struggles for autonomy and sustainability in an era of empire and globalization.* Earthscan, London, UK.

Van der Ploeg, J. D., (2010). *The peasantries of the twenty-first century: the commoditisation debate revisited. Journal of Peasant Studies* 37(1):1-30.

Van der Ploeg, J., D. (2013). Peasants and the Art of Farming. A Chayanovian Manifesto. Fernwood Publishers, Nova Scotia.

Van der Ploeg, J., (2000). In the era of global agrarian crisis, we need to rethink how we can shift the current food production system to a socially and ecologically sustainable one.

Van der Ploeg, J., D., (2014). *Peasant-driven agricultural growth and food sovereignty. Journal of Peasant Stud. 41, 999–1030.*

Van der Ploeg, J., D., (2017). Differentiation: old controversies, new insights. Journal of Peasant Stud. 1–36.

Van Aswegen, H.J., (1991). Die geskiedenis van Suid-Afrika tot 1854. Pretoria: Academica. 318p.

Van der Ploeg, J., (1993). Rural sociology and the new agrarian question: A perspective from the Netherlands. *Sociologia Ruralis* 33, no. 2: 240–60.

Van der Ploeg, J.D., (2010a). *The food crisis, industrialized farming and the imperial regime. Journal of Agrarian. Change 10, 98–106.*

Van der Ploeg, J.D., (2010b). *The peasantries of the twenty-first century: the commoditisation debate revisited. Journal of Peasant Studies. 37, 1–30.*

Van der Ploeg, J., Jingzhong, Y., & Schneider, S., (2012). Rural development through the construction of new, nested, markets: comparative perspectives from China, Brazil and the European Union. Journal of Peasant Studies. 39, 113–173.

Van der Ploeg, J., (2013). Peasants and the Art of Farming. A Chayanovian Manifesto. Fernwood Publishers, Nova Scotia.

Van der Ploeg, J., Franco, J., & Borras, S., (2015). Land concentration and land grabbing in Europe: a preliminary analysis. Can. Journal of Development Studies. Canada. 36, 147–162.

Van Griethuysen, P., (2002). *Sustainable development: an evolutionary economic approach. Sustainable Development*, 10(1), pp. 1–11.

Van Griethuysen, P., (2010). Why are we growth-addicted? The hard way towards degrowth in the involutionary western development path. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 18(6), pp. 590–595.

Van Griethuysen, P., (2012). Bona diagnosis, bona curatio: How property economics clarifies the degrowth debate. *Ecological Economics*, 84, pp. 262–269.

Van Empel, G., (1997). *Report on broadening access to financial services for the agricultural sector*. BATAT Series: Finance 8. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture.

Van Jaarsveld, F.A., (1976). Van Riecbeeck tot Voster (1652-1974): lnleiding tot die Van Suid-Afrika. Johannesburg: Perskor: Tafelberg: 137p.

VanLoon, G., Patil, S., & Hugar. L., (2005). Agricultural sustainability: Strategies for assessment. New Delhi: SAGE Publications, and London: Thousand Oaks.

Vannoni, M., (2014). What are case studies good for? Nesting comparative case study research into the Lakatosian research program. Cross Cultural Research, 49(4), 331-357.

Van Onselen, C., (2019). The Seed is Mine. Jonathan Ball Publishers. Johannesburg.

Vasquez Heilig, J., K. D. & Brown, A. L., (2012). “The Illusion of Inclusion: A Critical Race Theory Textual Analysis of Race and Standards.” Harvard Educational Review 82 (3): 403424

Van Zyl, J; Kirsten, J. & Binswanger, C., (1996). Agricultural Land Reform in South Africa. Cape Town: Oxford University.

Vincent, A., (1987). Theories of the state, Basil Blackwell.

Vink, N., & van Rooyen, J., (2009). *The Economic Performance of Agriculture in South Africa since 1994: Implications for Food Security. Development Planning Division Working Paper Series No. 17. Midrand: Development Bank of Southern Africa.*

Visser, M., & Ferrer, S., (2015). Farm workers' living and working conditions in South Africa: Key trends, emergent issues and underlying and structural problems. Pretoria: International Labour Organisation.

Von Braun, J., & Meinzen-Dick, R., (2009). Land Grabbing by Foreign Investors in Developing Countries: Risks and Opportunities. IFPRI Policy Brief 13, April 2009. Washington DC.

Von der Weid, J. M., (2000). *Scaling up, and scaling further up: an ongoing experience of participatory development in Brazil.* Assessoria e Serviços a Projectos em Agricultura Alternativa (AS-PTA), Sao Paulo, Brazil. URL: http://www.fao. (Accessed, 11-2-2021).

Vorley, B. & Fox, T., (2004). Global Food Chains – Constraints and Opportunities for Smallholders. Prepared for the OECD DAC POVNET. Agriculture and Pro-Poor Growth Task Team. Helsinki Workshop, 17–18 June 2004, Finland.

Wallerstein, I., (1974). The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century New York: Academic Press.

Walker, C., (2008). Landmarked: Land Claims and Land Restitution in South Africa. Johannesburg: Jacana.

Walker, C., (2003). 'Piety in the Sky? Gender Policy and Land Reform in South Africa', Journal of Agrarian Change, 3 (1-2): 113-148.

Warren, B., (1982). Imperialism: Pioneer of Capitalism, London: NLB-Verso.

Warriner, D., (1969). Land Reforms In Principle and Practice, Claredon Press, Oxford.

Walker, C., (2008). *Landmarked: Land Claims and Land Restitution in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Jacana.

Weatherspoon, D., & Reardon, T., (2003). The rise of supermarkets in Africa: implications for Agrifood systems and the rural poor. Development Policy Review. 21, 333–355.

Weber, M., (2009). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Routledge.

Wegerif, 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. Research report 19. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape.

Wegerif, M., B. Russell & I. Grundling, (2005). *Still Searching for Security: The Reality of Farm Dweller Evictions in South Africa*. Polokwane North and Johannesburg: Nkuzi Development Association and Social Surveys.

Wegerif, M., (2019). *The ride-along: a journey in qualitative research. Qualitative Research Journal 19(4)*

Wegerif, M. & Anseeuw, W., (2020). Unearthing the less visible trends in land inequality. Rome: International Land Coalition, Land Inequality Initiative.

Wegerif, M., (2010). 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. University of the Western Cape. PLAAS.

Weis, A. J., (2007). The Global Food Economy: The Battle for the Future of Farming. Zed Books. WHO I Food Security. (n.d.). World Health Organization.

Wenger, E., (2009). A social theory of learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning: Learning theorists in their own words*. (pp. 209–218). London: Routledge.

Werbner, R., Ed., (2002). Postcolonial Subjectivities in Africa, ZED Books.

West, C., (1988). Toward a socialist theory of racism. In Prophetic fragments: Illuminations of the crisis in American religion and culture (pp. 97–108). Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.

Wezel, A., S. Bellon, T. Doré, C. Francis, D. Vallod, & C. David, C., (2009). Agroecology as a science, a movement and a practice: a review. *Agronomy and Sustainable Development* 29(4):503-515.

Wharton, C., (1969). "Subsistence Agriculture: Concepts and Scope." Pp. 12-22 in Subsistence Agriculture and Economic Development, edited by Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. New Brunswick, NJ: Wolford, W., (2007). "Land Reform in the Time of Neo-Liberalism: A Many Splendored Thing." Transaction Publishers.

Williams, G., (1996). *Setting the Agenda: A Critique of the World Bank's Rural Restructuring Programme for South Africa. Journal of Southern African Studies 22(1): 139-67.*

Willis, J., (2007). Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and Critical Approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Wilson, F. & Ramphele, M., (1989). *Uprooting Poverty: The South African Challenge,* Norton & Company, New York.

Wilson, B., (1994). When Social Democrats Choose Neoliberal Economic Policies: The Case of Costa Rica. Comparative Politics, 26(2), 149–168.

Wilson, F. A., (2013). Dialectical research methods in the classical Marxist tradition. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Wolford, W. (2007). Land Reform in the Time of Neoliberalism: A Many-Splendored Thing. Antipode 39

(3): 550-570

Woods, M., (2007). Engaging the global countryside: globalization, hybridity and the reconstitution of rural place. 31, 485–507.

Wolf, E., (1986). Beyond the Green Revolution: New Approaches for Third World Agriculture. World-watch Paper 73. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov (Accessed 20-7-2021).

Woodhouse, P., (2009). *"Technology, Environment and the Productivity Problem in African Agriculture: Comment on the World Development Report 2008"*, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 9:2, April, pp. 263-276.

Woods, M., (2014). Family farming in the global countryside. Anthropol. Note b. 20, 31–48.

World Bank, World Development Report 1991, New York: Oxford University Press, 1991, pp 31, 49.

World Bank, (1994). South African Agriculture: Structure, Performance and Options for the Future. Working Paper 12950. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank, (2007). World Development Report 2008. Agriculture for Development. The World Bank. Washington, D.C.

World Bank, (2010). Rising Global Interest In Farmland: Can It Yield Sustainable and Equitable Benefits? Washington DC: The World Bank.

"World Bank, (2013). Africa held back by land ownership confusion." BBC, July 23, 2013. https://www.bbc.com (Accessed 20-6-2022).

World Bank, (2016). *Enabling the Business of Agriculture 2016: Comparing Regulatory Good Practices.* 2016. http://documents.worldbank.org (Accessed 20-6-2022).

World Bank, (2017). Enabling the business of agriculture 2017. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group.

Yamamoto, E., Serrano, S., & Rodriguez, M., (2003). "American Racial Justice on Trial – Again: African American Reparations, Human Rights and the War on Terror." Michigan Law Review 101: 1269 – 1337.

Yanow, D., (2000). Conducting interpretive policy analysis. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Young, C., (1994). The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective, Yale University Press.

Yim, D., (2007). Study on Substantial Innovation System to Enhance Local SMEs Competitiveness. In UNESCAP Enhancing the competitiveness of SMEs: Subnational Innovations Systems and technological capacity0building policies, pp. 27-62. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand. Available at: http//www.unescap.org/tid/publication/indpub2435.pdf

Yin, R.K., (2003). Case Study Research Design and Methods. 3rd Edition, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K., (2014). Case study research (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Zimmermann, R., Brüntrup, M, Kolavalli, S, & K. Flaherty, K., (2009). Agricultural policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: understanding CAADP and APRM policy processes. Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik / German Development Institute Studies 48, Bonn.

Zoomers, A., (2010). *Globalisation and the foreignisation of space: seven processes driving the current global land grab, Journal of Peasant Studies, 37(2), pp. 429–448.*

Zoomers, A., (2010). *Globalisation and the foreignisation of space: seven processes driving the current global land grab. Journal of Peasant Studies. 37, 429–447.*

Annexure A – Interview Guide beneficiaries

Guiding Questions: Beneficiaries

"Hello. My name is Zakes Hlatshwayo, I am a PhD student doing academic research on: State efforts to support emerging black farmers.

RQ1: What is your name?

RQ2: Where do you live?

RQ3: What is your highest level of qualification?

RQ4: Gender

RQ5: Age

RQ6: Do you farm? If so what do you farm? When did you start? How did you start? Why did you start, what informed your decision? Where is the farm located?

RQ7: How did you get access to the land where you farm? Do you own it, rent it, have permission to occupy it, or have another type of right to the land? Who decides on land use?

RQ8: Where did you learn farming? Have you ever received training or advice on farming and if so from who? Were your parents farming?

RQ9: What are the sources of your livelihood (that is how do you support yourself and your family)?

RQ10: What form/s of labour or equipment do you use, if any? Do you farm for self-consumption, or selling or a combination of both, explain? What forms of support do you get and from whom?

RQ11: When did you get involved in the Agripark? Where did you hear about it and from who? How did you come to be involved? Why did you decide to be involved? What entry criteria, if any, is used? Is any other member of family benefitting, if so how?

RQ12: What actual support have you received from the Agripark? (Such as, credit facilities, extension services, access to markets, training, logistics, technology supply and distribution etc.)? How is it delivered? What improvement, if any has it brought?

RQ13: Do you sell any of your agricultural produce? If so, what do you sell? Where do you sell them? When did you start to sell there? How did you come to sell there the first time?

RQ14: Have seen or benefitted from any efforts of the Agripark to involved youth or women? If so what was done to encourage women and youth to be involved?

RQ15: Have you ever been involved I the Agriparks planning meetings, if so how? Do you participate in meetings? Have you seen the Agriparks plan, or have a copy? What form of communication is used with farmers? What, if anything, do you like about the communication? How can it be improved?

RQ16: What issues and concerns have arisen in connection with the functions of Agriparks? What efforts are made to address these issues and challenges? How can they be improved?

RQ17: In what way can Agriparks be improved, do you have any recommendations? Are there any other issues that you suggest I should look into?

Thank you for participating in the study.

Annexure B – Interview guide, non-beneficiary farmers

Guiding Questions: Non-Beneficiaries

"Hello. My name is Zakes Hlatshwayo, I am a PhD student doing academic research on: State efforts to support emerging black farmers.

RQ1: What is your name?

RQ2: Where do you live?

RQ3: What is your highest level of qualification?

RQ4: Gender

RQ5: Age

RQ6: Do you farm? If so what do you farm? When did you start? How did you start? Why did you start, what informed your decision? Where is the farm located?

RQ7: How did you get access to the land where you farm? Do you own it, rent it, have permission to occupy it, or have another type of right to the land? Who decides on land use?

RQ8: Where did you learn farming? Have you ever received training or advice on farming and if so from who? Were your parents farming?

RQ9: What are the sources of your livelihood (that is how do you support yourself and your family)?

RQ10: What form/s of labour or equipment do you use, if any? Do you farm for self-consumption, or selling, or a combination of both, explain? What forms of support do you get and from whom?

RQ11: Are you aware of the state support programme to emerging black, if so, how did you become aware of it? Why are you not participating in the Agripark? Did you intend to participate, if not, why not?

RQ12: Did you do anything to be allowed to participate, if so, what? Do you know why you were not included? Is any other member of your family benefitting, if so how?

RQ13: Do you sell any of your agricultural produce? If so, what do you sell? Where do you sell them? When did you start to sell there? How did you come to sell there the first time?

RQ14: What are your actual experiences? What issues and concerns have arisen in connection with your farming? What efforts are you making to address these issues and challenges? How can support to black farmers be improved?

RQ15: In what way can Agriparks be improved, do you have any recommendations? Are there any other issues that you suggest I should look into?

Thank you for participating in the study.

Annexure C – Interview guide, key informants

Guiding Questions: Key Informants.

“Hello. My name is Zakes Hlatshwayo, I am a PhD student doing academic research on: State efforts to support emerging black farmers.

RQ1: What is your name?

RQ2: Where do you live?

RQ3: What is your highest level of qualification?

RQ4: Gender

RQ5: Age

RQ6: Are you involved with Agriparks?

RQ7: How are you involved?

RQ8: For how long have you been involved; how did you get involved?

RQ9: What is the background of the Agriparks that requires them to support emerging black farmers?

RQ10: What policy changes influenced the establishment of Agriparks?

RQ11: What are the present functions of Agriparks?

RQ12: What are the priorities of Agriparks?

RQ13: What are their perceived efficiencies in fulfilling their functions?

RQ14: What do you believe are the main successes of the Agriparks?

RQ15: What are the challenges, if any, that you see with regard to land ownership, agriculture, and poverty alleviation?

RQ16: What processes are put in place to deal with the challenges?

RQ17: How are emerging black farmers identified and recruited to be part of the programmes of the Agriparks?

RQ18: What are the main farming practices of emerging black farmers?

RQ19: What legislative reform justified the emergence of the Agripark to provide support to emerging black farmers?

RQ20: Who decides on the type of support and services given to emerging black farmers?

RQ21: How are decisions communicated to emerging black farmers?

RQ22: How do emerging black farmers participate in the decision-making on priorities of Agriparks?

RQ23: Are emerging black farmers given plans about the priorities of Agriparks?

RQ24: Are women and youth benefitting from Agriparks? If so, how?

RQ25: What are the challenges of the Agriparks? How are these challenges dealt with?

RQ26: What are the successes of the Agriparks? How is success determined?

RQ27: What are your recommendations for the future of Agriparks and wider support to emerging black farmers? Are there any other issues that you suggest I should look into?

RQ28: RQ16: How did you hear about Covid-19?

RQ29: How did Covid 19 affect you?

RQ30: How did you respond to the government's lockdown, did you benefit?

RQ31: Are there any other issues you would like to share or that I should explore?

Thank you for participating in the study.

Annexure D – Ethics Approval

UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Faculty of Humanities
Fakulteit Geesteswetenskappe
Lefapha la Bomotho

Humanities 100. Since 1919

14 December 2020

Dear Mr NZ Hlatshwayo

Project Title:	Emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them: a study of three government Agriparks in South Africa.
Researcher:	Mr NZ Hlatshwayo
Supervisor(s):	Dr MCA Wegerif
Department:	Anthropology and Archaeology
Reference number:	18396799 (HUM012/1119)
Degree:	Doctoral

I have pleasure in informing you that the above application was **approved** by the Research Ethics Committee on 14 December 2020. Data collection may therefore commence.

Please note that this approval is based on the assumption that the research will be carried out along the lines laid out in the proposal. Should the actual research depart significantly from the proposed research, it will be necessary to apply for a new research approval and ethical clearance.

We wish you success with the project.

Sincerely,

Prof Innocent Pikirayi
Deputy Dean: Postgraduate Studies and Research Ethics
Faculty of Humanities
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
e-mail: PGHumanities@up.ac.za

Annexure E – Informed consent form

Consent Form: Participation in Research Study.

"Hello. My name is Zakes Hlatshwayo, I am a PhD student doing academic research on **Emerging black farmers' practices and state support to them: a study of three government Agriparks in South Africa.** This study explores state efforts to shape agrarian change, the study will look at legislation, policies, programmes, and institutional structures. To achieve this goal the study will focus on The *Comprehensive Rural Development Programme* looking at how it was conceptualized and is being implemented, including related legislation, policies, programmes, and institutional structures.

Hopefully, the information will help policymakers, practitioners, officials, and managers to make informed decisions on such programmes in the future.

The research study has been approved by the University of Pretoria's Ethical Committee. Your **privacy and confidentiality** will be secured**.** No direct reference will be made to you, I will use codes and categories to keep information about you confidential and to protect it from unauthorized disclosure, tampering, or damage. You are not required to use your name, do not write your name on any of the documents. The data will be kept for 15 years in a password-protected format and used for University of Pretoria research only.

Your Rights:

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You have the right not to participate at all or to leave the study at any time. Deciding not to participate or choosing to leave the study will not result in any penalty or loss.

Consent:

I have read and understand the consent form, I voluntarily agree to participate and receive a copy of this form. I understand that I can leave at any stage, that there will be no penalty, and that I will receive no compensation through my participation.

Consent signature:

Respondent Signature:……..Date…….

Thanks you for agreeing to participate.

Yours sincerely

Zakes Hlatshwayo