

LAND OCCUPATION IN SOUTH AFRICA

**A research paper undertaken by
by Mfaniseni Fana Sihlongonyane for the
National Land Committee**

TABLE OF CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 INTRODUCTION	5
2.0 CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND	6
2.1 Ethnographic LO	8
2.2 Colonial LO	8
2.3 Commercial LO	8
2.4 Political LO.	9
2.5 Indigenous LO	9
2.6 Negotiated LO	9
2.7 Military LO	9
3.0 ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT OF LAND OCCUPATION	10
3.1 The First Wave of Land Occupation	10
3.2 The Second Wave of Land Occupation	11
3.3 The Third Wave of Land Occupation	12
3.3.1 Political Resistance to Forced Removals: Players and Modus Operandi	14
3.4 The Fourth Wave of Land Occupation	16
3.5 Institutional vacuum and urban crisis	18
4.0 NATURE OF LAND GRIEVANCES, DEMAND AND STRATEGIES - MOTIVATION FOR LAND OCCUPATION	18
4.1 Apartheid poverty	18
4.2 Neo-liberal policies	20
4.3 Economic Migration Influx	21
4.4 Security of Tenure	21
4.5 Limited Land for Housing	21

5.0	SOCIAL ORIGINS, COMPOSITION AND BASIS	21
5.1	Social Resistance	22
5.2	Micro-problems	23
5.2.1	Homelessness	23
5.2.2	Overcrowding and lack of privacy	23
5.2.3	Conflict with land/house owners	23
5.2.4	Marital breakdown	23
5.2.5	Poverty and Unemployment	23
5.2.6	Health problems	23
6.0	COMPOSITION, CLASS BASIS, GENDER PATTERNS AND MATERIAL IDENTITY OF LAND OCCUPIERS	24
6.1	Women and disadvantages of blacks	24
7.0	REACTION OF AUTHORITIES	26
7.1	Government Reaction and difficulties	26
8.0	SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, ALLIANCES AND LINKAGES	29
8.1	NLC and Affiliates	29
8.2	Restoration of Land Charter and Alliances	30
8.3	Landless People's Movement and Linkages	33
8.4	Broader Framework of the Social Movement Struggles	34
9.0	KEY ISSUES AND LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE	34
9.1	Rhetorical struggle for land	34
9.2	Shift in Land Struggle	35
9.3	Fragmentation in the Struggle for land	35
9.4	Gap between Theory and Practice	35
9.5	LPM Carries promise	36

9.6	Communication plan	36
9.7	International collaborative partnerships counts	36
9.8	Mobilising and strengthening grassroots support	37
9.9	Land Reform Recast	37
9.10	Strategic Intervention	37
9.11	Mediation	38
9.12	Data Collection	38
9.13	Research Areas	38
9.14	Militancy and Developmental approach	38
9.15	Education	39
10.0	CONCLUSION	39
11.0	REFERENCES	411
	APPENDIX 1	48

Table 1: South African Emerging Social Movements

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to discuss Land occupation as a concept and its social origins, composition and dynamics in South Africa. The focus is on the social, political and geographical issues that have influenced land occupation over the decades and it identifies the land occupiers as well as their gender patterns, alliances and linkages. It looks also at their economic class, their material possession and the reasons motivating land occupation. It concludes by drawing key issues and lessons for the future.

INTRODUCTION

For a long time, the land issue and in particular, land occupation has been smoldering beneath the limelight of more glaring issues such as: housing, employment creation, infrastructure, etc. It took the blazing headlines of the politicized Zimbabwean land reform and the Bredell land occupation conflict to bring the issue of land occupation to the forefront of research.¹ Adding impetus to the research concerns are recent sensational headlines highlighting, “land grabs,”² “Zimbabwe-style land invasions,”³ “landlessness and desperation;”⁴ and “Hunger for land.”⁵ Perhaps, the highlight of this sensation is the warning headlines of the *New African* magazine (Commey: 2002) which stated that ‘the South African Land issue is a ticking bomb.’

As such, land occupation (LO) has been happening since the 1980s without much political clout except a few spurts of reactions. It took the widely publicized Bredell land invasion in 2001 to fire the opening salvo. The government rushed in with a stern intervention to curb a sporadic occurrence of similar incidences. But the economically hard-pressed blacks increasingly occupy vacant land in the peri-urban areas (as well as in farms) in order to access job opportunities and better facilities (Commey: 2002). This has confirmed that a new wave of collective conscientiousness is emerging from various grassroots communities to tackle the historical scourging issue of landlessness.

Thus, the objective of this paper is to discuss land occupation as a concept and its social origins, composition and dynamics. The focus will be on the social, political and geographical issues that have influenced land occupation over the decades and identify the land occupiers as well as their gender patterns, alliances and linkages. The paper will also look at their economic class, their material possession and the reasons motivating

¹ Deborah James (2001, p94) locates this stimulus within the ‘regional setting’ (cum ‘neighbour syndrome’) which raises questions about the relevance of these events in South Africa.

² *Newsweek*, 16/july 2001; *Cape Argues* 29 Aug, 2001; *Cape Times* 6 July 2001

³ *Newsweek*, 16July 2001

⁴ *Natal Witness* 17 Aug 2001

⁵ *Sowetan* 16 July 2001

land occupation. The paper will conclude by drawing key issues and lessons for the future.

2.0 CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BACKGROUND

What is widely recognizable is that land occupation is conventionally referred to, as land invasion is South Africa. Invariably, it is also referred to as ‘squatting’ ‘land seizures,’ or ‘land grabs.’ Moyo’s (2002) interpretation of land invasion in the context of Zimbabwe is that it denotes a negative view of politically organized ‘trespass’ of farms lead by war veterans. Squatting is used to refer to invasion in the past (before politicization) and now refers to the illegal stay of people on a piece of land. More widely used recently is the term land seizure (especially in the media) to mean a variety of phenomena including outright repossession of land through armed liberation struggle and conquest in Zimbabwe.

In the procurement of LO, Moyo (ibid) identified various dimensions to it namely: the symbolic,⁶ intimidatory,⁷ physical seizures,⁸ social mobilization,⁹ political campaign,¹⁰ and legitimate compulsory acquisitions.¹¹ Depending on the method of procurement and its facilitators (public or covert) the form of land occupation can be determined. In the final analysis, the conceptualization of any form of LO is irrevocably political.

In South Africa, LO is widely referred to as land invasion, an apartheid borne concept that sought to politically despise the conceited effort by disposed blacks to acquire land that was taken from them. The concept creates a negative impression that those who occupy land informally warrant to be dealt with rough-handedly. Yet, the informal occupation of the streets does not warrant the same treatment. Moreover, when the imperialists took land through unscrupulous means from the native people, it was not

⁶ Engages demonstrations often facilitated by communities (civic leaders), traditional leaders, war veterans, peasants

⁷ Involves perceived violence and prompting land occupants.

⁸ Entails outright invasion and land grabbing

⁹ Instigates people to occupy land and can be used as an electoral campaign usually by the opposition.

¹⁰ Procures political re-education and intimidation to support a particular political course

¹¹ Aims at formalising occupations normally after a widespread history of occupations.

seen as land invasion but land occupation and/or 'European occupation' of the 'dark continent' (Davidson: 1968).

Therefore, land invasion is a racist concept to demonise the efforts of the black people to get access to land. Unfortunately, the post-apartheid government flippantly inherited the land problem with its conceptual malaise and has used it as well. Thus, it is used in a negative sense to despise any form of land acquisition. However in retrospect, LO is the only way by which poor blacks that are economically marginalized acquire land in order to earn a living and access their inalienable right to land in a situation where the system denies timely access to it. It refers to the physical utilization of a piece (s) of land by an individual or a group of people in order to fulfill their economic, social or political needs.¹²

A historical analysis of the different forms of LO shows that they are various economic, social and political factors, all simultaneously related, that shape up the forms. These forms of LO are not mutually exclusive. One form may lead to the other, co-exist or even exist in a complex combination of varying degrees. Broadly, all the forms can be located in a broader framework of a triangle of various motivating factors that are political, economic and social.

The form of LO inside the triangle can be seen to be constantly moving bearing a dynamic influence on each one of the corners. Each corner can influence, intersect, or even run parallel to the economic, social or political conditions of another in terms of its approach, mechanisms, players and relationships of each other LO in the triangle. In other words, the mix of factors that result to a particular form of LO should be seen to be always in a state of flux.

¹² The imperative for LO arises not out of sheer greed or ineptitude, it is a product of the system in which we live and for which we are responsible. And so those, whose justice cannot be met, have no alternative but to do something that can make them realize their birthright to justice and to land. Naturally, the old time cliché still holds that justice delayed is justice denied.

The different forms of LO are identified as follows:

2.1 Ethnographic LO refers to tribal occupation of land by virtue of their ethnic right to access the land. Such land is usually held under communal ownership. The ownership is vested in a community not an individual and the chief or traditional leader is regarded as trustee with power to allocate the use of land to individual heads of families. This takes a symbolic dimension in Moyo's maxim in that traditional leadership or peasants facilitate it.

2.2 Colonial LO is the fundamental form of occupation that led to the displacement of black people from their native areas or ethnographic occupation. Apartheid epitomizes the model example of colonial displacement through forced removals and subsequent occupation of the land by white people. Various laws were promulgated to institute the inequalities of apartheid in terms of land occupation. The examples of the laws include: Native Land Act of 1913, Native Administration Act of 1927, Development trust and Land Act of 1936, Asiatic Land Tenure Act of 1946, Group Areas Act of 1950s and 1966, etc.¹³

2.3 Commercial LO proceeds by lease, sale, quitrent or other form of commercial agreement. This is done formally and informally. While clear leases, sale or quitrent can be done formally especially where a government agent is involved, there are cases where land occupation proceeds to different ownership through 'informal' (outside any form of legislation or procedure) sale or rent by traditional leaders, civic committees, etc.¹⁴

Some of the leaders in rural areas in many parts of South Africa are known for corruption. They sell land to people in a way that is not approved by neither civic nor traditional law. A lot of informal land occupation in various informal settlements is accessed through the payment in terms of lease, sale or rent to the 'traditional leader,' 'a

¹³ This takes various dimensions but mainly it is intimidatory and uses physical seizures and political campaigns

¹⁴ This problem is widely acknowledged in Lesotho (Shale, 1997) and Swaziland (Sihlongonyane: 2001)

landlord' or 'a gate keeper.' This practice has been associated with Pan African Congress (PAC) officials in South Africa and some the local governments (Shale, 1997 pg5-7).

2.4 Political LO is notable where a political party mobilizes a group of people or support a community to occupy a piece of land in pursuit of the political ends of the party concerned. In such circumstances, the motivation to annex or take control of a piece of land sits in line with the ideology or agenda of the political party or even government.¹⁵ The Bredell case, as reflected in the media had some political bearing to mobilization by the PAC.¹⁶ Similarly, the Zimbabwean case epitomized LO under a state political agenda.

2.5 Indigenous LO occurs where indigenous owners of the land are reclaiming land. Usually, the occupiers have been on the piece of land for many generations. The motivation for occupation is generated by physical evidence in such areas e.g. graveyards, olds shrines, artifact remains, etc. Indigenous groups include: the Khoisan, Hottentots, etc.¹⁷

2.6 Negotiated LO happens where an owner or overseer of the land enters into an agreement or treaty (formal or informal) that govern terms and conditions of occupying the land. There are numerous negotiated settlements that occur especially in the urban areas where the shortage of land is very acute. LO on white farms, backyard shacks and informal settlements are solicited under such arrangement often with daring agreements.¹⁸

2.7 Military LO refers to forceful removal of people from a piece of land so that others or something else is located instead whilst maintained by militant forces. Notable examples can be found in various cases of colonial incursion by imperialist agents and countries e.g. the manner in which France took claims of land in ancient Ghana, Mali and

¹⁵ characterised by Moyo (2002) as a political campaign

¹⁶ See SAPA July 14 2001-Zuma- PAC to meet over land issue

¹⁷ It might involve social mobilisation but the acquisition of land is essentially symbolic.

¹⁸ This is relatively legitimate between the parties involved especially in cases where government formalises occupations that have been seen as informal settlements. Moyo (2002) views this as a legitimising process.

Songhay (Davidson: 1968). The Zimbabwean Land Reform had cases of military LO (*Mail and Guardian*, May 1994).¹⁹

3.0 ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL CONTEXT OF LAND OCCUPATION

The different forms of LO are located in a long history of waves about dispossession.

3.1 The First Wave of Land Occupation

The first wave can be traced back to pre-colonial societies where land occupation was based on the fundamental principle of collective ownership. The community had allodial interest in the land (the highest interest identifiable in the customary scheme of interests) and the entire community had a hold on the land. The Head of the community, either a chief, head of clan or head of family however, exercised authority and acted ownership on behalf of the community. The head was therefore enjoined to manage and administer the land in a fiduciary capacity with the advice, consent and concurrence of his councilors or elders (Bentsi-Enchill, 1964).²⁰

Currently, most societies in rural areas have these forms of land occupation especially provinces with the largest number of poor rural inhabitants e.g. Eastern Cape, KwaZulu-Natal and Northern Province (Martin et al: 2000). In the former KwaZulu area in KwaZulu-Natal, 85.5% of land fell under the traditional communal system in 1996 (Marcus et al: 1996, p153).²¹ This is where a chief or a traditional leader leads the land occupier broadly practice this form of LO. However, there are ‘traditional leaders’ as well in certain informal settlements who are either ‘self-made’ or sheer landlords that are characteristic of the same setup e.g. Mr Ngwenya at Etwatwa, Barcelona was perceived

¹⁹ This involves physical seizures, political campaigns and intimidation but as well legitimate compulsion may be involved where government backs it with a national policy.

²⁰ This form of LO is critical in any process of land reform because it had its own gender, environmental and social dynamics that may not necessarily be compatible with the modern human rights culture and the developmental and progressive demands of the current economic environment. It should raise a word of caution to the oft-cited romanticism evoking ethnographic practices of the past.

²¹ About 2.4million rural households or about 12.7 million people approximately 32 per cent of the total population are concentrated in about 13% of the country (Adams et al: 2000, p111).

as traditional leaders since he led land invasions in the early 1990s and people paid money to him in order to erect shacks in the area.²²

3.2 The Second Wave of Land Occupation

The second wave takes us to Davidson's (1968) infiltrating exploration of Africa by white merchants, missionaries and settlers in a devoted detail all over the continent showing how European imperialist agents engendered European land occupation.²³ In the process, various institutions, churches and stations were established on the native lands through numerous unscrupulous deals and treaties (Davidson 1968). The climax of imperialism occurred through colonial incursions. Britain, France, Germany, Belgium as well as Italy, Portugal and Spain set out to define an effective agreement on land partitioning at the Berlin Colonial conference in 1884-5. Through the invasion (France of Algeria, Britain of Lower Egypt and Red Sea,) establishment of Anglo-French control of Egypt, Colonial subjection of tribes and countries (France of Morocco, Britain of South Africa, and its protectorate), Portugal of Angola and Mozambique (the German of Cameroon, Togo and Tanganyika), colonial land occupation was assured. Davidson (1968, p244) asserted that the European powers proceeded to detailed penetration and subjection of the lands to which they had thus assured each other of effective occupation.

When the first European settlers landed on the tip of South Africa in 1652, they saw a vast, unclaimed land, never mind the Khoisan, Hottentots, or Xhosas. In the European eyes, they didn't own the land in any "proper" sense. They built Dutch East Indian Company, which was nothing but a refreshment station. But they were very advantageous because they owned houses and guns, and consequently the Khoisan were dispossessed of their land. The process of white expansion and blacks dispossession went on from this

²² See SAPA July 29, 2001 "PAC man fingered for Bredell land invasion"

²³ The journey of Mungo Park in 1797 in northern Africa, Rene Caillie (1827-8) in central Africa (Gambia through western Sudan and Morocco) David Livingstone's inspiring, quarter of century journey in southern and central Africa in 1841, Cecil John Rhodes from Cape to Cairo, all typifies the imperial land occupations (Davidson 1968).

point. Some of them were dispossessed through military conquest.²⁴ Poor chiefs thought they were granting grazing right, not the total alienation of the land and exclusion of themselves and their people (Independent Teachers' Center 1981pg9-20). Any revolt by natives was met by suppression, often with brutal incursions into their land.

This caught South Africa with the second wave of LO through colonial LO. Its land occupation took shape after the Anglo-Boer war of 1899-1902 when the British conceded all powers of government to the white population and established the Union with Cape Province, Natal, Orange Free State and the Transvaal subtracting the protectorates of Swaziland, Basutoland and Bechuanaland. The establishment of the Union through colonial power created the formidable problems of being landlocked for some of the protectorates that have a strong bearing to the current land occupation patterns in South Africa.²⁵ It set a clear stage for colonial exploitation of black societies both inside and outside South Africa through a divide and rule situation that fostered processes of land shortages which have sophisticated and become complex over time to give rise to the recent spate of land occupation, so-called land invasions.

3.3 The Third Wave of Land Occupation

The third wave is located in the post-colonial era. The important thing to note about the post-colonial era is that it brought about various elements of nationalism that became a facilitating factor in the nationalization of land in many African states. Nevertheless, the fruits of nationalism did not benefit the majority of the people. In South Africa, post-colonialism (in terms of gaining independence from Britain) was typically white nationalism which sought to secure and safeguard land occupation interests for the white population. This process saw huge tracks of land being transferred into state control and subsequent white private control at subsidized rates in order to promote white supremacy.

²⁴ For instance, arable land of Basotho by the war in 1865-1868, the Anglo-Zulu war 1879 and the wars on the eastern frontier of the Cape. Some of the land was ceded by chiefs to white government or group of white settlers.

²⁵ The Native Land Act segregated African and Europeans on a territorial basis by designating about 8% of the country's farmland as reserves which become the only areas that could legally be farmed by Africans (Adams et al 2000, p119).

It has been estimated that 3.5 million people were displaced to accommodate the white government's discriminatory laws. Among these as many as 1.2 million blacks were affected, 670 000 "black spots" removals took place and 834 000 people were displaced under the Group Areas Act (Kassier and Groenevald: 1992). Mabin (1991) indicated that the 1936 Act provided for the restriction of blacks to have a right to own land and substantial areas were added to the reserves defined in the 1913 Act to eliminate various forms of black tenancy that occurred outside them.²⁶ The National Party replanned rural areas by concentrating people in closer settlements in what was called betterment planning.²⁷ This was seen to be good for the people in as far as the liberals were concerned. But, it proved to be beneficial to a few people who kept access to land and it was negative for the majority who, through the process lost what was limited access.

One of the main ways in which the Nationalist Party government tried to bring about alteration in rural areas was by restructuring labour relations. The state sought to eliminate, first squatting on white owned land and secondly, rent payment tenancy which it began to call squatting, despite the payment of rent. Thirdly, the state began to eliminate African labour tenants whose right to live and produce on white-owned land depended on providing a certain amount of labour to the white farmer every year. In the process, it encouraged wage labour. By 1950, racial restriction on access to land and housing was non-negotiable. The National Party passed the Group Area Act that affected Blacks, Indians and Coloureds. They were all forced to and removed to live in segregated areas. And they were not allowed to occupy land outside areas assigned to them (Melville, 1987). In 1951, the Prevention of Illegal Squatters Act was passed and it gave power to remove people without notice and to demolish their places. In 1953 Reservation of Separated Amenities Act ensured the reservation of public amenities for the use of persons belonging to a particular race.

²⁶ The Surplus Peoples Project (SPP) estimated that between 1960 and 1983, 475 000 people were removed from black spots in Platteland in the former Transvaal.

²⁷ Bundy (1987) noted that the betterment planning schemes met with bitter resentment, though implemented to improve environmental conditions, it only served to alienate people further.

The outcome of these laws nationally was that an estimated 3.5 million removals to the homeland or between them from 1960 to 1980 took place (Platzky and Walker 1985). In KwaZulu-Natal, 12 % of the surface was allowed to 700 000 Africans as against 87 % to Europeans in an unjust way. The Province experienced 165 black spots by 1950, 97 000 people were removed from the Bantustans between 1960 and 1970 and more in the 1980s.

Between 1948 and 1982, 105 000 people were removed from 109 African freehold areas and 14 missions. Between 1960 and 1970, 340 000 labour tenants and 753 000 squatters were estimated to be removed and 300 000 people were evicted from farms between 1948 and 1982 (Harley and Fotheringham 1999, p38-42).

3.3.1 Political Resistance to Forced Removals: Players and Modus Operandi

It is within the third wave that social resistance begun dramatically to oppose apartheid.²⁸ The Liberal party, later known as the United Democratic Front reacted with a spurt of social mobilisation against forced removals. It, together with churches was among the first forms of resistance that was initiated by groups with close links to the communities that were being moved in the 1960s. These social groups aimed at publicizing what was happening in particular communities where peoples' land was being possessed against their will.

It used a number of methods such as its traditional silent vigils to highlight the removals and express outrage. Many concerned citizens within the white community expressed opposition to the removals either individually or through citizens' organizations and groups, for example the Citizens' Action Committee (CAC).²⁹ They aimed at raising awareness about removals. Also concerned citizens formed the National Citizens

²⁸ In this context, the political resistance to forced removals was occurring in a context of nationalist approach described by Moyo et al (2000) as one that advocates for nationalised interests. In Zimbabwe, it was anti-foreigner and anti-colonisers. At the juncture, the South African resistance had an inspiration for a transformative approach (that is seeking to change the framework of accessing land in a context of human rights and democratisation – *ibid*).

²⁹ The CAC was initiated in Johannesburg in 1962 and it grew to have other branches in major cities and in the country.

Association (NCA) in August 1968. The NCA rose out of an *ad hoc* committee formed by a number of individuals and representatives of churches and other organs.

In the 1960s much of church opposition to removals was done in conjunction with broader campaigns and churches played an integral role in the activities of the liberal Party, for example the prayer meeting in September 1963 and the appeal by Prominent citizens the year after. The churches produced publications on issues of removals, for example Father Cosmos Desmond; a Priest wrote a book called “The Discarded People”, which aroused Public condemnation of removals both nationally and internationally. In 1974 the national conference of the South African Council Of Churches (SACC) passed a motion calling on the constituent members to give their full support of aid to those refused to move. According to the SACC, removals were acts of violence.

Unfortunately, resistance of communities to removals was largely unsuccessful because of the government’s relentless determination. Nevertheless, very few communities did not attempt to resist removals in anyway they could, for example praying, refusal to demolish houses, refusal to accept compensation, violence in some cases, letters of appeal to government and opposition groups.

In the 1980s, the struggle against removals began to be subject of a legalistic and human rights debate. The United Democratic Front (UDF) called for the stop on the demolishing of shacks with immediate effect. It believed that basic rights are shelter for all human beings and it is in human to destroy a person’s shelter without providing suitable alternative accommodation.³⁰ The UDF called on government to announce that communities still under threat of forced removals are entitled to remain permanently where they are. Also tenants who had not paid their rent could not be evicted. They also said that there should be consultation with the representative organization before any action could be taken. (Land Update no3 August 1990 pg7). All calls for the government

³⁰ Largely the growth of informal settlements was synonymous with land occupation which the Apartheid state was increasing failing to control and contain with its regulatory mechanisms.

to immediately suspend punitive sections of the Preventive of illegal squatting Act, which mandated local authorities to demolish shacks (Land Update no3 August 1990 pg7).

3.4 The Fourth Wave of Land Occupation

This set up came under pressure in the 1980s as the adoption of neo-liberal policies associated with Reaganism in the USA and Thatcherism in the UK began to affect South Africa and the region at large. These policies imposed by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank advocated for a minimalist state and a reassertion of the power of market forces in economic management. At the heart of these institutions was the notion that, “Government increasingly recognises the need for more restraint and for taking ‘market friendly’ step to deal with problems” (World Bank: 1992, p6). This meant that the apartheid state could no longer exercise the strong command on the economy. It was now faced with an ever changing and volatile economic environment that could no longer be mastered by the regulatory and institutional mechanisms of apartheid.

Related to this condition was the growing political opposition to apartheid and to racial segregation, which intensified the difficulty of managing the city in the 1980s. There was the rise of civic-based resistance to apartheid policy and administration. Education, rent and services boycotts, land invasions and resistances to removals (as well as outside pressure) were developed as strategies to overthrow the apartheid regime (Bremner: 1994, p39).³¹

Apartheid authoritarianism suffered a deepening crisis in resistance. Democratization was increasingly difficult to resist and the world was moving towards plural democratic governance. That meant, apartheid could no longer perpetuate the Big Lie. Since the 1980s, an intensifying demand for a democratic society meant that the apartheid state could no longer impose planning solutions. Spatial and regulatory planning together with

³¹ These activities undermined the local government state apparatus often in conjunction with NGOs. Some organizations (e.g. Planact and Built Environment Support Group- BESG) and individuals started looking for alternative approaches to planning which rendered the state illegitimate and ineffective to the people on the ground (Mabin and Smit 1997).

forced removals were no longer an option, instead a more progressive approach was necessary.

Under these circumstances, the fourth and the most remarkable wave of land occupation began to occur driven structurally by the austerity economic conditions. Hendler (1992) noted that although more than 150 per cent of the land (measured in hectares) declared for African residential development between 1980 and 1980 was set-aside during 1987.... From 1989 until June 1991, a further 20 200 hectares were declared as land for the development of African townships, with a balance of 23 500 hectares still to be allocated.

Thus from the mid 1980s, the quantities set aside for township establishment increased so rapidly that by the turn of the decade more hectares had been allocated for township development that had originally been envisaged in the guide planned for the turn of the century (Hendler: 1992, p67).

A more revealing indicator of growth was in the Free State. Impelled by agricultural restructuring and redundancies on the mines, the population of Tweespruit nearly doubled between 1991 and 1994 to 7 250 residents. The rise in Dewetsdorp was even higher. Tembalethu, outside George in the southern Cape was established in the mid-1980s. In 1991, its population was a little over 14 000, it became estimated at 40 000 (Marcus, et al: 1996, p29).

The rampant land occupation took place rapidly in response firstly, to the falling away of apartheid laws as FW De Klerk conceded to remove all the apartheid laws unconditionally. This sparked a massive movement of people into South Africa not only to urban areas but also into rural areas especially from neighbouring countries. In the urban areas, the move was motivated by the RDP promissory note to provide access to land (RDP:1994, p20). To some extent, the flexible stance of government to squatter settlement i.e. the engenderment of informal settlement upgrading and green field settlement support motivated various processes of land invasion.

3.5 Institutional vacuum and urban crisis: What further motivated rapid land occupation especially in the early 1990s was the institutional vacuum in government. Notably, the period between 1990 and 1994 was depicted by Harrison and Mabin (1997:37) as crisis ridden, uncertain and an inauspicious context for planning. They argued that the effectiveness of government structures had declined precipitously, bitter and often violent conflict at local level derailed many planning initiatives. Exacerbating the situation is the fact that there was a policy vacuum. Even the image of planning was dull as the general public associated planning with apartheid forced removals. South Africa found itself trapped between a concerted security clampdown and an increasingly disruptive and organised rebellion. Far from urban restructuring, the media coverage of the period captured, “The economy was in decline and unemployment and urban crime were rising fast” (Mabin and Smit:1997, p213).

4.0 NATURE OF LAND GRIEVANCES, DEMAND AND STRATEGIES - MOTIVATION FOR LAND OCCUPATION

4.1 Apartheid poverty :These developments were linked to the fact that the colonial land occupation in South Africa gave rise to patterns of land distribution that are racially skewed and inequitable causing overcrowding in urban areas and the countryside and poverty. About 3.5 million South African in urban and rural areas lost their land and rights in property through forced removals (DLA, 1995). In 1995, the population of South Africa was projected at 42.8 million. Approximately 13.5% of all households (1.06million households) live in “freestanding” squatter settlements on the urban peripheries and in backyards of formal housing units (RSA 1994). The large and increasing housing backlog was due to low rates of formal housing provision, coupled with an increasing number of people accessing land informally- in informal settlements, backyard shacks, in overcrowded conditions in existing formal housing and most contentiously, through land invasions (Royston, 1998). In particular, land distribution patterns reflect grim statistics with approximately 55 000 commercial farmers having access to 102 million hectares of land, whereas 11.2 million black households have access to 17 million hectares in the former homelands (Marcus et al: 1996, p97).

The enormity of the apartheid's housing backlog posed one of the most significant challenges to reconstruction and development. Intensifying this pressure was the fact that democratizing raised high expectations. Yet, the people who were waiting patiently for delivery of the RDP promises could no longer, instead took matters onto their own hands and started invading land.

In 1994, there were about 2.6 million formal housing units. An estimated 1.7 million households around 7 million people were living in shacks on un-serviced sites, and over million people were in 620 000 shacks on serviced sites. A further 100 000 serviced sites were not occupied they were in the wrong place provided the wrong facilities or were unaffordable. An astonishing 2.1 million people lived in hostels often with a family to a bed, and sometime with additional friend or family squatting outside (NHF 1994). It was estimated that, there were approximately 300 informal settlements in Gauteng in 1995. Some were located on government owned land and were either the product of transit areas or "shack farming" operation by land-owners.

In the rural areas, the broader democratization processes made South Africa to be a greener pasture in comparison with the neighbouring states. Some were coming back from these states to their land following their forced removals. In some cases, they came back with others who were not necessary part of the forced removals but had social relations with them. The added advantage was the need to get the pension money for the aged or retired which was not available in the neighbouring states. Also, the proportion of rural households with access to formal income is generally much higher in South Africa than in neighbouring countries. May (1996) reported a value of 94.9% for South Africa as a whole. Comparative figures from Namibia (Caprivi) and Zimbabwe are 20% (Ashley and LaFranchi 1997) and 43% Bradley and Dewees 1993) respectively. Many areas in Mpumalanga and KwaZulu Natal, which are neighbours to Mozambique and Swaziland, are part of this process.

4.2 Neo-liberal policies: One of the fundamental explanations for land occupation derives from the major interjection of the austerity policies in the 1980s that shrank the role to the state and state revenue destroying the patron-client relationships that favoured small farmers with subsidies. Bryceson and Bank (2001, p13) noted that African peasant farmers were squeezed by rising cost of agricultural inputs including fertilisers, improved seeds and insecticides while cash crop incomes fluctuated and often declined. They observed that market liberalisation from the perspective of the rural consumer, tended to expand choice but at an arms' length, for much of the tantalising merchandise came with unaffordable prices. Consequently, rapid migration was spurred by the falling prices in agricultural products and adverse competition engineered by the neo-liberal policies. This is signified by the drop in Agriculture's share of the GDP from 17% in the 1950s to around 4% in the 1990s (Department of Agriculture: 1995). Commensurately the number of people employed in agriculture has declined from a high of more than a million and a half in the 1970s to less than 1 million in the 1990s (Mather: p151)

Since the urban areas have high land rates and bare adverse formalities of urban planning, bureaucracy and market related financial responsibilities, most of the people swooped the peri-urban interface as a survival strategy (Holm in Becker and Pedersen: 1992, p245). Survival strategies emerged amongst the poor, small producers, informal enterprises such as: beer brewing, prepared snacks, hair plaiting, small scale retailing, prostitutions, handicrafts, tailoring, etc. many of these activities previously have not be commoditised (Bryceson and Bank: 2001, p14). One of these survival strategies is informal land occupation.

In South Africa, the deepening social and economic crisis in the rural areas, fuelled by falling formal sector employment, the ravages of HIV/AIDS, ongoing evictions from farms and the collapse of agricultural support services in the former homelands is accelerating the movement of people from 'deep rural' area to towns and cities throughout the country, whilst a lot of urban workers are retrenched. These people are left with few alternatives but to look for open land near the places of jobs in the peri-urban areas where land occupation takes place (Lahiffa and Rugege:2002).

4.3 Economic Migration Influx: The migration of people to urban areas to live with households under austerity conditions does not provide migrants with good accommodation. As a result, they cannot sustain themselves within other households where they have to pay rent, food, etc. Since they are less literate and lack marketable skills, they are forced to join the informal sector where wages are extremely low. They resort to seeking an independent place which is informal access to urban land.

4.4 Security of Tenure: The pursuit of informal access to land is linked to the need for residential land that can provide security of tenure to migrants. Another demand for residential land centres around security. This is often expressed as a desire for freehold rights because historically bad relations between tenants and private landlords and tenants and different levels of the state. (Marcus et al: 1996).

4.5 Limited Land for Housing: There is an assertion that government seems to overlook the provision of sufficient and suitable land for housing. This has limited the delivery of low-income housing for the poor people. The legislative control plus the fact that land was previously assembled according to the ability to pay rather than need, makes insufficient land assembled for low-income housing, yet the low income earners and the unemployed people in urban areas are the majority. The erection of informal settlements through land invasions shows that the problem is not solely a housing issue in the South African context but also a land issue.

5.0 SOCIAL ORIGINS, COMPOSITION AND BASIS

5.1 Social Resistance: The social origins of land occupation can be linked to the fact that most rural societies have maintained their traditional way of life outside the capitalist modes engendered by apartheid over the decades. The essence of the apartheid system was to marginalize the black people within the system. Wolff (1974) charged that Africans persistently resisted the changes in the whole economic and social pattern of their lives, which was demanded by the policy transforming them into regular wage earners.

Balandier (1968:190) lamented that Africans despised wages, exploitation and profit because of its inconsistency with the lineage core relation and not because it was in their nature. This made Sangmpam (1995: 52) generally to argue that capitalist expansion via colonial rule did not lead to capitalist implantation because of the failure of capitalism to implant itself and due mostly to the neutralisation of capitalism by the structural dynamism of black societies.

The majority of black people therefore find themselves peripheral partakers or passive participants in the operation of the capitalist system modernized in the fashion of neo-liberalism. The majority of the poor stay in rural areas in South Africa with a poverty share of rural areas (percentage of poor individuals who live in rural areas) is about 71% , compared with 29% in urban areas. “Not surprisingly, 61% of the African population is poor and a mere 1% of the white population is poor” (May: 2000, p21). This means that the formidable resistance of racist policies circumscribed and isolated the blacks in white farms, black reserves and ‘black spots.’ Social segregation created extreme shortage of land and insecurity of tenure causing migration from rural areas to urban areas which in turn created social fragmentation and generation gaps that led to loosening of the social fabric.

Cross (1997) and Cross et al (1996) argued that things such as customary tenure system are fairly much in pieces on the ground as corrupt administrators and developers become helpless and many communities are now too divided and weak to enforce accountable land rights. Moser (1996) argued that households throughout the world are becoming more isolated as social capital linkages fall apart and women become less able to depend on the help of relatives and neighbours with the work of household production. Cross (1999) indicated that the weakest households are dropped from reciprocity networks and their claims for help are rejected by relatives once they have fallen below the threshold of possible repayment. May et al (1995, 1996, 1997) identified the role of social exclusion and isolation of the poor as a contributing factor to poverty itself, as well as a by-product of impoverishment.

5.2 Micro-problems

There are also micro-problems that motivate the need to claim land.

5.2.1 Homelessness- people do not have homes, as they cannot afford to buy or rent a house. Homelessness is a major feature of the South African political landscape with well over 10 million people considered to have been living in inadequate shelter in the 1990s (Lawson 1991)

5.2.2 Overcrowding and lack of privacy- the family size and structure can be a problem as Black people usually have extended families even though they do not have access to land or a proper and formal housing structure. Many people moving into urban settlement have been allocated plots which are smaller than they are used to and are often inadequate for the living space their household need. Others want garden sites to supplement their food and income This ties in with the shift away from arable field cultivation to home gardens noted for example in the Eastern Cape (Marcus et al: 1996)

5.2.3 Conflict with land/house owners- people living in backyard structures are sometimes in conflict with the land or house owners, for example, when the tenants cannot afford to pay rent every month due to poverty and unemployment.

5.2.4 Marital breakdown- a situation where a woman and possible children have to move away to look for alternative place to stay as the house they lived in belongs to the husband.

5.2.5 Poverty and Unemployment - being poor and unemployed means lack of access to regular cash incomes hence raise issues of affordability of land and housing rates. This is related to high unemployment rates in African countries.

5.2.6 Health problems - overcrowding in small houses or informal settlements may pose health problems to the people living in such conditions.

6.0 COMPOSITION, CLASS BASIS, GENDER PATTERNS AND MATERIAL IDENTITY OF LAND OCCUPIERS

In 1994, South Africa ranked 86th amongst countries for which the Human Development Index (HDI) were measured. The Northern Province had a low HDI, comparable to that of Zimbabwe or Namibia. White South Africans had a level of human development similar to that of Israel or Canada, while Africans score lower on HDI than countries such as Egypt or Swaziland (May: 2000, p22). May et al (1996) found that 22 % of the rural black population fell into the lowest rank of a four-scale indicator (75% of these households also fell below the income poverty line). A Rural survey released in 1997 reported that 70% of the rural population had access to land, although in the case of more than 50% of this group, the land size was less than one hectare (SSA: 1999).

6.1 Women and disadvantages of blacks: May et al (1995, p17) argued, “Of all women in South Africa, the spatial and economic marginalisation of rural African women is the most severe.” Whilst they are stuck with the responsibility of household support in a dwindling environment of social support and stringent economic situation, they do not have direct title or control to land. Often they access land rights through their husbands or families. Cross (1999, p12) stated that “land access is closely defended by power structures and is key to the institutional processes that determine what women can and cannot do with resources in the support of their households”

The dwindling significance of the household farm (Bryceson 1999; Ibrahim 1994; Meagher and Mustapha 1994) (discussed earlier) due to structural adjustments and globalisation means that women begin to enter the non-agricultural activities without choice (Bishop and Scoones 1994; Shackleton et al 1995; Shackleton and Shackleton 1997; Davies et al. 1999). Since most of the rural women do not have high literacy level or specialized skills, they are rendered redundant and superfluous in the low-skilled job sector. Most of them end up taking hazardous informal jobs e.g. prostitution, etc often working under precarious conditions such as street vending at night and without support by the state or policy.

Similarly, rural men and those that lost jobs due to austerity effects find themselves involved in informal activities of crime, vending, gambling, etc. This is because of the high rate of retrenchments and job losses in the formal sectors of the economy estimated at half a million lost since 1990 by 2000 (Shackleton, et al 2000, p35). The common factor amongst these people is that all are migrants from rural areas in South Africa or outside. They are bound by the common denominator of colonial LO and subsequent racist doctrines of economic development. For the sake of distinction, there are those that occupied land due to overcrowding or conflicts in the township created by the apartheid state. Usually the land occupied in this instance is adjacent to the old township and occurred during the 1980s.

There are those occupations that were orchestrated by civic organisations due to shortage of housing in the old townships or in the initial occupied areas. Most of these occurred during the 1980s and early 1990s. The reasons are wide and mixed. Some of these occupations relate to land and housing shortages, some have to do with rendering the apartheid government ungovernable and some have to do with taking an opportunity of gaining easy access to land through consolidation when the new government coming in. Foreign migrants who came from the southern African region also pumped up the rapid influx (*Mail and Guardian* June 16 1994).

It is important to point out that women are the most affect by patterns of land occupation that exists especially in the rural areas (Cross: 1999). This is because they do not have as much power as men, and this determines women's participation in, access to and control over land and other resources. Since women do not have equal access to land in rural areas, mobilized land occupation often offers more access to land since it is not always guided by the traditional gender patterns under chiefdoms. The ease of access to land provides a resource to women and it presents an opportunity for women to meet a variety on needs including those, which are socially identified as primarily their responsibility (Bryceson, 1995). This is driven by the pressures in their roles of social production hence the demand for land.

It is widely recognized that people living in poor households engage in a wide range of activities in order to generate a livelihood with which they are able to achieve food security (Lipton et al 1996). A lot of women are pushed into land occupation because they are more vulnerable of being unemployed than men. Even in circumstances where women are employed, they tend to be drawn into the very bottom and often worst end of formal economy, for example, domestic service and commercial agriculture.

7.0 REACTION OF AUTHORITIES

The government has not been sleeping on the land issue. Its chief concern has been to ensure that the burning land question does not lead to capital flight and disinvestments so that the result becomes an economic meltdown in a white system that has been bred for many decades, linked to the western economic super powers. South Africa's response has been very cautious therefore not to scare investors whilst obliged by its conscience to deliver land to the landless. A number of legislations have been made since 1990 to intervene between the twin interests namely: Upgrading and Land Tenure Rights Act 1991; Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights, 1996; Community Property Associations Act, 1996; White Paper on Land Policy, 1997; etc.

7.1 Government Reaction and difficulties

In 1994, the government introduced the Land Reform programme which sought to redistribute 30% of agricultural land between 1994 and 1999 through the restitution, redistribution and Tenure reform programmes. However, the Programme has been largely disappointing. According to the South African Survey ((1999/2000) at the end of December, 1998 (deadline for lodging land claims) some 63 000 claims had been lodged with the Commission on the Restitution of Land Rights, only 41 claims had been settled. The slow release of land was demonstrated in that after eight years of post-apartheid government still 60 000 farmers own more than 80% of the land, some of which is not

productively used. Yet more than half of South African are landless and need land (NLC: 2001/2002).

A number of critical reasons are given for the poor delivery. Kock, et al (2002, p139) argued that the new government's commitment to a neo-liberal macroeconomic programme has helped to slow down land redistribution which depends essentially on state spending to be achieved. The programme remains a state-driven programme dependent on extremely limited state resources being injected into a stagnant land market. The relative demobilization of civil society means that demands from below are not powerfully expressed, diminishing the incentives of the state to release more resources, especially when facing calls for fiscal discipline.

In particular, the state's stress on the "willing-buyer" – "willing-seller" principle has in numerous circumstances left rural communities who are desperate for a secure form of shelter and thus willing to pool their acquisition grants, vulnerable to inflated land prices (Kock et al 2002, p144). The market mechanisms coupled with a weak state has meant that power relations remain unchanged as landowners are able to dominate transfer negotiations to their benefit. The R15 00 Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant is limited since it covers land acquisition and improvement and the high price land is frequently insufficient to achieve the latter. Therefore, rural people are left with little money after acquisition of land and building their shelters from the grant to plough into productive farming. This makes Redistribution to become a means of reducing South Africa's serious housing/shelter shortage, but it does not deal with food security and rural unemployment – thus a half-backed solution.

The LAPC (1997) warned, "There is a danger that the new 'communities established through land reform will become no more than new Bantustans, where people are dumped in settlements with no visible means of supporting themselves." Notably in some cases, the commercial land being sold to redistribution communities is most often the kind that has already experienced poor environmental management by inefficient white farmers (Fakir, personal Communications) (hence cheaper to buy). The other thing is that

men traditionally dominate the market mechanism and the collective use of household grants in which the rural poor purchase land. There is limited scope for women to exercise a say in the land redistribution process.

Also, the national DLA lacks the capacity and support from other spheres of government to vigorously pursue its programme. Thus, the DLA and non-government organization have failed to find effective ways of working together to empower rural society. In time the new government had let the land reform slip low down on its political agenda (Kock et al 2002, p142). This is in line with NLC's argument that generally weak civil society and lack of resources for organizations are the stumbling blocs in pushing the land reform from below. It argued, "The rural society had been "demobilized" in the mid- to late 1990s as NGOs leaders have moved into government positions and the trade union movement placed decreasing effort into organization of rural farm workers" (Pearce 1997).

Exacerbating the situation is the fact that evictions have continued to occur unabated. Increasingly, farmers carry out evictions as a result of private action with state support and agricultural companies against workers who are no longer wanted on the farms. Instances where the farm workers are evicted are:

- When farmers sell the farm to new owners, often the new owners feel no obligation towards farm workers whom they inherit from previous owners
- On farms where some form of tenancy arrangements still exist, the failure by tenant families to replace ageing workers with younger, fitter members of the family can often result in a notice to vacate the land.
- Workers who complain about poor conditions or attempt to join a union are frequently dismissed for being 'trouble makers'

The powerful position of the farmer as an employer and landowner enables him to take punitive action against worker, if he so desires- expulsion being the ultimate sanction at his disposal. This makes it difficult for people to hold on the land that their families have lived in for generations. In the face of eviction orders, trespass notices, court cases, fines,

demolition of their homes, impounding of livestock, and even prison sentences, most tenants families show dogged determination and resistance in their attempts to hang on or to keep their homes and way of life.

The formidable difficulties which farm tenants and dwellers face were summarized by the chairperson of the Landless People's Movement as follows: closure of access to natural resources e.g. rivers by employer farmers, cutting access to water e.g. taps, lack of law enforcement because policy bribery by from owners, barring tenants from rearing livestock, chasing members of the family out of the family and demolition of tombs amongst others.³²

It is within this framework that the Bredell land occupation incident sprang up with media hype and political furore. A lot of people in the country do not have land to settle and the government programmes (housing and land reform) are slow to meet their needs. Surprisingly, the government responded by evacuating the land occupiers and threatened to pass a bill for criminalizing land occupation.

8.0 SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, ALLIANCES AND LINKAGES

8.1 NLC and Affiliates: Only a few Non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations and research centres and institutes have remained to pursue the land agenda. Most of them were active since the 1980s such as: the Association of Rural Advancement (Afra);³³ the Surplus People's Project (SPP);³⁴ the Transvaal Rural Action Committee (TRAC);³⁵ the Grahamstown Rural Committee (GRC)³⁶ and the National Committee Against Removals (NCAR) (formed through the affiliation of the above organizations).

The NCAR's early work was on campaigning for the reprieve of communities under threat of removal and for the return of communities that had already been removed from

³² The interview was carried out in December 2002.

³³ Formed in 1979 to fight evictions in the KwaZulu homeland and Natal

³⁴ Formed a year later in 1980, out of the crossroads evictions struggle in the Western Cape

³⁵ Grew out of Black Sash committee to fight forced removals

³⁶ Now known as Border Rural Committee (BRC)

their land. In 1990, the NCAR was renamed the National Land Committee (NLC). It took part in the debate around restitution and redistribution with the ANC affiliates and made policy proposals.

Ever since the NLC has promoted the creation of a new and unified network of national Rural Social Movements in the belief that pressure from below is the most effective mechanism to galvanize more effective state action around land reform. Other important network partners include: policy organisations like the Group for Environmental Monitoring, the Land and Agricultural Policy Centre, and the Centre for Rural Legal Studies, as well as academic institutions e.g. Centre for Legal Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand and the Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies at the University of the Western Cape (Kock et al, 2002).

8.2 Restoration of Land Charter and Alliances: When several displaced communities rejected the then apartheid government's land reform body in 1993, the Advisory Commission on Land Allocation (ACLA), the NLC launched the "Back to the Land Campaign." It led representatives from 80 rural communities from across the country in protest against property rights clause of the fledging constitution. This led to increased affiliation to the organization. Subsequently, the organization organized a land summit that was attended by some 400 civil society and land organisations in the 1994 before the country's first non-racial elections. The summit produced a land charter that circulated to all political parties. The charter motivated the rural social movements to consider expropriation as a lever to force the pace of reform (Pearce 1997).

In 1999, the NLC joined forces with other rural orientated NGOs and community based organisation to launch the Rural Development Initiative (RDI) in a Land and Agrarian Reform Conference (LARC). The LARC was a once-off initiative organized by the NLC and the Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS), a research and policy institute based at the University of Western Cape. It was held in Pretoria in 1999 and brought together a range of actors (national and provincial) and NGOs, and a small number of representatives from community based organization (CBOs). The conference

assessed the progress with land and agrarian reform in the five years of democracy (Hargreaves: 1999, p43).

The RDI is driven by a number of NGOs namely: NLC, the Rural Development Services Network (RDSN), the Trust for Community Outreach and education (TCOE), the Initiative Participatory Development (IPD) and the South African NGO Coalition (SANGOCO). It was organized through clusters between provinces and regions and Steering committees were established to coordinate activities at all levels. The RDI National Steering Committee developed a gender strategy in November 1998 and a small working group known as the Gender Task Team (GTT) was formed.

The RDI also produced a Rural People's Charter and Rural Development Policy Framework and Implementation Plan. The charter was drafted in a Convention in Bloemfontein at which representatives of more than 600 rural communities across the country were present. In the process, the RDI sought to lay the groundwork for rural social movements. It also convened policy task teams comprising NGOs with experience in rural development to evolve policy for an integrated rural development strategy framework (Greenberg: 1999). The NLC also mobilized its affiliates to advocate the rights of the landless through its Land Rights and Advocacy Department (LRAD) responsible for lobbying, advocacy and policy. A number of conferences has been hosted ever since which have led to the formation of the Land Access Movements of South Africa (LAMOSA) concerned with strengthening community structures.

In 2000, the NLC convened a summit of land organizations. This was intended to get actors outside government to reflect on the new Integrated Programme on Land Redistribution and Agricultural Development (IPLRAD) policy and come up with a joint response. The organisations involved were: COSATU, SACC, Centre for Applied Legal Studies, Legal Resources Centre, Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies. In Addition a number of community organisations made contributions e.g. the Labour Tenants Committee in Johannesburg consisting of labour tenants from Wakkerstroom district in

Mphumalanga (NLC 2001). Through the NLC support, the organizations managed to organize a picket at the Department of Land Affairs offices in Pretoria.

Subsequently, the NLC organised a national training workshop for its affiliates. Planact, an allied NGO was asked to facilitate the workshop. The NLC and the BRC conducted training on Integrated Development Plans (IDP) for AFRA. The BRC shared their experience on the IDP process in the Willowvale District of the Eastern cape. Another training workshop on local government budgeting was held in August 2000 facilitated by IDASA and all IDP information acquired from Planact was given to the NLC IDP task team to be distributed to its affiliates.

In addition the NLC got involved in collaborative research initiative with Food First/The Institute for Food and Development Policy in the USA. In pursuit of its collaborative endeavour, the NLC, Rural Development Services Network (RDSN) and Centre for Applied Legal Studies (CALS) submitted a joint submission to the traditional leaders and institutions.

In particular, the NLC was responsible for the collaborative formation the Southern African Network on Land (SANL) established in 1998 to ensure coordination and cooperation in the land and rural development sector in the region. The SANL consists: The Forum for Sustainable Agriculture (FONSAG) for Botswana; Namibian NGO Forum (NANGOF) Zimbabwe environmental regional Organisation (ZERO); Organacao Rural Ajuda Mutua (ORAM) for Mozambique; Lesotho Council of NGOS (LCN) Land Agriculture and Environment; Coordination Assembly of NGOs (CANGO) for Swaziland and National Land Committee for South Africa. It is seen as a vehicle to share experiences, expertise and creating a common platform for advocacy.

Thus, not only is the NLC a national but the regional node of Southern Africa for the Agrarian Reform Network (ARNET). ARNET is a programme of the Popular Coalition to Eradicate Hunger and Poverty. It is also part of the Land Rights Network of Southern Africa (LRNSA). Furthermore, strategic partnerships and international links have been

forged with Oxfam UK's Land Rights unit, the UK Department for International Development, The Southern African Regional Poverty Network and the Southern African Human Rights NGOs network.

8.3 Landless People's Movement and Linkages:

The trend towards creating supra-national grouping has seen increasing collaboration at international levels on common issues of development. A Landless People's Charter was adopted in 30 August 2001 in Durban in a Landless People's Assembly during the United Nations World Conference Against Racism (NWCAR). More than 3000 landless delegates from communities across South Africa and their landless allies from around the world were part of the adoption.

The charter declared: "We are the people who have borne the brunt of colonialism and neo-colonialism of the invasions of our land by the wealthy countries of the world, of the theft of our natural resources, and of the forced extraction of our labour by the colonists." This was also in pursuit of the NWCAR's "Landlessness=Racism" campaign which was carrying forward the 1994 demands of the Community Land Charter (NLC Annual Report 2001/2002).

On this occasion, the NLC also supported the "Day of the Landless" convened by Landless People's Movement (LPM) which was formed (July 2001) during the conference. As the most visible social movement, the LPM (launched in August 2002 during the WSSD in Johannesburg) has the objective captured in its motto as: "Land Now! Organise and Unite!" It is struggling for land and working to organize and unite all the landless people of South Africa to demand land now.

In time, these visible networks of the NLC have motivated joint ventures with other national and international NGOs. Some joint work with the Urban Sector Network (USN) has begun to get underway following the urban forced removals in Gauteng as apart of the governments "Urban Renewal Programme." A visit by the Brazilian MST (the Movimento Dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra, or Landless Workers Movement)

to South Africa was coordinated by Nkuzi and the NLC. This led to several public speaking engagements, including the Landless People's Assembly during the WCAR, the World Rural Women's Day Workshop in Kimberly, the WSSD preparatory meeting of the Civil Society Indaba and the NLC Annual general meeting.

Even the church has since been stimulated to lend a hand in responding to the plight of landlessness. Churches have been involved in several ways in the campaign for land restoration and many fieldworkers from the Council of churches and individual churches have supported communities returning to the land.

8.4 Broader Framework of the Social Movement Struggles

The rise of these networks occurs in a context where there is a convergence between globalisation, social crisis and democratisation. The unsettling combination of these generates a reaction from groups that can be described as loose-constellations of left leaning community based social movements. They vary in size, focus and influence. Perhaps what unite them are their common objectives of helping the poor, downtrodden and their resentment of hierarchies, bureaucracies and profit motive in unfettered market and corporate power. These are shown in the appendixes 1.

9.0 KEY ISSUES AND LESSONS FOR THE FUTURE

There are a number of issues that are emerging within the struggle for land occupation especially in the spate of the new social movements that are emerging. The following have been noted.

9.1 Rhetorical struggle for land: The struggle for land is largely defensive in nature. A coherent political programme for social change does not underscore it. It is reactive and casual. It lost the oomph and the zest that drove the anti-apartheid struggle in the 1980s. It lost the supporting thrust of civic organisations, labour and students. These have now been caught up with anti-globalisation struggles and the support for land largely remains rhetorical. Most NGOs have also focused on more fashionable and political

rewarding issues e.g. HIV/AIDS, poverty, environment, etc at the expense of politically sensitive issues such as land.

9.2 Shift in Land Struggle: The pursuit of the struggle for land redistribution has changed since 1994 in two ways. Firstly, the struggle now has shifted from being embraced by the major political parties, unions and civics to being driven by community-based organizations that are directly affected by the issues of land. A new tide of a struggle for land has emerged that seems to be inimical to the interests, not just of government, but its partners such as Cosatu and civics. The alliance has created a dampening of the protest spirit and containment of the revolutionary struggle. Secondly, victims affected on the ground now, generate the struggle for land. These are people who not opposed not only the apartheid injustices, but also the continuation and creation of new injustices within the post-apartheid system.

9.3 Fragmentation in the Struggle for land: There is lack of a coherent widespread synthesis of the struggle. Whilst instances of collaboration and common areas of objectives, programmes and grievances recognizable, there is no clear common enemy. Whilst some attack government at national level, some attach it at local levels, some at provincial levels and even others attach privatization/globalisation. The enemy seems to be varying from national to local and to global targets. This creates some subtle senses of confusion and uncertainties about the target of the struggle, focus areas and means of achieving the objectives of the struggle. Thus, most of the groups seem to be sheer pressure groups without ideological persuasion and without a clear technical and structural organ to pursue its ideals. In some cases their organization appears to be periodical and casual, in others their relations with government are ambiguous and shifting. There is also a shaky side to the relations that have with NGOs and amongst themselves. In other cases, the organizations themselves are not clear whether they are NGOs, CBOs or simply a pressure group, a weapon for social mobilization.

9.4 Gap between Theory and Practice: The interview with the Chairperson of the LPM and some members of the social movements show that there is a gap between

theory and practice. The policies (laws, bills and white papers) which government has put in place cannot be adhered to or fulfilled with the capacity that the government have. Thus, lot of communities is now pinning government down on policy issues. For example, the eviction of farm workers continues irrespective of the legislation proscribing against it. The chairperson cited cases where government seems ineffective to curb this. Bribery and collusion between white farmers and government police and officials creates bottlenecks to the creation of any solution. This demonstrates the dilemma in which government finds itself in a catch 22 situation, where it has to develop policies to fulfill the ideals of a progressive democracy, yet at the same time be sensitive to the obligations of the market dynamics.

9.5 LPM Carries promise: Such a firm organizational structure, which carries promise, is the Landless People's Movement. It provides a good start for the creation of a solidarity struggle for land amongst different people working on land. The Challenge that still stand is the harmonization of the different perspectives to land reform, the skewness of priorities and positions regarding land reform, the shaky organizational structure of some of the players, the superficial nature of the networks and partnerships, lack of resources and the political willingness for all concerned to push the land issue forward.

9.6 Communication plan: What can be recognised here is that there are numerous organizations at international, national and local spheres that have an interest to land reform in both urban and rural areas. Their focus is diverse though in terms of gender, rights, development, environmental, area, etc. These organizations are connected through networks in complex webs and strings between and within cities and rural areas. A good and effective communication plan is critical to their success. This plan should deal with ideological, language, gender, and remote barriers.

9.7 International collaborative partnerships counts: The land struggle should go beyond the national boundaries because the fight is against a common system that has ravaged black people in the region and in the whole world. There is need therefore to develop a global struggle against landlessness beyond the rhetoric of 'WSSD show off

struggles.’ The struggle must be underscored by a practical implementable plan of changing people’s lives. Thus, the networks that NLC has made with organizations such as MST, etc should be developed into a worldwide struggle against landlessness. This should help influence the international agenda in terms of raising the land issue as a priority.

9.8 Mobilising and strengthening grassroots support: There are currently weak institutional bridges that connect national leaderships of peasant movements and other external ally organization such as NGOs with the grassroots organisations. This is because the current market friendly mechanisms divide and weaken rural social movements. The market policies is in favour of those that are better amongst the peasants, e.g. tenant farmers, and regular farm workers, at the expense of the rural poor since the market favours those who are economically efficient and abreast with competitive use of land resources. In certain cases, it consolidates pre-existing patron-client relationships between peasants and elites, or creates new lines of patronage based on market relations. It is thus, at the disadvantage of women because in all likelihood, they are new and few in the competitive world.

9.9 Land Reform Recast: It means engaging the praxis of land reform more realistically and avoiding developmentalism – the tendency to pursue development for the sake of it to keep buoyant without practical results to benefit the poor. The land reform needs to be recast to take into consideration the needs of the people rather than the market. The Land reform currently is focusing on mobilizing the market rather than meeting the poor people’s needs. Priority, approach, timing and locational issues must be dealt with in the policy.

9.10 Strategic Intervention: There is a need for a strategic approach to land reform. This should take into consideration the fact that the land issues are diverse in the various parts of the country. The economic, political and social framework, population composition, historical dynamics etc determines the kind of strategic action to be taken. The tendency to apply a ‘blanket strategy’ falsifies the specific situations. Whilst one

situation may warrant land invasion, another may need sheer negotiation to acquire a piece of land. A range of strategies therefore needs to be developed.

9.11 Mediation: The activity of land reform requires the creation of a structure for mediation. Currently the mediation organ is only targeted at the Land Claims but the conflicts that occur at local levels are left to legal and policy enforcement procedures. A tense environment is created through these procedures and it stifles any move to procure action within the land reform programme.

9.12 Data Collection: The process of land reform has been made to be demand driven in disfavour those communities that have less organizational ability and resources to make their claims. Also government has been able to avoid confronting the land issue head on spawning to a historic rhetoric of the land reform because of lack of data. There is a need to develop data on the following:

- People who need land on the basis of their land right e.g. forced removals
- People who need land on the basis of economic reasons
- People who need land for commercial reasons
- People who need land for traditional and religious reasons
- Land audit of ownership of land per province
- Land use patterns of land per province
- Land capacity for production per province per farm.

9.13 Research Areas: Data collections can be developed by undertaking research to do the following among other things: Develop a land audit, Relation between land and HIV/AIDS, Mapping of forced removals per province, Historical data about forced removals, Culture and land reform, Religion and Land reform, Land and technology and environment and Ownership dynamics of land since apartheid.

9:14 Militancy and Developmental approach: Any form of land struggle should not sheer be a political gimmick. It must be backed up by a development plan. This will bring on board the civic society organs in rendering technical support to the militancy. In the

process, it would allow a community driven process, rather than one that entirely depend on government. As well, this will be a move towards policy reform of the land reform programme. As the situation stands, land delivery highly depends on the government's World Bank determined policy framework, which has demonstrably shown its failure.

9:15 Education: A lot of people still have a very thin knowledge about land reform. This is complicated by the fact that there is a lot of organisations sending diverse information about land e.g. NGOs, consultants, government, etc. This creates a cloud of confusion amongst the landless. Education about the land reform and about the Landless people's approach and plans should be undertaken in a more radical manner. This could be done by: Media advertisement, Newsletters, Leaflets, Internet webs, Educating chiefs and other traditional leaders, Educating civics and labour leaders

10.0 CONCLUSION

The land question is a long-standing issue in South African politics and is fundamental to human rights, development and prosperity of the people. It is the basis on which the political and economic changes that occur especially in developing countries are determined. To a large extent, besides religion, it is the primary dynamic factor to processes of imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism and has had repercussions for the determination of power in the processes of production, distribution and exchange. However, no matter how critical this issue has been, it has been overshadowed by more politically rewarding issues such as: housing, employment creation, infrastructure, etc.

The resounding coincidence between the Zimbabwean and Bredell land occupations at the verge of the conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in Durban brought the issue to the fore. This occurred at the hindsight of the reverberating echoes of "Seattle style resistance," "Genoa, the repeat" and the sense of continuum for the struggle held up anxiety for resistance politics. Such anxiety was generated by the apparent limited land delivery by government and the pressing problems that are experienced by people on the ground.

The attitude of government is that of fostering stability and conformity with the state's programme, but the response of the communities and some NGOs is that of exerting pressure to government. This has generated tensions between government and some NGOs around issues of funding, alliance, support and technical assistance. Many NGOs are at pains to redefine their stand vis a vis government. Others are torn between alliances and ambiguities of purpose and a re-introspection is underway.

Whilst this introspection ensued, it is apparent that there is a ground swell in community social movements that raises land demands. Varied, vibrant, variegated as they are, they seem to have common points of convergence especially around the obliterating effects of the neo-liberal policies. But, as well there are practical differences in approach, strength and attitudes towards government and to one another. This suggests that the playfield for social movements in South Africa is yet to be cleared of humps and ditches.

REFERENCES

Adams, Martin., Ben Cousins., and Siyabulela, Manona (2000). Land Tenure and Economic Development in Rural South Africa: Constraints and Opportunities in B. Cousins (ed) At the Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century. Braamfontein: PLAAS and NLC.

Ashley, C and LaFranchi, C. (1997) Livelihood Strategies for rural livelihood in Caprivi: Implications for Conservancies and natural resource Management. DEA research discussion paper. No 20. Winkhoek, Namibia: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Balandier, G. (1968). Daily life in the Kingdom of the Kongo. New York: Pantheon.

Bentsi-Enchill, K. (1964). Ghana Land Law: an Exposition, Analysis and Critique. London: Sweet and Maxwell.

Bishop, J and Scoones, I (1994) Beer and Baskets: the economics of Women's livelihoods in Ngamiland, Botswana. IIED research series, Vol 3 No.1. London International Institute for Environment and Development.

Bradley and Dewees, P. (1993). Indigenous Woodlands, Agricultural production and household economy in communal area in P.N Bradley and K. McNamara. Living with trees: Policies for Forest Management in Zimbabwe. World Bank Technical Paper No.10. Washington, DC.

Bremner, L. (1994). Development and resistance: The lessons for the planners of Phola Park. Urban Forum, Vol. 5, No.1.

Bryceson, D. (ed) (1995). Women Wielding the Hoe: Lessons from rural Africa for Feminist Theory and Development Practice. Oxford: Berg Publishers.

Bryceson, D. (1999). Sub-Saharan Africa betwixt and Between: Rural Livelihood practices and policies. A Paper presented to the Between Town and Country: Livelihoods, Settlements and Identity Formation in Sub-Saharan Africa Conference, Rhodes University.

Bryceson, D. F. and Bank, L. (2001). End of Era: Africa's Development policy Parallax. Journal of Contemporary African studies, Vol. 19, No.1, (January).

Bundy, C. (1987). Land and Liberation Popular rural protest and the national liberation movement in S. Marks and S. Trapido. The Politics of race, class and Nationalism in the twentieth Century South Africa. Essex: Longman Group.

Cape Argues 29 Aug, 2001;

Cape Times 6 July 2001

Commey, P. (2002). South Africa, Land: A Ticking Time Bomb. New African. (November) 12-16.

Cross, C. (1997). Rural Land Tenure Reform: Surrounded by Hungry Allocators. Indicator South Africa, Vol. 14, No. 2.

Cross, C. (1999). Women and Land in the rural crisis. Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity. No. 42,12-27.

Cross, C. Mngadi, T. Sibanda S. and Jama V. (1995). The Land is not enough, district study report for Weenen/Escourt Vol.1 Research report for Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. Johannesburg.

Cross, C. Mngadi, T. Sibanda S. and Jama V. (1996). Making a Living out the Land Reform: weighing up the chances in KwaZulu-Natal' in Land, Labour and Livelihoods in Rural South Africa, M. Lipton., F. Ellis and M.Lipton (eds), vol. 2 Durban: Indicators Press.

Cross, C. Mngadi, T. Mbhele, T. Mlambo, N. Kleinbooi, K Saayman, L. Pretorius, H and Bekker, S. (1997). An Unstable Balance: Migration, Small Farming, Infrastructure and Livelihoods in the Coastal Provinces, Vol.1 KwaZulu Natal, Midrand: Development Bank of Southern Africa.

Department of Agriculture (1995). Abstract of Agricultural Statistics, Pretoria.

Davidson, B. (1968). African history: themes and Outlines. London: Cox & Wyman Ltd.

Davis, G. (1991). New 'Hut squads' threaten negotiations. Cape Town. 25 July p4:

Department of Land Affairs (1995). Land Policy framework Document, Consultant Document. (May).

Davies, J, Richards, M and Cavendish, W. (1999). Beyond the Limits of PRA: A Comparison of participatory and conventional economic research method in the analysis of ilala palm use in south Eastern Zimbabwe. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Fikir Personal Communications

Forrester, J. (1989). Planning in the Face of Power. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Francis, Elizabeth (1999). Learning from the Local Rural Livelihoods in Ditsobotla, North West Province, South Africa. Journal of Contemporary African Studies. Vol.17. No. 1. pp50-73.

Gauteng Department of Housing and Land Affairs (1996). Informal Settlement Upgrading Programme. July.

Greenberg, S (1999). Building a people driven rural development strategy: lessons from the RDI. Unpublished paper presented to the land and Agrarian Reform Conference Pretoria July

Harley, A. and Fotheringham, R. (1999) AFRA: 20 Years in the Land Rights Struggle 1979-1999. Pietermaritzburg: Association for Rural Advancement.

Harfgreaves, Samantha (1999). Land Reform: Putting Gender in the Centre. Agenda , Vol. 42. 42-48.

Hendler, Paul (1992). Living in Apartheid's Shadow: residential Planning for Africans in the PWV region 1970-1990. Urban Forum. Vol 3 No.2.

Holm in Baker, Jonathan And Poul Ove Pedersen (1992). (eds.), The Rural-Urban Interface in Africa: Expansion and Adaptation. Seminar Proceedings No. 27. The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies. Uppsala

Ibrahim, H el B. (1994). Household causes and Consequences of the de-agrianisation. IDS Bulletin, Vol.27, No. 2.

Independent Teachers' Centre (1981). Bias in History. Johannesburg

Kassier, E. and Groenewald, J. (1992). Agriculture an Overview in R. Shrinieled. Wealth or Poverty: Critical Choices for South Africa. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Kock, E. (1996). Land Reform in South Africa; Buoyed by Restitution and Redistribution a Phoenix Arises. Ford Foundation Report, New York: Winter.

Kock, E. Massyn, P.J. and van Niekerk, A. (2002). The Fate of Land Reform in Southern Africa: The Role for the State, the Market and Civil Society, In Whose Land? Civil Society Perspectives on Land Reform and rural Poverty Reduction: Regional Experiences

from Africa, Asia and Latin America K.B.Ghimire and Moore B.H.. Pp129-163. IFAD. The Popular Coalism UNRISD.

James, Deborah (2001). Land for the Landless: Conflicting Images or rural and Urban South Africa's Land Reform Programme. Journal of Contemporary African Studies. Vol. 19. No.1.

Lahiffa E. and Rugege, S. (2002). A critical assessment of state land redistribution policy in the light of the Grootboom judgment. New Agenda: South African journal of social policy and economic policy. Issue 7. Third Quarter.

Land Agriculture Policy Centre (1997). Review of Land Reform Programme in South Africa, Unpublished.

Land Update no3 August 1990 pg7

Lawson, L (1991). "The Environmental crisis in the urban areas" in J. Cock and E. Kock (eds) Going Green: People Politics and the Environment, Cape Town.

Lipton, Michael., De Klerk, M and Liton M. (eds) (1996). Land , Labour and Livelihoods in Rural South Africa. Volume Two: KwaZulu-Natal and Northern Province. Durban: Indicator Press.

Mabin, A. (1991). The impact of apartheid on rural areas of South Africa. Antipote:33-46

Mabin, Alan and Harrison, P (1997). Ideas, Philosophy and Personality in the history of KwaZulu-Natal's Town and Regional Planning Commission. South African Planning Journal. University of the Witwatersrand

Mabin, A and Smith, D. (1997). "Reconstructing South Africa's cities? The Urban planning 1900-2000". Planning Perspectives, Vol. 12, p193-223.

Mail and Guardian 1994. Vol 10. 18 May, by Andrew Meldrum in Harare

Mail and Guardian 1994 Vol. 10 No. 23 June 10-16,

Marcus, T., Eales,K., and Wildschut, A. (1996). Down to Earth: Land Demand in the New South Africa. Durban : Indicator Press.

Marcus, Tessa., Eales,Kathy and Wildschut, Adele (1996). Land Demand in the New South Africa. Land and Agriculture Policy Centre. Indicator Press, University of Natal.

Martin, A., Cousins, B and S. Manona (2000) Land Tenure and Economic Development in Rural South Africa: Constraints and Opportunities. In B. cousins (ed) At the

Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century.
Braamfontein: PLAAS and NLC.

Mather, Charles (2000). South African Agriculture and Rural Livelihoods in the era of Liberalisation in B. Cousins (ed) At the Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century. Braamfontein: PLAAS and NLC.

May, J. (1996). Assets, income and livelihoods in rural KwaZulu-Natal in M. Lipton, F. Ellis and M. Lipton (eds). Land, Labour and Livelihoods in rural South Africa. Volume two: KwaZulu-Natal and Northern Province.

May, J. Atwood, H. Ewang, P. Lund, F. Norton, A and Wentzel, W. (1997). Experience and Perceptions of Poverty in South Africa: An Entitlement Approach. Unpublished report to the World Bank, Government of Netherlands and ODA, Data Research Africa, Durban.

May, J. Posel D. and Carter, M (1996). The Composition and persistence of poverty in rural South Africa: an entitlements approach to poverty. Research report No. 15, Land and Agriculture Policy Centre, Johannesburg.

May, J. (2000). The Structure and Composition of Rural Poverty and Livelihoods in South Africa in B. Cousins (ed) At the Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century. Braamfontein: PLAAS and NLC.

Meagher, K and Mustapha, A. R. (1994). 'De-agrarianisation in rural Housaland: Flexibility or fragility?' in De-Agrarianisation in Africa, D. Bryceson and C. van der Laan (eds). Working Paper, 20, Africa Studies Centre, Leiden.

Melville, F. (1987). Land and Race: South Africa's Group Area and Land Act. Johannesburg: South Africa Institute of Race Relation.

Moser, C. (1996). Confronting Crisis: A Comparative Study of Household Responses to Poverty and Vulnerability in Four Poor Urban Communities. Washington DC: World Bank.

Moyo, S. (2000) The Political Economy of Land Acquisition and Redistribution in Zimbabwe. Journal of Southern African Studies. Vol 26. No.1 (March): 5-28.

Moyo, S., Rutherford, B., and D. Amor-Wilds (2000) Land Reform and Changing Social Relations for Farm Workers in Zimbabwe. Review of the African Political Economy. No. 84: 181-202.

National Housing Forum (1994) NHF News, 9, August.

National Land Committee (2000/1) Annual Report.

National Land Committee (2001/2) Annual Report.

Natal Witness 17 Aug 2001

Newsweek, 16/july 2001;

Newsweek, 16July 2001

Pearce, B (1997). Overview Paper on Land Reform in South Africa, Unpublished mimeo, December.

Platzky, L and Walker C. (1985). The Surplus People's Project: Forced Removals in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Platzky,L and Walker,C. (1985) The Surplus People: forced Removals in South Africa. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) (1994) African National Congress. Cape Town: Umnyango Publishers.

Republic of South Africa (1994). White Paper: A New Housing Policy and Strategy of the Government of National Unity, Government Gazette.

Royston, L. (1998). Urban Land Issues in Contemporary South Africa: Land Tenure Regulation and Infrastructure and Services Provision. No. 87. The Development Planning Unit. University College London.

SAIRR, South African Survey ((1999/2000)

SAPA July 29 2001

Shackleton, S.E., Stadler, J.J, Jeenes, K.A., Pollard, S.R and Gear, J.S.S. (1995). Adaptive Strategies for the poor in arid and semi-arid lands: in search of sustainable livelihoods: A case study of Bushbuckridge District, Eastern Transvaal, South Africa. Unpublished Report produced for the IIED, and by Wits Rural Facility, Klaserie.

Shackleton, C.M., and Shackleton, S.E. (1997). The Use and Potential for Commercialisation of veld Products in the Bushbuckridge Area. Unpublished Report. DANCED Community Forest Project. Department of Water Affairs and Forestry. Nelspruit.

Shackleton, S.E., Shackleton CC and B. Cousins (2000). The Economic Value of Land and Natural Resources to Rural Livelihoods: Case Studies from South Africa in B. Cousins (ed) At the Crossroads: Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa into the 21st century. Braamfontein: PLAAS and NLC.

Sihlongonyane, M.F. (2001) Rural-Urban Encounters In Swaziland: The Case Of Manzini City. A Paper Presented at a DPU International Conference on Rural-Urban Encounters: managing the Environment of the Peri-Urban Interface. London: 9-10 November.

Surplus People's Project. (1985) Forced Removals in South Africa. Ravan.

Sowetan 16 July 2001

Sangmpam, S.N. (1995). Social Theory and the Challenges of Africa's Future. Africa Today, Vol. 42, No.2.

Shale, P. (1997). Illegal Land Occupation in Maseru, Lesotho Faculty of Architecture

Statistics South Africa: (1999). Government publication.

Vilakazi, Herbert, W (2001). African Intellectuals and the African crisis. Africa Insight. Vol 31, No. 3. September.

Wolff, R. D. (1974). The Economics of Colonialism: Britain and Kenya - 1870-1930. New Haven: Yale University Press.

World Bank (1992). Government and Development. Washington, D.C. A World Bank Publication.

Appendix 1. South African Emerging Social Movements

Name	Date formed	Membership	Objectives	Slogan or statement	Alliances
Treatment Action Campaign (TAC)	December 1998	From diverse political backgrounds	Ensuring proper, affordable treatment for Aids sufferers, preventing and eliminating new HIV infections and fostering HIV/AIDS treatment literacy	-	Links with more than 100 organisations. Inc Frontiers
Anti-Privatisation Forum	2000	Umbrella of 16 small organizations incl. Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee, Katlehong Concerned Resident's Forum & working Class Coordinating Committee	Mobilize against privatisation	"Basic rights can not be commodified"	Cosatu and South Union
National Land Committee	1987	Affiliates work on issues against land forced removals	Network and social mobilisation of all organization working on land issues	"Government land programmes are severely limited and the promises made to the people have not been met" Hlathwayo	MST, regional and i
Education Rights Project	2001	Joint initiative with Centre for Applied Studies and Education Policy Centre at Wits University	Enforces the right to basic education. Opposes privatisation	"The ERP is not a social movement but our work is linked to strengthening the social movements" Salim Vally The State is shirking its responsibility. The cost of education is passed on to parents and education is becoming marketised" Vally	Legal researchers, e representatives Active in Durban 5 and Thembelihle SACCAWU, Cosatu
Soweto Electricity Crisis Committee	2000	Residents concerned	Opposes cuts in water and electricity provision	"Its criminal to rob people of the necessities of life" "Mbeki uses revolutionary sounding phrases and ANC struggle credentials to implement a capitalist agenda" Trevor Ngwane	Anti-eviction cam Forum and Zimbabv
The Landless People's Movement	July 2001	Largest social movement	Opposes land forced removals Year 2003 – year of the Landless	"Landless ness has been pushed under the carpet largely because it is seen as a socialist concern. A people centred rather than a market oriented	Concerned Citizens

				approach is needed.” LPM Activist.	
Jubilee South Africa	November 1998	Advocates for the scrapping of the Third World debt Assists people claim against apartheid crimes	More than 60 civil society organization: incl.: Cosatu, SANGOCO,	“Debt cancellation is not an act of charity, its an act of justice “ Neville Gabriel	Local branch of movement Collaborates with K
Concerned Citizens Forum	1997	Formed by a Prof. Fatima Meer formerly at the University of Durban Westville	Community movements in Greater Durban area Against community electricity cuts, evictions, racism and water cut-offs Against brutal Reaganomics.	“Smash Gear Celebrate Life”	Links with the Lan anti-eviction campai
South Durban Community Environmental Alliance (SDCEA)	1996	Made of five residents and rate payers organisation in the south Durban industrial basin	Opposes effects of market in the Durban council Against pollution	Some people are “living in the wrong place”	Friends of the Earth criminal
Anti-Eviction Campaign	November 2000	Against evictions of low cost housing bond defaulters Organizes protests, sit ins, restore evicted owner to properties	20 residents associations in the Western Cape	The AE has at time responded by making the contested property unlivable..”We bsite	Anti-privitisation fo
National Association of People Living with HIV/AIDS (NAPWA)	1994	200 000 to 300 000 civilians	Protect people living with HIV/AIDS from victimisation, stigmatisation, dehumanisation and discrimination Campaigns and protests and civil disobedience over the price of AIDS drugs To facilitate care, counseling an support for them to lobby for the their rights to foster HIV awareness and gender sensitivity	“The general attitude is that government is responsible but we must help” Thanduxolo Doro	Nehawu, Democra South Africa (tension with TAC s
Palestine Solidarity Committee	1998	Solidarity with Palestine struggle Supports the expulsion of Israel Labour Party from Socialist International	Educate south African about Palestine Promotes the political, diplomatic, trade, academic and cultural isolation of Israel and cultural isolation Campaigns against the torture of political prisoners	“The ANC should be in the forefront in supporting the Palestinian struggle”	
Khulumani Support Group	1995	Apartheid victims Active membership in Western Cape, KwaZulu-natal, Free State, Gauteng and Eastern cape	Supports apartheid victim’s interests in the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Pursue lawsuits for reparations of victims	“There is a deep disillusionment with governments failure to keep its promises, especially over reparations” Marjorie Jobson	Council of South Af