

https://dspace.org/

Land reform and the quest for labour tenants: reassessing tenure, power and agrarian citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa

Moyo, Mbuso; Zantsi, Siphe

2026-04-12
Routledge
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/50126
Moyo & Siphe Zantsi (2026) Land reform and the quest for labour tenants: reassessing tenure, power and agrarian citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa, Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 44:1, 103-126, DOI: 10.1080/02589001.2026.2642824

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/



Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Contemporary African Studies

ISSN: 0258-9001 (Print) 1469-9397 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/cjca20

Land reform and the quest for labour tenants: reassessing tenure, power and agrarian citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa

Mbuso Moyo & Siphe Zantsi

To cite this article: Mbuso Moyo & Siphe Zantsi (2026) Land reform and the quest for labour tenants: reassessing tenure, power and agrarian citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa, Journal of Contemporary African Studies, 44:1, 103-126, DOI: 10.1080/02589001.2026.2642824

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2026.2642824

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 12 Apr 2026.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 425

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjca20

JOURNAL OF CONTEMPORARY AFRICAN STUDIES
2026, VOL. 44, NO. 1, 103–126
https://doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2026.2642824

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

OPEN ACCESS Check for updates

Land reform and the quest for labour tenants: reassessing tenure, power and agrarian citizenship in post-apartheid South Africa

Mbuso Moyo[a] and Siphe Zantsi[b,c,d]

[a]Southern Centre for Inequality Studies, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; [b]Economic Analysis Unit, Agricultural Research Council-Central Office, Pretoria, South Africa; [c]Department of Agriculture and Animal Health, University of South Africa, Roodepoort, South Africa; [d]Department of Agricultural Science and Game Management, Nelson Mandela University, Gqeberha, South Africa

ABSTRACT

This study examines the implementation of South Africa's labour tenant programme to assess whether it has restored land rights and secured the livelihoods of labour tenant households in the post-apartheid period. Drawing on interviews with labour tenants, civil society organisations, and government officials, the study evaluates administrative performance, lived experiences of claimants, and the broader structural context shaping land reform outcomes. The findings show that, despite the programme's transformative intent, progress remains slow and uneven, with thousands of claims still unresolved. Labour tenants continue to face entrenched power imbalances on commercial farms, limited access to post-settlement support, and prolonged administrative delays – conditions that reinforce longstanding critiques of weak state capacity and persistent rural inequality. The research contributes updated empirical evidence on an underexamined component of land reform highlighting the urgent need for institutional strengthening, clearer accountability mechanisms and sustained support for beneficiaries to realise the constitutional promise of land justice.

ARTICLE HISTORY
Received 15 April 2025
Accepted 4 March 2026

KEYWORDS
Land tenure; human rights; land policy; agrarian reform; labour tenants

1. Introduction

The labour tenant question occupies a central yet unresolved place in South Africa's post-apartheid land reform trajectory. Although the Constitution mandates the protection of the rights of labour tenants, implementation has been slow, fragmented, and politically marginal (Greenberg 2021; Hall 2011; RSA 1996). Existing literature emphasises the persistence of agrarian inequality (Bernstein 2010; Cousins 2016), the vulnerability of farmworkers and dwellers (Ntsebeza 2007; Wegerif 2021), and the state's limited capacity to

CONTACT Mbuso Moyo mbusodewa@gmail.com 112 San Francisco, 10 Park Lane, Parktown, 2193, Johannesburg, South Africa

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

transform rural power relations (Hall and Keep 2017; Lahiff 2008; AFRA 2008). Labour tenants occupy a particularly precarious position: both workers and historical land users, yet structurally excluded from secure land rights (Ntsebeza 2005; AFRA 2008).

This article situates new empirical findings within these debates to reassess the state of the labour tenant programme. Through qualitative insights from beneficiaries, state officials and supporting organisations, the analysis demonstrates that labour tenant experiences reveal the deeper dynamics of South Africa's incomplete agrarian transition: entrenched power asymmetries, institutional failures, and the ongoing struggle for agrarian citizenship (Koopman 2020; Rudolph 2019).

The paper contributes theoretically by demonstrating that labour tenant precarity is not incidental but structurally produced by South Africa's agrarian political economy. It argues that restoring labour tenant rights requires reframing land reform as a political project centred on the redistribution of power, rather than as a narrow technical process of land transfer.

2. Literature review: land, agrarian change and labour tenants

2.1. Agrarian political economy and rural inequality

South Africa's agrarian structure is the product of centuries of racialised dispossession, labour coercion, and the consolidation of a capitalist farming economy dependent on cheap African labour (Bernstein 2010; Platzky and Walker 1985). The result is a dualistic agricultural system consisting of a capital-intensive commercial sector and a marginalised smallholder sector with limited resources, weak market integration and minimal state support (Aliber and Cousins 2013; Cousins 2016). This dualism is not merely spatial but embedded in social relations of production – shaping who controls land, how labour is organised, and who benefits from state policy.

Scholars argue that land reform must therefore be understood not as a technical exercise but as a political project aimed at transforming structural inequalities (Cousins and Hall 2020; Hall 2015). Redistribution alone cannot overcome entrenched power dynamics without accompanying shifts in tenure systems, market access, post-settlement support and rural governance (Lahiff, Borras and Kay 2007). As Bernstein (2010) notes, the 'agrarian question of labour' persists in South Africa, where access to land remains central to livelihoods, dignity and political participation for rural households. The agrarian political economy lens thus highlights the need to locate labour tenant struggles within broader processes of accumulation, class formation and state restructuring in the post-apartheid countryside.

2.2. Labour tenants in South African scholarship

Labour tenants have been widely studied as one of the most historically rooted yet politically marginalised rural groups (Ntsebeza 2005; Ntsebeza and Hall 2007). Their hybrid status – simultaneously workers, residents and land-rights holders – complicates their relationship with commercial farmers and the state. Historically, labour tenancy enabled white farmers to secure permanent, low-cost labour while restricting African households to small plots for grazing and subsistence cultivation (Beinart 2001). As

scholars note, this system forged deep intergenerational ties to land, making labour tenants distinct from other categories of farmworkers (Walker 2008).

Contemporary research shows that labour tenants continue to face:

- **Ambiguous or unenforced land rights**, despite legislative protections under the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act 3 of 1996.
- **Entrenched power imbalances** between tenants and landowners, often manifesting as evictions, intimidation, or restricted access to grazing and homestead areas (Wegerif 2021).
- **Weak state enforcement and administrative paralysis**, particularly regarding Section 16 claims, many of which have been stalled for more than two decades (AFRA 2008; Hall 2011).

Scholars have also highlighted how labour tenants' struggles sit at the intersection of land restitution, tenure reform, and labour relations – fields that the state has often addressed in fragmented and contradictory ways (Claassens 2014). This body of work underscores how labour tenants challenge dominant property regimes by asserting land-use and residence rights that predate colonial borders and private property norms.

2.3. Institutional weaknesses and land reform performance

The broader literature on land reform performance points to systemic institutional weaknesses that have constrained implementation since the 1990s. Key issues include chronic underfunding, high staff turnover, weak intergovernmental coordination, inconsistent policy interpretation, and shifting political priorities (Lahiff 2008). The labour tenant programme is widely recognised as one of the most severely affected components of land reform, with the Special Master of Labour Tenants appointed in 2019 following a Constitutional Court judgement finding the state in breach of its obligations due to administrative collapse.

Scholars emphasise that unresolved claims and bureaucratic delays reflect not only resource constraints but also deeper governance failures, including poor leadership, collapsing record systems, a lack of monitoring frameworks, and an overreliance on discretionary power at local offices (Greenberg 2021; Hall and Keep 2017). The labour tenant programme is thus often cited as evidence of the state's inability to enforce statutory rights and manage complex processes of land acquisition, verification and post-settlement support. This aligns with broader critiques of post-apartheid land reform as largely symbolic, with limited transformative effect on agrarian structure due to institutional fragility and weak state capacity.

2.4. Agrarian citizenship and rural belonging

A growing body of scholarship conceptualises land access as fundamental to *agrarian citizenship* – the ability to participate fully in social, political and economic life in rural South Africa (Koopman 2020; Rudolph 2019). Land is not only a productive resource but also a basis for identity, belonging, intergenerational continuity and rural justice (Walker 2008). Labour tenants' persistent struggles for recognition illuminate the limits of democratic

inclusion in the countryside, where rights exist formally but remain unevenly enforced due to enduring power imbalances between landowners and rural dwellers (Ntsebeza 2007).

Scholars argue that without secure tenure, state enforcement and material support, labour tenants experience what Koopman (2020) terms 'partial citizenship' – a condition in which individuals possess legal rights but lack the institutional and material means to exercise them. This has implications for rural governance, as insecure households remain vulnerable to eviction, restricted mobility and exclusion from agricultural and political decision-making structures. Labour tenant claims thus represent broader contests over rural belonging, historical redress, and the meaning of citizenship in a deeply unequal agrarian society.

3. Methodological approach

This study employed a multi-method qualitative approach that combined archival analysis, oral history interviews, community mapping, and participatory research techniques. The integration of documentary evidence, lived experience, and spatial data enabled a holistic understanding of labour tenants' historical claims, contemporary struggles, and relationships to land. In addition to conventional qualitative methods, the research incorporated an interpretive engagement with what scholars describe as 'the voice of the land' – ancestral grave sites, homestead remnants, cattle tracks, and other material markers made visible through geospatial investigation and systematic field walkthroughs.

Archival materials were sourced primarily from the Office of the Special Master of Labour Tenants (SMLT) and the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD), including historical applications, case files, correspondence, and unresolved Section 16 submissions. These records provided the institutional context within which labour tenant claims had been lodged, processed, or neglected.

3.1. Oral histories and the MACRI process

Oral history interviews constituted the core of the empirical methodology. They formed part of the Multi-site Accelerated Claims Resolution Initiative (MACRI), a purposive strategy developed by the SMLT to accelerate the resolution of labour tenant claims across 26 farms on which an estimated 450 applicants resided. These farms – primarily in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga – were identified jointly by the SMLT and DALRRD based on the density of unresolved claims (Ditlhake 1997).

Oral histories were particularly critical because many applications constituted claims to ancestral land rather than conventional restitution requests. Combined with geospatial mapping, these narratives helped reconstruct historical settlement patterns, grazing areas, and cultivation zones prior to colonial conquest, enabling precise identification of changes in land use, boundaries, and rights over time.

Interviews were conducted with individual claimants or household representatives. This decision reflected the historically individualised and patriarchal nature of labour tenancy contracts, which were typically concluded between male household heads and landowners (Levin 2022a, pers. comm.). Treating each claimant as a household unit, therefore, aligned with the legal and social architecture of labour tenancy.

3.2. Research team, instruments and data collection

Interviews were conducted collaboratively by land activists and post-doctoral researchers associated with the Centre for Social Change Research Project (CSRP), including one of this paper's authors. The CSRP and SMLT jointly designed the interview instruments and provided training to community-based activists, whose longstanding engagement with labour tenants positioned them as trusted interlocutors. Organisations such as Qina Mbokodo, the Landless People's Movement, and the Farm Dwellers Social Movement played a critical role in mobilising participants and facilitating access.

The interviews were conducted during site visits with labour tenants drawn from 26 farms. Field visits enabled detailed observation of living conditions and the physical environments within which labour tenants resided. Photographs and field notes were used to corroborate tenants' accounts and to document material evidence of occupation, dispossession, and ongoing vulnerability. As of 12 August 2022, a total of 561 labour tenants from these farms had been interviewed or engaged through oral history, verification, and geospatial research processes under the MACRI initiative. However, this article is based on forty-six (46) interviews (conducted with individual respondents) completed in July 2022, some of which were conducted by one of the authors of this paper. Some of the interviews were conducted by other post-doctoral researchers and land activists, but whose audio recordings were furnished by the Special Master of Labour Tenants' office. The interviews were conducted on the following farms: Sprinboklaagte, Nooitgedacht, and Ravensworth in the KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga provinces. The data collection tool was a questionnaire which was structured into seven thematic sections, each capturing a distinct dimension of farm dwellers' relationships to land, labour, and local authority, namely: personal and household identification, residential history and patterns of occupation, use of land for grazing and cropping, labour relations and remuneration, land acquisition claims, and eviction processes and legal compliance. Apart from responding to structured guiding questions, the interview process was made flexible to allow the labour tenants to narrate their experiences of abuse. The limitation of this study is that averments by labour tenants could not be authenticated or rebutted by white farmers against whom allegations of abuse were made. Field visits to labour tenants' households provided corroborating evidence for their claims of abuse by white landowners who, as discussed later in this paper, restricted them from constructing habitable dwelling structures.

3.3. Healing of memories workshop

Oral history data were further enriched by insights from a Healing of Memories (HoM) workshop, in which one of the authors participated as both a facilitator and a respondent. This workshop acknowledged the deep psychological trauma experienced by labour tenants and their descendants and sought to create a safe space for narrating experiences of abuse, violence, and dispossession. Participants included labour tenant survivors, HoM counsellors, representatives of the KwaZulu-Natal Council of Churches (KZNCC), post-doctoral researchers, officials from the SMLT, and AFRA staff.

In line with Chatham House rules, disclosures were confidential and anonymised. Discussions took place first in small groups facilitated by KZNCC counsellors, and then in

plenary sessions where themes – not individuals – were reported. These narratives, which included accounts of physical violence and dehumanising treatment, provided insight into the psychosocial dimensions of labour tenancy that are often absent from official records. Only synthesised discussions, rather than specific testimonies, are reported in this paper. Although workshop proceedings were not recorded, detailed notes were taken by one of the authors of this paper on which consolidated discussions are based.

3.4. Labour tenants assembly and participatory methods

Additional insights were gathered from the Labour Tenants Assembly, a forum guided by non-extractivist research principles developed by the CSRP. While the Assembly aimed to review the SMLT's progress and receive updates from DALRRD, it also provided a platform for labour tenants to articulate their material aspirations, critique the land reform process, and exchange knowledge with peers. Although the plenary format risked reproducing power imbalances among officials, academics and tenants, this was mitigated by enabling discussions in vernacular languages and by prioritising labour tenants' voices.

An exhibition of claimant-generated photographs – produced through participatory photography methods – further illustrated tenants' agricultural activities and aspirations for medium- to large-scale farming. This exhibition, curated by Ngubane and Xaba (2022), challenged narratives that black claimants lack farming capacity and visually demonstrated how unresolved claims obstruct livelihoods and agricultural expansion.

4. Findings

4.1. Lived experiences of labour tenants on white commercial owned farmland

The challenges faced by former labour tenants living on commercial land in South Africa revolve around unequal power relations rooted in the legacy of colonial rule. Some of the violations that the former labour tenants continue to endure on the farms include being prohibited from keeping livestock (Yeni 2021). This section critically discusses the experiences of labour tenant applicants on privately-owned land. These experiences show that, while the LTA is important in protecting and promoting the rights of labour tenants in theory, they remain vulnerable to widespread rights violations in practice. These violations take various forms, such as arbitrary evictions, curtailment of land for grazing and cropping, and systematic violations of dignity. We elucidate on these experiences in the ensuing sections.

4.1.1. Arbitrary eviction

A report presented in Parliament in August 2005 on farm evictions (Wegerif, Russell, and Grundling 2005), revealed that over three million black people were forcibly removed from white-owned farms between 1994 and 2005. Despite the LTA generally prohibiting evictions, oral history interviews and workshop engagements with interlocutors reveal a pattern of ongoing evictions and repeated relocations of labour tenants within farm boundaries onto marginal land, accompanied by limitations on herd size and the impoundment of cattle (Levin and Ngubane 2024, 96). These practices persist despite Section 8 of the LTA, which prohibits the relocation of labour tenants without a court

order and the provision of just and equitable compensation. In part, Section 8 of the LTA reads as follows:

(1) An owner who requires the land used or occupied by a labour tenant or his or her associate, for his or her own agricultural activities or for the purposes of any development which, in the opinion of the Court, is of public benefit, may institute proceedings in the Court for an order for the relocation of the labour tenant, or associate:
(2) The Court shall not grant an order for relocation unless it if is satisfied that greater hardship will be done to the owner or lessee if a labour tenant and his or her associates are not relocated;' than will be done to the labour tenant and associates if they are relocated.

Despite the provisions outlined above, the everyday praxis of supremacist white landlords and their families continue to legitimise 'everyday forms of racism perpetrated against labour tenants' (Levin and Ngubane 2024, 87). The story of Zandile Ngubo (alias) illustrates that '[be]yond meagre and erratic payments, labour tenants [are] an oppressed lot, [and are] forced to offer free labour most of the time for access to land for residence and farm production' (ibid.).

Vignette 1: Zandile's story, an illustrative example of constructive eviction.. Zandile's family had been living on this farm [name of farm withheld] for approximately 80 years – three to four generations – since the 1930s. She had been born on this farm 68 years ago. Her parents and grandparents had worked for the farm owner as labour tenants, providing unpaid labour for six months each year. They had worked in exchange for the right to reside, and to crop and graze livestock on the parcel of land that had been allotted to them. Zandile's father had been forced to start working on the farm at a very young age to protect his family's right to remain on the land. Her mother worked on the farm as a domestic worker for the same reason, too. Her father worked until old age and died. On this occasion, Zandile was forced to start working for the farm owners at the age of 13 to protect their right of access to the land. She married a Mr Gumede, who was also a farm worker, and together they had children. Zandile, who had initially worked at the forest plantation on the farm, was transferred to a sugar cane plantation where she was promoted to a farm 'induna' (forewoman) on account of her 'good' relationship with the farm owner, a Mr X [name of farmer withheld]. Zandile narrates her family's ordeal from this point onwards:

> The farm owner stopped me from working because he said I was now qualified for old age pension since I was above 60 years. I continued staying on the farm but I was denied some of the rights I had enjoyed while I was working such as having electricity in my house. One day I woke up to farm workers surrounding my home. When I asked about what they were doing, they said they had been instructed by the farm owner to open a fire brake very closer to my house. This means that the bigger part of my yard was taken and I could no longer have access to, and/or use, it. They then removed the fencing around my house saying that the farm owner instructed that it be removed. This is when my troubles and sorrows begun because it was now clear that the farm owner was starting my constructive eviction. When I and my children tried to defend the rights, we had enjoyed for years, the farm owner approached the court seeking to apply for our eviction of which he succeeded. I was represented by a lawyer provided by the Department, but I lost and ended

> up living at my relative's RDP house in New Hanover. It was about 2018/2019 when my family was thrown out of the farmhouse into the street with nothing. We left our dogs, our chicken, our groceries, and our clothes. Children who were going to school at the time left their uniforms and could not attend classes. Our chicken and dogs died because we left them unattended. After throwing us into the street, the farm owner placed burglar bars on our house to ensure that we could not enter the house again. On the day of our eviction, we slept at the reception of the uMshwati Municipal offices. The following day we went to live at the RDP house. I lodged the application for land more than 20 years ago, but the claim remained unprocessed until the court decided to evict me. I left the farm because the farm owner was powerful. He had access to the courts and security guards … (Labour tenant, interview, 20 September 2022)

Zandile's story epitomises a longstanding pattern of removals that has shaped the lives of labour tenants since the colonial period. This pattern of removals has historical antecedents, and needs to be analysed in terms of relations of production which characterised the genesis of capitalist agriculture. Examining the socio-spatial relations between the labour tenants and white farm owners reifies Tyner (2016) and Nixon's (2011) ideation on violence under capitalist relations, where people's lives are valued based on their contribution or lack thereof to the reproduction of the capitalist system. In examining these relations alluded to above, it is imperative to hark back to the 1960s. Mechanisation in South African agriculture, which accelerated in the 1960s, resulted in a decreased demand for labour supplied by labour tenants (Williams 1996). Consequently, as a general pattern, the parcels of land which had been allotted to them were increasingly and progressively minimised.

Listening to the life histories of labour tenants, we identified a pattern in which, after mechanisation set in, labour tenants were forced to shift from their own livelihoods – cultivation of crops and rearing of livestock – to receiving rations from white landowners. However, the mechanisation thesis as a causal dynamic to land dispossession should not be overemphasised because it conceals the racial dynamic attached to cultural racism and white supremacy at the locus of the colonial project, and the land dispossession of the indigenous polities (see Mayende 2022). This argument holds water when racist statements such as the 'beswarting van die platteland' (blackening of the countryside), which warranted widespread evictions of black people from white-owned land, are considered (Williams 1996). These statements illustrate that land dispossession was not an immanent capitalist process but a cultural and racist one which ultimately deliberately blocked the emergence of a black landed class that could have become powerful in politics (see Mayende 2022). The mechanisation thesis risks sanitising the central role of racism in processes of land dispossession. Cultural racism, which underpinned the colonial project, ignored the land-based modes of livelihood of Africans. Currently, the unresolved land claims mean that land-hungry South Africans remain subject to colonially constructed practices of arbitrary eviction and forced relocation, which immiserate them, as the following vignette shows.

> I saw my father lose everything. We were from section of the farm to another where the land that we had was reduced. Immediately when we arrived at the new place, we lost everything, all cattle died, and I saw my father change from being a jovial man to being sombre and sad all the time. (Lungi [alias], participant at Labour Tenant Assembly, 10–11 November 2022)

Just like Zandile Ngubo's case, Jacob Mabuza's predicament corroborates the foregoing. Like most of the 43 labour tenant applicants who had lodged claims against Portions 0,2,16 and 21 of the farm Vumba Farm (pesudonym) and Sechaba Farm (pseudonym), owned by Viable Mining Enterprises (pseudonym), Jacob Mabuza's plight remains deplorable.

Mr Mabuza was interviewed on 16 June 2022 by a team from the Office of the Special Master (OSM) of which one of the authors of this paper was part. With this interview, the OSM, *inter alia*, sought to understand the historicity to Jacob's land claim and his material aspirations. At this interview, he exhibited reticence to complete the interview questionnaire reporting that he did not 'trust anybody' anymore (Jacob Mabuza, Interview, June 16, 2022). He testified that he was forcibly removed from his ancestral home on Vumba Farm to Dube Village (pseudonym) with his family in 2009. His daughter recounted how the removal took place at night. She contracted tuberculosis (silicosis) due to the coal dust that was thrown up during the forced removal.

He narrated that he and other labour tenants were coerced into signing letters at night with cell phones used as torches to point out where to sign the settlement agreement letters agreeing to the removal. They were dumped into unfinished houses. Jacob Mabuza had a large herd of cattle, including Simmental and Brahman cows. He drove a Nissan Skyline and a bakkie, which was still parked in his garage. His wealth and livelihood were destroyed by the forced removal. Many of his cattle and goats died after they were moved to Dube Village. During our interviews, we came across unbelievable scenes of cattle roaming around a township-like area with inadequate pasture or water sources. Even though living in houses with electricity, decorated with Ndebele artwork, could have been described by some as cathartic, to some it represented a land dispossession experience where former pastoralists were transmogrified into urbanites with little access to land to build meaningful modes of land-based livelihoods, such as small-scale subsistence and commercial crop production and cattle rearing.

At Dube Village, the labour tenant applicants experienced unimaginable forms of oppression, which included leaving under angst due to the possibility of imminent relocation and disempowerment through having no access to legal representation. The possibility of relocation was occasioned by the mining operations, which were fast expanding towards labour tenant applicants' homes. Constant blasting, which is an inherent feature of open-cast mining operations, added to the daily misery of our interlocutors.

This experience compounds the misery of social dislocation, which severed their social and emotional ties with their areas of birth (Vumba and Sechaba farms) – the only places they could call their home. The foregoing exemplifies the ramifications of the Department abandoning its obligations under the law, particularly its failure to provide necessary support to those affected by forced relocations, including legal assistance during negotiations with landowners. In the present case, it led to some labour tenants waiving their rights and claims lodged in terms of the Act without understanding the implications thereof.

Background on Jacob and the other labour tenants' claims is imperative. To settle the labour tenant claims, the Nkangala District Office served section 17 notices in terms of the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act 3 of 1996 on the landowners (Viable Mining Enterprises, hereafter VME) of the above-mentioned farms. The VME accepted some applicants as labour tenants and denied others pending confirmation of their genealogies and the

tracing of their land claim applications. By contesting the locus standi of some claimants as labour tenants, the VME declared a dispute.

The OSM met with the Chief Director of the Mpumalanga Province, Ms Sivuyile (pseudonym) and the Director of Tenure, Ms Ngcobo (pseudonym), on 27 May 2022. Ms Sihlangu underscored the need to secure legal representation for the applicants and insisted that a lawyer should be appointed and managed by the Special Master because the applicants did not trust the Department. The OSM spent several days in the field trying to track down the all-labour tenant applicants who were spread out on the farms and invariably preferred to be interviewed on weekends, as many of them were wage labourers. This, coupled with a lack of trust, meant that it was not possible to complete forms for all the applicants.

The OSM then decided to apply for a Mediator (Mr Vincent Anderson, pseudonym) through the Land Reform Management Facility (LRMF), because the situation on the ground was volatile. Mr Anderson was then identified as a suitable Mediator by the LRMF after several bureaucratic delays. He began his work during the OSM's visit to Vumba and Sechaba farms on June 18. As of the writing of this paper, the Special Master reported that George's mandate had been terminated before land claims of the people in Dube Village were resolved (Richard Levin, interview, November 20, 2023).

Zandile's and Jacob's cases signify counter-agrarian forces represented by landowners, where they are party to the impoverishment of labour tenants by uprooting them from land to live in poor townships, which do not support their historical modes of livelihood – crop cultivation and livestock rearing. This is a double-edged jeopardy in the sense that people who had never acquired any other skills than those in farming, cultivation and cattle keeping, and have spent a huge art of their lives tending to plants and livestock on white farmers, are suddenly dumped in urban locations where there are no provisions for pastures and cultivation of crops.

Other forces relate to the state's application of quantitative measures of land reform programme achievements, i.e., the number of resolved claims, the number of people resettled, and the geographic extent of the land acquired by labour tenants. A few cases being processed by the Office of the Special Master indicate that issues of quality have evidently been peripheralised. The Special Master draws attention to a very important aspect of claims resolution, i.e. the quality of the resolved claimed land and post-settlement support.

There is a need to consider the fact that while numbers are important, resolved claims must be attached to the reality of the centrality of land for agrarian-based livelihoods (large scale mixed farming with livestock and crop production) which remains critically important for labour tenants and the country. The failure to identify and address the aforementioned gaps continues to impede the progress of land rights claims and to limit access to justice for labour tenants. This is a classic exemplar of Ngubane's (2020) 'impoverished landed property'. Ngubane uses this concept to illuminate a situation in which land beneficiaries are forced to rent out their land to fragments of agrarian capital due to indebtedness or poor economic conditions. This concept can be extended to capture an emerging dynamic where labour tenants are being allocated to marginal land, condemning them to non-salvageable skeletal farms. The allocation of marginal land to the labour tenants means that they can neither rent it out nor use it for any productive purposes. For this reason, they become an impoverished landed class. The

impoverished landed property described by Ngubane would be better off than those articulated in the foregoing, in which the marginality of the land neither supports any form of production nor exchange based on the acquired land. The centrality of land becomes poignant in the work of Ngubane (2020) (cited by Levin and Ngubane 2024, 97) which shows that land beneficiaries are resuscitating new forms of petty commodity production as evidenced by improved livestock herds and real livestock expansion both of which underpin the emergence of new forms of post-land-reform tenure regimes.

The evidence of improved petty commodity production following access to the land jettisons the colonially constructed 'paternalistic feudal-type relationships' which incubated the 'mythologies of black farmers' incapable and unable to farm, and 'which were created as central pillars of racist ruling class ideology' (Levin and Ngubane 2024, 95). The myth was that, Levin and Ngubane (2024) reveal, black people kept cattle for bride price and wealth because they had no knowledge of livestock production, a preserve of white farmers. 'This ideology', Levin and Ngubane contend, 'provided part of the rationale for the gross theft and dispossession of cattle by white settlers from black livestock producers and continues to the present day' (ibid.).

To conclude this section, we emphasise the point that land dispossessions have correlated with labour tenant land claims lodgements (Wegerif, Russell, and Grundling 2005). While Cousins (1997) was correct in observing that shortly after the enactment of the LTA, the landowners ceased some evictions, it is important to note that evictions thereafter intensified. The landowners proceeded with evictions when the time was ripe, after they had assessed the political situation which worked in their favour. They continue to do so henceforth. These evictions have heightened tensions on farms and have led to a paralysis of rural social relations. The thesis which posits that the Labour Tenants Act has increased social tensions is substantiated by the various National Land Committee (NLC) reports which have revealed increased levels of evictions and pre-emptive measures taken by farmers prior to and shortly after the enactment of the Act (Hall 2004). The NLC reports indicate that the Labour Tenants Act has spurred landowners to, as a pre-emptive measure, disengage from arrangements involving people living on or using their land out of fear that the latter could use these arrangements to lodge claims. The stance by landowners has essentially resulted in the 'freezing' of transactions on land, thereby reducing the flexibility of the informal land market in opening access to land (PLAAS 2016).

4.1.2. Arbitrary curtailment of land for grazing and cropping

Our discussion in the preceding section, demonstrates labour tenants' impermanence and insecurity of land tenure on privately owned land. Our interlocutors attribute this insecurity to the discourse of land ownership which they say is misplaced. While the term 'labour tenant' is legally ascribed to them, many argue that this nomenclatural classification is misleading in the sense that it suggests that they are 'lodgers' in their own land when they are its rightful owners who lost it by virtue of colonial conquest. To counter such claims, the delegates and participants in the Labour Tenants Assembly (LTA), of which 150 were labour tenants from across South Africa declared, among others, that:

> The Labour Tenants are the original owners of the land, and they are the owners of their land. By processing their land claims, they are not being done a favour, nor are they customers or

> clients, they are citizens with inalienable rights. Labour Tenants should not be beholden to or seek permission from anyone when they develop their lives and their dwellings, as well as their crops or livestock. (Labour Tenants Assembly Declaration, 10–11 November 2022)[1]

To strengthen their voice on claims to the land, the labour tenants deployed the discursive resources which have been formulated by AFRA which has accused the state of presiding over a legal system that is indifferent to the plight of labour tenants. The discursive resources involve the use of terms such as 'we were born and raised here', 'our forefathers 'graves are here', 'our ancestors were forced off this land' (Mutale 2011, 70); and 'this land is the land of our ancestors' (Tricontinental: Institute for Social Research 2022[2]) to stress their rightful residence on the land under contention. Other markers of identity include reference to graves which symbolise cultural attachment to the land. The continued reference to their being labour tenants, they said, implicates the Labour Tenant Act and its definitions of this category of people as that which defines their residence by providing labour to the owner of the land, *inter alia*. The labour tenants say that they do not need the Act to assert their right to the land. Their complaints about the challenges of the Acts in place suggest that a move must be made from this solution to other alternatives. As Fischer (2003, 167) believes that stories give meaning to life and the labour tenant's story tells of the past, the present and the future. Yet, despite these material aspirations, the common experience of being disallowed from engaging in farming activities persists, as reflected in the following vignette.

> We are suffering. Our cattle are only allowed to graze on limited pastures. Unlike in the past, we are not allowed to grow crops and we are only allocated small gardens to do so. We have since abandoned the hope of engaging in meaningful cropping. We live in overcrowded homesteads because our children do not have land on which they can build their own households when they grow up. (Mandla [alias], participant at Labour Tenant Assembly, 10–11 November 2022)

The LTA provides that labour tenants can conduct burials and farming on commercial farms, to create social and economic stability among this community of beneficiaries. Section 3. (1) of the LTA provides that a person who was a labour tenant on 2 June I995 'shall have the right with his or her family members to occupy and use that part of the farm in question'. Section 3. (2), provides that 'The right of a labour tenant to occupy and to use a part of a farm as contemplated in subsection (I) together with his or her family 'members· may only be terminated in accordance with the provisions of this Act'. The LTA states the conditions under which the rights of labour tenants can be terminated which include when the labour tenant leaves the farm voluntarily, and/or when they appoint a person on their behalf. The rights contemplated in the foregoing sections can be interpreted to encapsulate wide ranging activities that come with land occupation such as farming and burial, and 'right of access to water, rights of way or other servitudes as are reasonably necessary or are reasonably consistent with the rights which she enjoys or has previously enjoyed as a labour tenant' (LTA, Section 16.(1)(d), 50). Yet the conduct of white landowners has been to sharply curtail such activities as the following vignette depicts.

Vignette 2: Crisis-induced 'depeasantisation' of the labour tenants?.

> I would like to tell you the experience of the Ngubane family in Riverland Municipality (pseudonym). The Ngubanes had been living on the farm [name of the farm withheld] for years. In fact, they qualified to be called labour tenants, but they have got no rights on the farm. They had a cattle herd of 14 head. One day they received an order from the sheriff of the court notifying them that their livestock is no longer needed on the farm. They ignored that order until the sheriff brought them the second one notifying them that the farmer had applied for the impoundment of their cattle. So, a certain date was provided, and I helped them by waking up at 4h00 am and rushing to their homestead (Ngubanes) and telling them to wake and take the cattle off the farm before the sheriff, had arrived. We had been leaked information that some security company, and the South African police men came would come at 6h00 am. I woke the Ngubane boys up and asked them to drive the off the farm. I went out of the farm and parked my car across the main road so that I could see them when they are coming. They came just exactly at 6h00 am and they parked their cars before they got into the farm and held a short meeting. I was monitoring them and they did not know my vehicle which was parked across. After finishing their meeting, they proceeded inside the farm and I notified the boys to move the cattle quicker because they ('thieves') were almost there. They went straight to Ngubanes' home but only found an empty kraal. On this discovery, they started following the cattle prints. Fortunately, when they got hold of the cattle, they were already out of the farm's borders. So, they had no rights to impound them outside their farm. I helped them (Ngubanes) drive the cattle to the nearest farm and pleaded with the farm owner to keep the cattle while the Ngubanes looked for an alternative place to keep their livestock. This farmer agreed but unfortunately, he changed his mind after a period of one week when he telephoned me to come and remove the cattle. It was clear that he had been influenced by other neighbouring white farmers who had gotten wind that he had assisted the Ngubanes and pressurised to remove the cattle. The Ngubanes took their cattle from this farm and asked the other person (white man) who was selling cows to help them keep their livestock in his place. He agreed and gave them the conditions to keep the cattle for a certain time and demanded that he be paid a cow for helping them. Thereafter, the Ngubanes moved the cattle to their relative was living in a township in Greytown, a place which was not safe and ideal for keeping livestock. To date, I have no idea of what became of the Ngubane cattle. I wonder if those cattle are still alive. (Labour Tenant Activist [Landless People's Movement], Interview, November 23, 2023)

Forcing their livestock off the farms constitutes a process in which the labour tenants are being 'involuntarily manoeuvred towards shifting away from farming' (Singh and Bhogal 2014, 1364). This, coupled with livestock impoundments, constitutes the totality of wealth and land dispossessions that ultimately cause poverty, and leads to 'depeasantisation'. 'Depeasantisation' entails a shift of the workforce from farming to the non-farming sector. It can either be spurred by developmental processes (and thus be called growth-led depeasantisation) such as mechanisation of agriculture, increasing employment and income, high education level, urbanisation, development of secondary and tertiary sectors, and state intervention for generating employment opportunities or be a crisis-induced transformation resulting from such factors as falling productivity (ibid., 1365) or deliberate curtailment of access to productive land as is currently experienced where labour tenants are forced to migrate to urban townships with their livestock in the manner described in the vignette. Such experiences encode counter-agrarian measures which continue to undermine South Africa's fledgling land reform programme.

4.1.3. Abjection as a lived experience

Ferguson (1999, 236) uses the notion of 'abjection' to describe 'a process of being thrown aside, expelled, or discarded'. The lived experiences of labour tenants reflect conditions of abjection characterised by humiliation, dispossession, and social marginalisation, to use Ferguson's (1999) phraseology (Ibid.). Beyond the productivist argument of disposal, our research found a general pattern of debasement of labour tenants' lives. However, former labour tenant households are not mere victims of white landowners, for their very existence on the land reveals their rootedness to the land and their resistance to complete land dispossession.

Despite that White Paper on land reform provides that '[l]egally secure tenure is a human right and farm dweller's poor access to services needed redress' (RSA 2017, 28), the lives of labour tenants continued to be underpinned by social upheaval and instability resulting from forced relocations; being disallowed to conduct farming activities on white owned land except to keep limited number of livestock; to build a limited number of huts, and keep a limited number of livestock; and the lack of land to allocate to engage in productive farming activities.

A recurrent concern raised by labour tenants related to the absence of adequate basic services on farms. Many of them lodged complaints about absent social services on farms a challenge which has been captured by AFRA which, during a Workshop in 2005 on land rights for farm dwellers, asked farm dwellers what the different government departments should be doing in terms of delivery to improve the quality of their lives (AFRA 2005, 25). Such experiences run contra to the government's acknowledgement in The White Paper on the land reform programme (RSA 1999, 19). Recently, AFRA registered a victory in getting a court judgment regarding state services on privately owned farms. In this case,[3] the labour tenants and farm dwellers had brought an application against various local and district municipalities in and around Pietermaritzburg to provide them with sufficient water, basic sanitation and collection of refuse on farms. In adjudicating this case, the Pietermaritzburg High Court found that municipalities were in breach of the Constitution for failing to provide labour tenants and farm occupiers with essential and basic services. It is important to note that for local municipalities to provide basic services such as electricity, they need landowners' consent, which is often withheld. The above-cited court judgement is a victory for labour tenants in that it declared that 'a landowner cannot unreasonably deny the municipality access to his farm in order to install necessary infrastructure to ensure the provision of the services' (AFRA 2005, 25). The co-operation of landowners is imperative if South Africa's land reform programme is to succeed.

The rallying cry by the labour tenants was that whilst they wait for the claims to be resolved, they needed to live in dignity. This demand was captured in a ten-point declaration which was made by the delegates and participants in the Labour Tenants Assembly (LTA) (Labour Tenant Declaration adopted at the Labour Tenants Assembly, 10–11 November 2022). One of the demands in this declaration was that while 'claims are being resolved there must be services, including electricity, water and sanitation provided for all labour tenant homesteads' (ibid., slide 9). The absence of these services meant that most labour tenants led lives of indignity. To address this, the government in the White Paper (RSA 2017, 19) argues that land and agricultural services must be integrated to address the entire spectrum of social and physical needs of farm dwellers. The White

Paper advocates for the 'convergence of health; education and social services [which] are important contributors to productivity in farming and rural sustainability' (RSA 2017, 19). The pictures below tell a different story though.



Picture courtesy of the OSM



Picture courtesy of the OSM

The pictures shown above reflect the oppressive social relations on white-owned farms where the last remaining former labour tenants live, where they are barred from constructing or expanding their homesteads by landowners, in addition to other restrictions, such as on animal herd sizes. Former labour tenant families grow. Sons and daughters are born, and these come of age on farms. As families grow, the requirement for more land for

the sons and daughters to establish their independent lives, which include using the land for growing crops, and rearing of livestock, also increases. The families living under the conditions depicted in the pictures above do so because they are prohibited from building proper structures. These families illustrate that the struggle for more land to expand small-scale, mainly commercial, petty commodity-producing enterprises, and to construct decent dwelling places continues (Levin and Ngubane 2024, 97, our own emphasis added).

The situation of these labour tenant families can be improved by democratically removing the oppressive hand of the landowners who deliberately bar them from building new homesteads, whether they can afford do so or not. Furthermore, we argue that it is crucial for the SMLT to find new ways of engaging the officials at the DALRRD in order to ameliorate the conditions of not only these families, but all former labour tenants and their descendants in South Africa. Currently, DALRRD has received a total of 20,325 applications across seven provinces, with the majority in KwaZulu-Natal and Mpumalanga. A total of 10,992 claims have been finalised, with 9,333 claims still outstanding. Most of these land claims are for agricultural purposes.

The pictures above depict structures in which three families of labour tenant applicants currently lived at Imbokodo Farm (pseudonym), in the relevant District Authority in KwaZulu-Natal. These families, the Shabangu, Mkhize, and Khumalo (all pseudonyms), had been visited by a team from the OSM on 26 May 2022 as part of the office's ongoing research. The team saw and was informed by the applicants of the dilapidated state of their dwellings, which were deteriorating before the heavy rains and devastating floods that demolished and severely compromised the quality of life of citizens in the province of KwaZulu-Natal for approximately four months in 2022. This situation prompted the OSM to write a letter to the relevant District Authority or Office of DALRRD, requesting that the latter urgently assist the five families on 27 May 2022. This letter partly reads as follows:

> The applicants are requesting that they erect new dwellings to enable them to live dignified lives under proper and safe shelter as the heavy rains and floods have further damaged their homes and left them in an extremely precarious and compromising situation, where they are now languishing and fearful of being homeless should the situation continue if they are not allowed to act immediately and rebuild their homes. The oral history research on the farm is being concluded this weekend and we will have to request that the NGI expedites the geospatial research so that the claims' resolution process can be finalised. Whilst we are waiting for that process to be realised we request the District Office assist the applicants with their request. It is also imperative to express that Section 26 of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, mandates the state to take reasonable legislative and other measures within its available resources to achieve the progressive realisation of the right to adequate housing. To give effect to this obligation the state has enacted various pieces of legislation. Below are a few of the photos taken by the applicants to provide the extent of the conditions of their dwellings; the other pictures will be attached to this letter. (Levin 2022b)

The relevant District Authority or the DALRRD office responded that the landowner was overseas and could not do anything. Nothing had been heard from it since that time (Richard Levin, Interview, November 20, 2023). The DLRRD's position with regards to the deplorable plight of the five families reifies the Foucauldian term 'letting die'. Letting die, as Marcatelli and Büscher (2019, 761) denotes the biopic concept of liquid violence which captures material conditions in which people are not literally 'killed' but

'disinvesting or non-intervening in particular groups of people (or "forms of life") so that these have structurally less chance of making a living or more chance of seeing their livelihood wither'.

The labour tenants are vulnerable. Their vulnerability arises in part because they are invisible to the law and policymakers. Spotlighting the vulnerable situation of the remaining labour tenants and their descendants is imperative as it provides the basis for the DALRRD's intervention. The focus should be on dealing with the everyday trauma, violence, and psychological torture to which they are exposed. Doing so constitutes part of deepening democracy in South Africa (Levin and Ngubane 2024). The everyday praxis of white landlords and their families, which subjects the labour tenants to indignity, should be criminally prosecuted, and a new regime of harmonious race and class relations should be spearheaded. This work cannot be shouldered by the DALRRD alone, however. The labour tenant activist organisations, the non-governmental organisations such as AFRA, the OSM, the South African Human Rights Commission, and academics such as the post-doctoral researchers from the CSRP, should work synergistically to assist the DALRRD in implementing the Labour Tenant Act.

4.2. Key issues emerging from the lived experiences that are consistent with literature

4.2.1. Administrative delays and unresolved rights

Consistent with national analyses (Greenberg 2021; Hall 2011), labour tenants face delays stretching up to two decades. These delays produce a condition of 'permanent limbo', where tenants cannot exercise full rights nor secure alternative livelihoods. The failure to acquire farms remains a primary bottleneck, mirroring Lahiff's (2008) observation that bureaucratic inaction perpetuates historical inequality.

4.2.2. Power asymmetries and ongoing dispossession

The findings confirm that landowners continue to hold disproportionate power, often limiting grazing or attempting to restrict tenants' presence – dynamics that are extensively emphasised in Ntsebeza (2005) and Wegerif (2021). Labour tenants remain subject to eviction threats, social exclusion and control over land access, reproducing what Ntsebeza (2007) terms 'democratic exclusion'.

4.2.3. Land access without adequate support

Even where land has been transferred, tenants receive limited or no post-settlement support, echoing Hall and Keep's (2017) and Cousins (2016) arguments that insufficient support undermines land reform outcomes. Beneficiaries lack fencing, water infrastructure, livestock support, implements and mentorship.

4.2.4. Emotional, intergenerational and identity dimensions

Consistent with Walker (2008), the findings reveal that land reform is not only material but deeply symbolic. Many tenants associate land with dignity, ancestral memory and identity, making delays and displacement emotionally devastating.

5. Discussion: situating the findings in national agrarian debates

5.1. The labour tenant programme as a reflection of state fragility

Our findings strongly reinforce Hall's (2011) claim of a persistent 'governance crisis' at the heart of South Africa's land reform. The labour tenant programme – mandated under the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act of 1996 – reveals multiple layers of institutional fragility. Our findings shows that claimants have waited *up to two decades* for the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD) to process applications, verify claims, or acquire land from owners. This prolonged inaction illustrates what Greenberg (2021) and Williams (1996) describe as systemic administrative paralysis, where decentralised bureaucratic structures, understaffing, and poor intergovernmental coordination undermine policy implementation.

Moreover, the state's reliance on court interventions – such as the Special Master for Labour Tenants appointed in the *Mwelase v Director-General* case – highlights its inability to fulfil statutory obligations without judicial oversight (Constitutional Court of South Africa 2019). This judicialisation of land reform (Hall and Keep 2017) indicates a state that is not only administratively incapacitated but also unable to act as guarantor of rights, thereby deepening rural marginality. Our interviews and presentation from the Labour Tenant Assembly show labour tenants repeatedly reporting unreturned calls, lost documentation, and inconsistent communication. Thes are symptoms of what O'Laughlin (1996) termed bureaucratic dispossession, where exclusion occurs through administrative neglect rather than overt coercion.

5.2. Reproducing agrarian dualism

Consistent with Cousins (2016) and Bernstein (2010), our study shows that labour tenants who eventually obtain land often receive parcels too small, fragmented, or poorly serviced to support viable livelihoods. The attached report documents cases where tenants received land without fencing, water infrastructure, machinery, or production inputs – effectively transferring land without the means to use it productively. This reproduces what Lahiff (2008) identifies as the 'land-only' approach, where redistribution occurs without the institutional and financial support needed to disrupt agrarian power structures.

In several sites studied, labour tenants who were relocated onto state-acquired farms found themselves competing for scarce grazing, lacking secure access to water points, or relying on informal arrangements with neighbouring commercial farmers. This mirrors the findings of Wegerif (2021) on the persistence of semi-proletarianisation, where rural households remain structurally tied to commercial farms through wage labour or dependency relationships despite nominal access to land.

Thus, instead of transforming the agrarian structure, the labour tenant programme often reinforces the bifurcated countryside, with a small number of large commercial farms dominating production and labour tenants occupying peripheral spaces marked by insecurity and limited economic opportunity.

5.3. Agrarian citizenship and the limits of democratic inclusion

The study's findings strongly echo Ntsebeza's (2007), Kepe and Ntsebeza (2011) argument that post-apartheid democratic reforms have not translated into substantive rural

citizenship for farm dwellers and labour tenants. Despite legal protections under the Constitution and the Labour Tenants Act, the findings show that labour tenants continue to experience restricted mobility, limited grazing and cultivation rights, and intimidation from landowners reluctant to relinquish control. This confirms the persistence of what Borras (2009) calls 'elite capture of rural authority', wherein landowners continue to wield quasi-sovereign power over those residing on their land.

The attached document provides numerous examples of labour tenants reporting fear of eviction, reductions in livestock numbers imposed by landowners, and denial of access to family graves – violations that undermine dignity and belonging. These experiences align with Walker's (2008) observation that land is deeply bound to identity and emotional belonging, and that rights violations reverberate across generations.

The state's inability to enforce statutory protections also reflects the limits of formal democratic inclusion in rural South Africa. As Koopman (2020) argues, agrarian citizenship requires more than legal rights; it requires enforceable claims, state accountability, and recognition of rural people as full political subjects. The findings clearly demonstrate that labour tenants remain citizens on paper but subjects in practice.

5.4. Contribution to theory

This study advances the land and agrarian studies literature in four key ways.

5.4.1. Labour tenant precarity is structural, not incidental

The study shows that ongoing vulnerability is rooted in institutional design flaws, historical agrarian relations, and unequal power dynamics – not simply bureaucratic inefficiency. This extends Bernstein's (2010) idea of 'classes of labour' by showing how state fragility reproduces labour tenancy as a condition rather than resolving it.

5.4.2. State incapacity is a key driver of agrarian inequality

The findings reveal that institutional failure is not merely an operational issue but a deeper feature of the political economy of rural governance. This supports Hall and Scoones's (2016) argument that land reform outcomes cannot be understood without analysing state capability and political will.

5.4.3. Labour tenant struggles illuminate agrarian citizenship and rural justice

By showing how labour tenants remain trapped between legal recognition and practical dispossession, the study contributes to debates on citizenship (Ntsebeza 2007; Rudolph 2019) and demonstrates that land rights are central to rural democratic inclusion.

5.4.4. Land reform must be understood as a political project, not a technical process

The findings show that redistributive justice requires confronting entrenched agrarian power, reconfiguring state-landowner relations and enabling meaningful participation of rural dwellers. This aligns with Borras and Franco's (2010) notion of land reform as a site of political struggle, not policy administration.

6. Conclusion

Labour tenants remain among the most marginalised actors in South Africa's rural landscape. This study shows that systemic institutional failures, power inequalities and inadequate support undermine their constitutional rights. By linking these findings to agrarian political economy and citizenship debates, the paper contributes to a more nuanced understanding of labour tenants' ongoing struggles. Achieving meaningful transformation requires not only redistributing land but rebuilding state capability, enforcing rights, and addressing the structural foundations of rural inequality.

The emotional and psychological scars described in the study highlight the need for trauma-informed approaches to land reform. Healing of Memories workshops, psychosocial support, and restorative dialogue processes should be institutionalised as part of land restoration rather than treated as peripheral activities. From the findings of this study, several recommendations are summarised below

6.1. Create a national labour tenant database and public transparency portal

Long delays and lost applications reflect a breakdown in information management. A publicly accessible database documenting all claims, their status, responsible officials and timelines would improve transparency, reduce corruption risks, and strengthen democratic accountability.

6.2. Recognise labour tenants as medium-scale farmers with production potential

Participatory photography and field evidence show that labour tenants are already engaged in meaningful agricultural production. Land reform should therefore move beyond subsistence-oriented support and create pathways for medium-scale commercialisation through credit schemes, co-operative development, and integrated value-chain support.

6.3. Develop a coherent national strategy for labour tenant redress

The labour tenant issue cannot be resolved through isolated interventions. A comprehensive national strategy – combining land acquisition targets, settlement standards, support packages, monitoring frameworks, and interdepartmental alignment – is required to give effect to constitutional obligations.

6.4. Embed labour tenant issues in broader agrarian transformation policies

As shown by the study and agrarian literature, labour tenant struggles are symptomatic of deeper structural inequalities. Addressing them requires integrating labour tenant redress into national debates on land redistribution, agricultural markets, rural governance, and tenure reform. This includes revisiting private property regimes that limit the realisation of historical land-use rights.

Notes

1. This declaration was made by delegates and participants in the Labour Tenants Assembly (LTA), composing of over 150 Labour Tenants from across South Africa, as well as a number of land rights activists, non-government organisations, experts, academics, government officials, as well as the Special Master of Labour Tenants, gathered from 10 to 11 November 2022 at Constitutional Hill in Parktown, Johannesburg, South Africa.
2. Cited from a recording of a discussion titled 'The Forgotten Rural?' hosted by SWOP, the Forge and MADEYOULOOK. The discussion took place on the 4th of November 2022. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1E0T17kQdo8&t=3121s, accessed on 10 March 2024.
3. Mshengu and Others v Msunduzi Local Municipality and Others (11340/2017P) [2019] ZAKZPHC 52; [2019] 4 All SA 469 (KZP) (29 July 2019).

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Notes on the contributors

Mbuso Moyo holds a PhD in Development Studies from the University of Johannesburg, South Africa. His PhD study focused on youth unemployment and sought to understand the challenges and uncertainties of everyday lives for unemployed youth in South Africa. Mbuso's research interests include industrial policy and economic alternatives, rural development and agrarian change, mining and local politics of land dispossession, land reform and agrarian economies, rural identities and social movements. Moyo is currently a post-doctoral research fellow at the Southern Centre for Inequality Studies where he leads a multi-country project, which involves South Africa, Zambia, Ghana, Tanzania, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, and examines how critical minerals can be leveraged to support inclusive and sustainable development pathways.

Dr Siphe Zantsi is an agricultural economist working for the Agricultural Research Council. He holds a PhD in Agricultural Economics from Stellenbosch University. His research focusses on the economics of rural development projects and land reform in South Africa. He has authored and co-authored more than 60 peer-reviewed articles. Dr Zantsi is an associate editor in Agrekon, an agricultural economics journal in Southern Africa.

References

AFRA. 1997. *Association for Rural Advancement Annual Report, 1997*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Association for Rural Advancement.

AFRA. 2002. *Association for Rural Advancement Annual Report, 2002*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Association for Rural Advancement.

AFRA. 2005. *Association for Rural Advancement Annual Report, 2005*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Association for Rural Advancement.

AFRA. 2008. *Association for Rural Advancement Annual Report, 2008*. Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: Association for Rural Advancement..

Aliber, M., and B. Cousins. 2013. "Livelihoods after Land Reform: Trajectories of Change in Northern Limpopo Province, South Africa." *Journal of Agrarian Change* 13 (1): 140–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12012.

Beinart, W. 2001. *Twentieth-Century South Africa*. London: Oxford University Press.
Bernstein, H. 2010. *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
Borras, S. M. 2009. "Agrarian Change and Peasant Studies: Changes, Continuities and Challenges – An Introduction." *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 36 (1): 5–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150902820297.
Borras, S. Jr., and J. C. Franco. 2010. "From Threat to Opportunity? Problems with the Idea of a 'Code of Conduct' for Land-grabbing." *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal* 13 (2): 507–23.
Claassens, A. 2014. "Denying Ownership and Equal Citizenship: Continuities in the State's Use of Law and 'Custom', 1913–2013." *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 40 (4): 761–779. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070.2014.931061.
Cousins, B. 2016. "Land Reform in South Africa Is Failing – Why? What Must Be Done?" *The Conversation,* 30 June.
Cousins, B., and R. Hall, eds. 2020. *Land, Law and Traditional Leadership in South Africa: Contests and Compromises*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
Constitutional Court of South Africa. 2016. *Land Access Movement of South Africa and Others v Chairperson of the National Council of Provinces and Others* [2016] ZACC 22; 2016 (5) SA 635 (CC).
Constitutional Court of South Africa. 2019. South Africa, 'Mwelase and Others v. Director-General for the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform and Another (CCT 232/18) [2019] ZACC 30; 2019 (11) BCLR 1358 (CC); 2019 (6) SA 597 (CC)', 20 August 2019. Accessed November 8, 2023 http://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZACC/2019/30.html.
Cousins, B. 1997. "How Do Rights Become Real? Formal and Informal Institutions in South Africa's Land Reform". IDS Bulletin 28.4.Institute of Development Studies.
Department of Land Affairs. 1997. *Law as Process: An Anthropological Approach*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Ditlhake, A. 1997. "Labor Tenancy and the Politics of Land Reform in South Africa." In *No More Tears: Struggles for Land in Mpumalanga, South Africa*, edited by R. Levin and D. Wiener, 228–230. Trenton: Africa World Press.
Ferguson, J. 1999. *Expectations of Modernity. Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Fischer, F. 2003. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Greenberg, S. 2021. *The Land Reform Crisis: Institutional Failure and the Struggle for Rural Transformation in South Africa*. Johannesburg: PLAAS Working Paper.
Hall, R. 2004. "A Political Economy of Land Reform in South Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 100: 23–37. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305624042000262257
Hall, R. 2011. "The Next Great Trek? South African Commercial Farmers Move North." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 45 (2): 235–251.
Hall, R. 2015. "Who, What, Where, How, Why? The Many Disagreements about Land Redistribution in South Africa." *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 4 (3): 261–279.
Hall, R., and T. Keep. 2017. "Elite Capture and the Failure of Land Redistribution in South Africa." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 44 (1): 106–127.
Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS). 2016. "Diagnostic Report on Land Reform in South Africa. Commissioned Report for High Level Panel on the Assessment of Key Legislation and the Acceleration of Fundamental Change, an Initiative of the Parliament of South Africa." University of the Western Cape September 2016.
Kepe, T., and L. Ntsebeza. 2011. *Rural Resistance in South Africa. The Mpondo Revolts After Fifty Years*. Brill: Leiden Boston.
Koopman, J. 2020. "Rural Citizenship and Land Rights: Rethinking Belonging in South Africa's Countryside." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 46 (4): 667–684.
Lahiff, E. 2008. *Land Reform in South Africa: A Status Report 2008. PLAAS Research Report No. 38*. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape.
Lahiff, E., S. M. Borras, and C. Kay. 2007. "Market–led Agrarian Reform: Policies, Performance and Prospects." *Third World Quarterly* 28 (8): 1417–1436. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701637318.

Levin, R., and M. Ngubane. 2024. "Deepening Democracy in Rural Spaces in South Africa: Labour-tenant Land Claims and Social Justice." In *The D-Word: Perspectives on Democracy in Tumultuous Times*, edited by C. van der Westhuizen, S. Dube, and Z. Jolobe. Gqeberha: Nelson Mandela University Press.

Levin, R. 2022a. *Special Master's Progress Report to the Land Claims Court in Terms of Its Directives Issued on April 21, 2022*. Obtained through Personal Communication with the SMLT in July 2022.

Levin, R. 2022b. "Letter Requesting Assistance from uMgungundlovu District for Rockley Labour Tenant Applicants, 27 May 2022." Obtained through Personal Communication with the OSM.

Marcatelli, L., and B. Büscher. 2019. "Liquid Violence: The Politics of Water Responsibilisation and Dispossession in South Africa." *Water Alternatives* 12 (2): 760–773.

Mayende, G. 2022. *The Land and Agrarian Question: The First Frontier of Decolonisation in South Africa*. Gqeberha: Nelson Mandela University Press.

Mutale, M. N. 2011. "A Narrative Policy Analysis of the Challenges of Land Tenure Reform in South Africa between 1996 and 2009: A Case Study of the Labour Tenants (Labour Tenant Act No.3 of 1996) in KwaZulu-Natal." Bachelor of Social Science (Honours) in Policy and Development Studies (University of KwaZulu-Natal), BA (University of Zambia).

Ngubane, M. 2020. "Investigating Socio-spatial Trajectories of Class Formation: Accumulation from below and above on "New Qwa Qwa Farms" from the mid-1980s to 2016." PhD thesis. Cape Town: University of the Western Cape. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv1g6q904.

Nixon, R. 2011. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ntsebeza, L. 2005. *Democracy Compromised: Chiefs and the Politics of Land in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Ntsebeza, L. 2007. "Land Redistribution in South Africa: The Property Clause Revisited." In *The Land Question in South Africa*, edited by L. Ntsebeza and R. Hall, 107–131. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Ntsebeza, L and R. Hall. (eds). 2007. *The land question in South Africa: the challenge of transformation and redistribution*. Cape Town: HSRC Press, 115–117.

O'Laughlin, B. 1996. "Through a Divided Glass: Dualism, Class and the Agrarian Question in Mozambique." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 23 (4): 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066159608438618.

Platzky, L., and C. Walker. 1985. *The Surplus People: Forced Removals in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

RSA. 1999. "The Agriculture & Land Affairs Portfolio Committee 20 October 1999." Pretoria. Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs. Accessed December 11, 2022 http://www.pmg.org.za/.

RSA (Republic of South Africa). 2017. *Report of the High Level Panel on the Assessment of Key Legislation and the Acceleration of Fundamental Change*. Parliament of South Africa.

Rudolph, M. 2019. "Agrarian Citizenship and Land Reform." *South African Journal of Human Rights* 35 (2): 134–153.

Singh, S., and S. Bhogal. 2014. "De-peasantisation in Punjab: Status of Farmers Who Left Farming." *Current Science* 106 (10): 1364–1368.

Tricontinental: Institute for Social Research. 2022. *This Land Is the Land of Our Ancestors*. Dossier no 53. Accessed March 10, 2024 https://thetricontinental.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/20220606_Dossier53_EN_Web.pdf.

Tyner, J. A. 2016. *Violence in Capitalism: Devaluing Life in an Age of Responsibility*. Lincoln; London: University of Nebraska Press.

Walker, C. 2008. *Landmarked: Land Claims and Land Restitution in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Jacana.

Wegerif, M. 2021. "Farm Workers and Farm Dwellers: Structural Violence and Precarious Livelihoods in post-apartheid Agriculture." *South African Journal of Human Rights* 37 (2): 214–233.

Wegerif, M., B. Russell, and I. Grundling. 2005. *Still Searching for Security: The Reality of Farm Dweller Evictions in South Africa*. Pretoria: Nkuzi Development Association.

Williams, G. 1996. "Transforming Labour Tenants." In *Land, Labour and Livelihoods in Rural South Africa, Volume 2: KwaZulu–Natal and Northern Province*, edited by M. Lipton. F, Ellis and M. Lipton, 215–238. Durban: Indicator Press.

Williams, G. 1996. "Transforming Labour Tenants: A Critique of the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act of 1996." Seminar Paper Presented in the Richard Ward Building Seventh Floor, on the 30 September 1996. Accessed March 10, 2024 https://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/server/api/core/bitstreams/da73b3fc-2c22-4175-b7cf-779116233f80/content.

Yeni, S. 2021. "Land Is More than Farming: Former Labour Tenants' Views on Land Expropriation without Compensation." In *Land in South Africa: Contested Meanings and Nation Formation*, edited by K. Mabasa and B. Mabasa, 185–211. Johannesburg: MISTRA.

Legislation cited

Republic of South Africa. 1996. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Government Print. https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/images/a108-96.pdf.

Land Reform (Labour Tenants) Act 3 of 1996. n.d. Accessed March 11, 2024 https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201409/act3of1996.pdf.