

https://dspace.org/

Can Land Redistribution Aid in Reducing Poverty and Inequality in South Africa?

More, Itumeleng

2023
University of the Witswatersrand, Johannesburg
https://hdl.handle.net/10539/38559

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



University of the Witwatersrand

School of Economics and Finance

Applied Development Economics Masters Programme (CCA01)

Research Report (ECON7052A)

Can Land Redistribution Aid in Reducing Poverty and Inequality in South Africa?

by

Itumeleng More

Student number: 605936

Supervisor: Prof Jérôme Lange

31 March 2023

Word count:10699

Declaration

I, Itumeleng More, declare that this research report is my original work and that all sources have been cited and acknowledged in the list of references.

Abstract

Land allocation has been a thorny issue in South Africa. Post-democracy, the ANC government promised to redistribute land to poor citizens with the main aim of eradicating poverty, ensuring employment of citizens, and enhancing economic development in the nation. This paper looks at different land redistribution approaches that can been used in land reforms with the main focus on the market-led approach and government-led approach. A systematic review has been utilized in the research to identify land reform processes in South Africa. Out of the twelve reviewed articles, eight indicate that land redistribution had a positive impact on addressing poverty, unemployment, and economic development. The articles also indicate that market-led land distribution did not achieve its intended objectives. The paper concludes that there is a need for comprehensive government intervention in land-redistribution and -allocation in South Africa.

Table of Contents

Introduction 5

Methodology 7

Apartheid Policies Which Created Inequality and Poverty in South Africa 8

a. Natives Land Acquisition Act of 1913 8

b. The Group Act of 1950 9

c. The Group Areas Act 36 of 1966 9

Post-Apartheid Legislation/Policies/Laws Around Land Reform 10

Results 12

Land Reforms and Agricultural Improvement in South Africa 12

Agricultural Reformation, Eradication of Poverty and Changes in Land Ownership in South Africa 15

Land Reforms, Market Acquisitions and Ownership Changes 17

The Importance of Land Reforms in South Africa 19

The Effects of Land Tenure Reforms on Economic Development in East Asia 20

Impacts of Land Reforms on Acquisition of Land in South Africa 23

Impact of Land Reforms on Poverty Reduction, Creation of Employment and Economic Development in South Africa 24

Discussion 26

Market-led Approach 28

State-Led Land Redistribution Reforms 31

Recommendations 34

Conclusion 34

References 37

Introduction

Land redistribution and reform is a process through which the government aims to redress land expropriation as well as unlock the economic potential that may be derived from land. Through land redistribution, the South African government intends to offer the poor and previously disadvantaged access to land for production and occupation purposes. The policy on land reform is based on section 25 of the Constitution of South Africa and some of its key beneficiaries are farm workers and tenants, together with people who are interested in venturing into agriculture in both urban and rural South Africa (Besley & Burgess, 2000, p. 392). In South Africa, land reform is important for addressing historical inequalities, specifically, the inequality that stems from land dispossession through forced removal and appropriation for much of the Black community (Aliber, 2015, p3-5).

This paper will look at the history of land expropriation and redistribution. As a point of departure, the historical development of landholdings throughout South Africa will be discussed. Various initiatives and laws that pertain to land reform will be discussed and contextualised, with the objective of understanding the issue of land and the socio-economic effects of dispossession and forced removal from land. For ease of understanding for the reader, an outline of South Africa's history of landholdings will be given and contextualised. The apartheid regime will be contrasted against South Africa's democratic regime for a well-rounded understanding of the impact of the racial inequality that flowed from land distribution policies and processes.

The author will explore the market-based land allocation process and its impact on land reform in South Africa. Reasons on why this method is not efficient in the country will be given, together with alternatives that may be explored in land reform and redressing poverty and inequality. It is important to note that the alternatives given on the market-based land allocation process have not been tested yet. The systematic review has been elected by the author as the best approach for examining the socio-economic effects of land redistribution and its role in the eradication of poverty, addressing inequality, and the development of both the rural and urban economies.

It has been twenty-nine years since South Africa became a democratic state. Enshrined in the country's Constitution is section 25 – a section dedicated to property and is also the founding legislation for all policy on property in South Africa. One of the focus areas in the new dispensation is the expropriation of land in South Africa and the economic impact as a result. For this reason, the democratic government has expanded its ambition from merely providing shelter (through the RDP policy) to expropriation and redistribution of land. Be that as it may, the rate at which the government has been able to implement land reform policies has been slow and inefficient, resulting in fewer strides made towards poverty eradication and restoring equality in the country. Jacobs *et al.* (2003, suggests that 90% of the land that has been redistributed thus far has been underutilised and a portion of the high levels of unemployment, poverty, food insecurity in the case of agricultural land and inequality can be attributed to said underutilisation. This claim can be rebutted, on the grounds of generalisation because the land to which reference is made is only a small fraction in the total agricultural land in South Africa. This narrative assumes that all redistributed land can only be productive if the new owners farm the land, thus showing resistance in the consideration of alternative ways and methods through which revenue can be generated from land in the absence of farming.

The land issue in South Africa and other African nations has been a significant barrier to alleviating inequalities and poverty. In South Africa, the vast majority of the population lives in poverty and for this reason, land reform should be an integral part of the government's strategy in the alleviation of poverty. Land distribution can be used to address the existing inequalities in South Africa, which brings the question of policies to play. To what extent can policies alleviate poverty and realise the objectives of section 25 of the Constitution of South Africa? Through this study, the author will attempt to answer this question and many others that flow from land reform and redistribution. Some of the key questions that will be answered throughout this paper are:

What are the economic impacts of land redistribution?

Will the redistribution of land have any effect on agricultural productivity? How will land reform aid in the development of the rural economy and alleviate poverty?

With this paper, the author will examine the process of land redistribution in South Africa and the socio-economic impact of this process. A systematic review will be used to unpack this topic and policy recommendations will be made in line with economic principles that will, if applied, result in improved productivity, economic growth and ultimately, the eradication of poverty.

As a point of departure, the paper will offer a brief introduction to policies which have contributed to inequality and poverty in South Africa. These policies will be contrasted with the Apartheid's regime's policies that facilitated inequality and poverty amongst much of the South African population. From here, the systematic review will be explored and contextualised within land reform. Various approaches will be unpacked, to ultimately answer whether or not land reform and redistribution can actually aid in the eradication of poverty and significant inequality in South Africa. Answering this question will serve as the conclusion of this paper, followed by policy recommendations.

Methodology

A systematic review has been employed to examine how land redistribution can reduce poverty and inequality and enhance economic development in South Africa. To ensure proper facilitation fo land reform, it is paramount for policy makers to first consider the challenges that hinder land reform and redistribution. By so doing, the South African government will have clarity on the most efficient approach in the expropriation of land. Through survey analysis, the author will make sense of the available literature, consider the role of politics in land reform and make policy recommendations on the best approach.

The literature that has been chosen for this paper was carefully selected. The author relied on various criterion to find the most relevant literature. These studies identified the recurring issues affecting land ownership in Africa and South Africa and revealed how land allocation can improve the livelihood of persons and enhance economic development.

The process of finding the most relevant literature initially generated 120 articles, whose core theme was land distribution in different parts of the world. After careful analysis and consideration of the literature found, the author settled on 12 articles.

Apartheid Policies Which Created Inequality and Poverty in South Africa

a. Natives Land Acquisition Act of 1913

The confiscation of properties under the 1913 Natives Land Code has contributed significantly to segregation. Under the Natives Land Acquisition Act of 1913, a great number of Black people were displaced and had their land taken by the colonial regime. To remedy the levels of displacement of Black people, the Native Trust and Land Act of South Africa (1936) increased Black's people land ownership by 6% (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). The Native land trust Act of 1936 made it a crime for Black people to possess or maintain the land. The colonial governments progressively relocated black people to rural areas and impoverished neighbourhoods (gov.za, 1997). Following the displacement of Black people when their land was expropriated, it became necessary for many to live their families behind to seek opportunities to improve their lives and the livelihood of their families.

The South African Native Foundation was founded in line with with the Native Trust and Land Act. Its objective was to oversee trust funds (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). It was essential for the administration of the Foundation to be efficient as it had the potential to spear the South African economy forward through the development of both the rural and urban economies.

The South African Community Foundation was an organisation that was entrusted with the purchase of land for Black people in previously labelled “restricted zones”. . According to paragraph 2(1) of the Native Trust and Land Act of 1936, some parcels of property, along with those listed in the Natives Land Act, were given to the Native Trust for administration by the Trustees.

b. The Group Act of 1950

The Act's primary objectives were to form group areas, regulate the purchase of movable goods, and regulate the use of land and buildings. The Legislation created three distinct groups of people: a white community, a native organization, and a coloured group. The Act provided for the development of group areas intended to be exclusively used and the management of individuals of a specific group depending on the founding of these organizations (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). Disqualified individuals, or those who did not belong to the identical category as the grouped zone were not allowed to occupy and/or own any land or facilities in a unit area without a permit.

c. The Group Areas Act 36 of 1966

The Act's primary objectives were to harmonize the laws governing the creation of neighbourhoods, restrict the purchase of the real estate, and manage the use of real estate assets. The Act formed three categories: white, Bantu, and coloured communities (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). It shares many characteristics with the Group Areas Act of 1950. While article 20 of the Act limits property occupancy in a controlled region, section 13 forbids the purchase of tangible assets in a zoned area.

The Group Areas Regulation of 1950's sections 4 and 5 are mirrored in these provisions. No individual organization representative may possess any land or facilities in a designated location that has not been legitimately inhabited. No human could enable every such individual to do so unless under the authorization of permission (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). Be that as it it may, The Act outlined the conditions under which an exception could be made for a non-White person to occupy and/or own land and facilities. Some of these conditions were that they had to be an employee of the

state, a visitor (for a maximum of three months), or they were a student at any higher education institution.

Article 23 of the statute gave the then State Leader the authority to declare sole occupation or ownership over another's land, thus deepening the roots of racial segregation in South Africa (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017), going as far as granting the South African Police Services the power to access any property and search it without a warrant or permission from the occupiers of said property thereby enforcing the provisions of the Group Areas Act. . According to estimates, the Groups Acts caused over 3.5 million persons to be forcefully displaced between 1960 and 1983 (South African History Online, 2021). From such statistics, a rebuttable claim It is clear that such pieces of legislation are unethical is made and their repeal necessary to establish a more equitable manner to own and distribute land.

Post-Apartheid Legislation/Policies/Laws Around Land Reform

The National Party administration of FW de Klerk bore the responsibility of redressing the injustices of the past that were committed against Black people by the Apartheid regime. Consequently, the Land Acts was repealed in 1991 and was replaced by the implementation of the Elimination of Racially Based Land Measures Act. The Act's lengthy-term states that it was published to eliminate limitations on the ownership and use of land rights based on ethnicity or status in a particular demographic group, and specific laws must be repealed or amended (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017) to ensure consistency with the Act. Discriminatory laws were repealed to allow for the gradual and ultimately, complete abolition of racially based organisations, structures and regulations Section 1 of the Elimination of Racially Based Land Measures Act removed the Natives Land Act and established standards to accomplish this goal, while Article 11 abolished the Natives Trust and Land

Act. Provisional procedures for the phase-out of the South African Development Trust were included in Section 12 of the Act (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). Because the Trust possessed most of the "original" land, it was necessary to put structural reforms to make it simpler to transfer the property from the trustees rustees to other government entities or organizations that had been set up to accept land transfers.

The Acquisition and transfer of undertakings Act of 1966 was repealed under Section 48 of the Elimination of Racially Based Land Measures Act. According to this clause, the Group Areas Ordinance of 1966 and all utilization and improvement were repealed immediately, allowing all South Africans, irrespective of race, to inhabit and own property in any region of the nation without concern for legal repercussions. Non-white South Africans were no longer forbidden from owning property for the first time in over 80 years.

The White Paper, which set forward the overarching land reform strategy dealt with issues such as the inequities brought on by racialized land evictions, disproportionate landholding, and the necessity of appropriate land usage. In this respect, the White Paper held that reconciliation would remain a distant reality in South Africa until proper acknowledgement of unfair discrimination had taken place, followed by steps to remedy the damage caused as a result. The White Paper's goal was to offer a comprehensive framework for structural adjustment composed of the identical three pillars described in the Reconstruction and Development Program: restoration, allocation, and tenure reform.

The government offered a land reformation initiative in which it would refrain from meddling in the real estate market. Instead of immediately purchasing land for distribution, the administration committed to upholding the "willing buyer, willing seller" concept, whereby it would contribute funds to facilitate market-led distributive deals without taking title to the property.

The three cornerstones of the land reform strategy were reaffirmed in the White Paper (gov.za, 1997). In terms of redistribution, the White Paper declared that the service's goal is to give the poor rights to opportunities for domestic and economic purposes to raise their standard of living and earnings. According to the White Paper, to safeguard the growth and competitiveness of land reform developments, consideration must be given to the following factors:

- The societal and economic benefits of land use.
- The financial sustainable development of the housing projects.
- The environmental sustainability.
- The closeness and accessibility of marketplaces and work opportunities.
- The water availability; and mass infrastructural facilities (gov.za, 1997).
- Any effective land reform plan must be viable and long-lasting.

The restoration plan is meant to help the crucial processes of racial forgiveness, restoration, and prosperity by restoring land and offering other restitution solutions to those whom racist and discriminatory laws have displaced. The framework describes four components: accreditation requirements, types of restoration, remuneration, and urban complaints. The policy also declares that the strategy and procedure for land ownership are established on the statutory regulations set in section 25(4) of the Convention and the Reparation of Land Rights Act (gov.za, 1997). In the majority of cases, the absence of fiscal and regulatory assistance from the state to land reform recipients is the main factor contributing to the inefficient utilization of property (gov.za, 1997).

Results

Land Reforms and Agricultural Improvement in South Africa

South Africa continues to carry a massive political burden after segregation. The "Land Issue" with the persistence of increasing poverty, deprivation of resources and a long tradition of racialized colonial exploitation can be cited as outcomes of historical oppression and discrimination. For rural

populations, the capacity to cultivate even modest pieces of land for sustenance and sale shows potential (Hall & Mtero, 2021). Many individuals have become skeptical regarding land reform's ability to sustain subsistence agriculture, enhance agricultural productivity, create jobs, and lower poverty. Politicians and other stakeholders that are involved in the land distribution must recognize the political importance of addressing the "Land Issue," and public discourse frequently uses land occupations in Zimbabwe as a dire warning regarding what could occur if land redistribution fails. To address South Africa's workforce conflicts, well-being, and social construction, land reform may be considered pertinent, peripheral, or necessary and should be revised to the country's current political and economic climate. . Conflicts between and among land reform's ideological and economic factors influence widespread discussion and academic assessment. Since South Africa has transition to democracy, land reform has been an area of past injustice whose remedial action has been slow and the implementation of policies barely effective. For this reason, it is important for the political and economic landscape of South Africa to be explored and their impact on land reform unpacked and remedied (Hall & Metro, 2021, p.9).

O'Laughlin et al. (2012) indicate that diverse experiences of imperial exploitation and oppression and the region's varied pathways of capitalist accumulation and growth have left a lasting impression on Southern Africa. The organization of the supply of workers for South Africa's mining areas as well as for successive settler agricultural production, manufacturing sector, and urbanization, remains pivotal to those experiences.

In South Africa, land disputes and the conflicts they threaten to spark are clear examples of the colonial heritage of displacement. In most of sub-Saharan Africa, nations gained their independence from foreign domination and national independence in the 1950s and 60s after engaging in violent conflict in areas where land-owning farmers predominate and are not subject to predatory land ownership (O'Laughlin et al., 2012). South Africa is an exception in that violent land grabs were avoided as the newly elected government had promised citizens that there will be a formal process to

restitute and redistribute land. Whether or not income difference is crucial for the capitalist transformation is debatable. In fact, unlike areas such as eastern India, territories like the Indian Punjab that have undergone some early capitalist developments have never been a component of the imperial zamindari framework and did not have the identical degree of prior inequality while in South Africa the levels of disparity are high (O'Laughlin et al., 2012).

Additional instances of capitalist divergence include post-socialist nations and areas with prosperous redistributive land changes in the 1960s and 1970s that ended land ownership. In those nations, de-collectivization frequently produced a very equitable resource redistribution process (O'Laughlin et al., 2012) with the emergence of a group of rural workers and proto-capitalist landowners. However, these transitional tendencies differ as the government maintains a strong hold over land distribution in several nations such as, like China and Vietnam. For this reason, differentiation occurs when better-positioned farmers purchase land from their less fortunate counterparts, engage in animals or cottage industries, or enhance agriculture productivity by utilizing high-value inputs, including mechanization, to gain an advantage over their less fortunate competitors.

The claim that the quality of life in rural areas in South Africa willdrastically improve due to owning farming land is based on a multitude of presumptions. These include the assumptions about those with agricultural expertise lack land or do not have enough land to support themselves and that South Africa's current agricultural land and water supplies can support the lives of many additional local producers (O'Laughlin et al., 2012). Land rights throughout South Africa still serve a purpose and have sociopolitical and symbolic significance.

O'Laughlin et al. (2012) present a solid case for actual income payments to the less fortunate, which have been hotly contested in South Africa but continuously supported by the government through the different monthly grants paid to millions of South Africans. In addition to agricultural output, the land offers numerous additional purposes and advantages for the poorer members of society.Without

a doubt, there is a need for a direct wealth transfer in South Africa and in a .a culture where everything is for sale, the stark discrepancy in South Africa's income distribution is significant because it shows that specific individuals will have access to better homes, nutritious food, good education, and better medical care.

Much literature details disparities between remote regions, poor neighborhoods, suburbs, and outlying areas along these characteristics. The redistributive procedures could occur in the areas of healthcare and schooling. The state of one's health primarily reflects the circumstances of daily living and employment (O'Laughlin et al., 2012). Individuals are impacted by curative treatment, but they are exclusive and foremost the economic costs of various industrial organizing strategies and various social connections of production. In order to make linkages between different kinds of proprietorship, how employment is organized, and health standards, (O'Laughlin et al., 2012) uses some of the historical writing on nourishment, malaria, and diseases in the area. Illustrations from Mozambique, Swaziland, and South Africa have demonstrated how different property and distribution processes and systems have resulted in different health issues and numerous political struggles. In order to address land issues, a comprehensive process should be created.

Agricultural Reformation, Eradication of Poverty and Changes in Land Ownership in South Africa

Sugden, F. (2020) indicates that farm production takes on a social shape with its farming and livestock-keeping practices, structure, workforce, and modes of labour. This is why when the discussion of land reform comes up, it is important to consider issues relating to land ownership and how this social environment will change. South Africa possesses a long history of reorganizing agricultural production and a regionally diversified organization of commercial farming. Since 1994, the idea of large-scale automated grain production has been reinvented. This system was utilized in a particular timeframe and was heavily subsidized through wheat boards and farmer organizations. The consolidation of properties, the repurposing of land for uses other than agricultural production,

and the planning of the various smallholder schemes are currently emerging at a higher pace to address concerns of property rights in South Africa.

Due to the disappearance of wage-labour options in agricultural production, the trend of South African agriculture and commercial redistributive economic reform might decrease average earnings and bring about a reduction in the global net food supply, particularly the food that is not commercialized. There are reasons to be sceptical about land redistribution including the fact that rural residents currently only produce a small amount of food in many regions of South Africa, the disproportionate significance of welfare grants and non-farm income streams for rural locations, and factual evidence of available land for crop production (Sugden, 2020). Some reparation plans claim that revenue from mining interests and leases will provide participants with significantly more financial rewards than those from agricultural production through land ownership rights.

Farmers and individuals in camps are another group involved in agricultural output who derive some or all of their livelihood from it. They often also possess other income streams and assets, such as social handouts and migrant labour exploitation. Such revenue streams and savings have significant effects on social reproduction and contribute significantly to social division by gender and socioeconomic status in the remote regions of the homelands (Sugden, 2020). Another option in the land redistribution involves the division of substantial plantation and farm operations into landholdings. The allocation of land should be predicated on collective ownership as well as management of large-scale land tracts, while ensuring that crop production, promotion, and labour organization remaining in position.

For proper administration of the land distribution process, it is important that farms are examined for the current subsistence output. In so doing, proper market valuation of the land and due diligence for

ownership and title deeds will be enhanced and allow for the streamlining of all land reform programmes and processes. + The mechanisms that led to camps being heavily populated places with deteriorated and sterile soils and inadequate water resources—just residential neighbourhoods for the children of migrant workers—are well documented in the scientific literature on the effects of land distribution. Since 1994, the number of farmlands in reservations under development has decreased. However, in some places, some individuals have indeed been able to continue raising cattle and grow crops to earn money (Sugden, 2020). The size of the lands, the facilities, the soil's overall condition, the supply of water, and connections to revenue-generating opportunities off the property can enable some development and consolidation in small-scale farming.

Land Reforms, Market Acquisitions and Ownership Changes

Walker, C. (2017) indicates that the Charter of rights and freedoms mandates land redistribution and allows the government to expropriate land while giving all landowners administrative protection, particularly tenants and non-owners. The ANC implemented the World Bank's Plans for Rural Reorganization in the farming sector, which included market-based structural transformation and agricultural liberalization. The economic plan took an unexpected turn toward the right with the "1996 social economic groupings" and its affirmation throughout the Growth, Employment, and Redistribution (GEAR) structure, which affirmed market-based initiatives such as land redistribution, and affirmation of property rights.

Affirmation of property as well as prevention of repossession and seizure will offer the necessary ownership rights and protection that are crucial for sustainable economic development. With this approach, the economic plan decided against utilizing the state’s legally protected right to expropriate assets to address land inequalities and unfair practices. The RDP from 1994 claimed that a comprehensive land administration system would serve as the "primary and driving element of a programme of poverty alleviation" and the delivery of assistance services. However, it did not refer

to a more comprehensive strategy for structural adjustment. The democratic administration will make the economy more robust by creating jobs, raising farm income, and reducing crowded conditions (Walker, 2017). Although land reform was moved around between diverse organizational homes from being a provincial mission then followed by being in the RDP department, and finally in the Presidency, the programme itself was never implemented.

Land Affairs fell under the provincial and local governments over the ensuing two decades, before landing in 2009 under the Zuma presidency as the ministry in charge of land redistribution. At this point, its entry diverted finances from agricultural restructuring into significant initiatives in areas not impacted by land redistribution. Rural development would serve as a charity in the impoverished neighbourhoods of the former Bantustans. In contrast, land redistribution would concentrate on the transition of agricultural production from White to Black farmers, even without a noticeable decrease in destitution or increase in work or income (Walker, 2017). Similarly, the power structures promoting land reforms—rural populations and their supporters among some NGOs—largely lacked any operational budget for allocation and were excluded from the more extensive economic discussions.

However, the ANC, which was in charge of implementing policies, needed more to provide in terms of land redistribution other than the requirement to control expenses, cut incentives, and create a pro-poor agenda. In this situation, the World Economic Forum made the case that land redistribution was fiscally essential as long as market-oriented subsistence agriculture was prioritized and that commercial procedures were employed to acquire the land. Farmlands firmly linked through a corporate agricultural system dominate the commercial agricultural industry.

There is an indication of growing integration in the agricultural statistics that follow. 2,610 substantial properties, meaning those with annual earnings over R22.5 million, made for 6.09% of all farmlands in the agriculture sector in 2017 (Walker, 2017). This disconnect between land reform

and agricultural production in post-Apartheid governance still exists. Land reform continues due to the lack of suitable food security and widespread support for small farmers. Land redistribution has advanced independently from other initiatives in infrastructures and business growth because of the need for substantial effective coordination for economic development.

The Importance of Land Reforms in South Africa

Hall, R., & Mtero, F. (2021) indicate that initiatives by the African National Congress (ANC) to redress the harsh imperial and racially discriminatory memory of forced relocation and congestion suffered by the African populace, in particular, should be seen in the context of the land reforms in South Africa. With the ANC's electoral landslide during the inaugural democratic processes in 1994, structural reform was quickly implemented. The ANC emphasized structural transformation as essential to rural prosperity in its electoral manifesto, which emphasized the Reconstruction and Development Program (RDP). Providing "dwelling and productive property to the lowest segment of the local dwellers and aspirational landowners" was a component of land redistribution. In accordance with these concepts, the White Paper on Land Policy stated that agrarian reform was "a core component for advancement and reconstruction" and, therefore, that an institutional structure for the country must successfully address the unfairness of racial-based settler colonialism of the past, the necessity of a fair allocation of landholdings and the importance of land redistribution to alleviate poverty and foster economic development.

Paradoxically, the argument that urban opportunities are the answer to South Africa's challenge of excessive poverty and discrimination has indeed been put forward at a moment when joblessness is at an all-time high, with nearly 40% of the people who are economically active supposedly unable to find jobs. Two widely used indicators of satisfaction are average earnings and consumption. The indicators hold that a household's ability to meet its real food and other needs is reflected in its earnings, measured in dollars (Hall & Mtero, 2021). Agriculture-related revenue, social assistance (grants), and commercial remittances, primarily from family, contribute to average earnings. Due to

the difficulties in obtaining reliable data on different input costs, particularly labour, feed, seeds, and fertilizer expenses, no assessment of operating earnings from intensive agriculture might be made (where applicable).

The reported consumer spending statistics were used to impute productivity for own spending, which is included in the estimated annual revenue. Agriculture-related revenue, government transfers (grants), and individual payments, primarily from family, all contributed to household expenditure (Hall & Mtero, 2021).

The Effects of Land Tenure Reforms on Economic Development in East Asia

Different schools of thought stress the importance of an accountable government in land redistribution. According to the neoclassical theory, an efficient administration is required to establish equipment and uphold market transaction laws (Dorner & Thiesenhusen, 1990). According to the state-centered perspective, only an efficient administration can implement a successful program of performance-based incentives. It has frequently been shown that certain occurrences that took place right before the post-war economic prosperity boom in the neighbourhood impacted how successful governance was in East Asia. China, India, and Brazil had protracted episodes of societal, cultural, and economic unrest brought on by conflict, upheaval, and civil conflict. As a result, they were placed on the Cold War battle boundaries and got considerable American help.

Dorner, P., & Thiesenhusen, W. C. (1990) indicate that three of such countries undertook significant land transformations that essentially abolished the landlord's class. Many people think that the U.S. government helped to make these land reforms practicable, if not actively backed them. Land redistribution is an external occurrence or event shared by all three. It is extrinsic in the idea that it necessitated a turbulent atmosphere, and the United States, an outside actor, was crucial in paving

the way for the transformation. Many considerations are typically cited as justification for the significance of structural adjustment in the later growth of the area.

First, it has often been considered that the landowner's estate or organization is a very conservative segment of the population that constantly influences political decisions to keep its powerful status regardless of the impact on the country's general growth and advancement. It is often believed that the capitalist class wastes the wealth it has acquired on opulent consumer items (Dorner & Thiesenhusen, 1990).sStructural reform removes this conservative aspect and puts the surpluses to other uses. The fairness of the developmental process is a second factor in the significance of land redistribution. The initial stages of expansion are most likely to result in widening inequality if farmland is allocated exceptionally unevenly.

Further expansion may be hindered by those who have been left behind using populist rhetoric to transfer wealth, which could limit progress. Also, building a governing movement in favour of policies that encourage development is anticipated to be much simpler if the rewards of progress are distributed fairly. Hence, land reform eliminates the power of landowners and permits the formation of a partnership for productivity expansion. Agrarian reforms in Asia were brought through outside intervention (Korea and Taiwan) or a legislative rebellion based on enlightenment ideas (People's Republic of China and the Philippines). The changes still need to be more developed in the last scenario. Policy changes initially favoured a more equitable allocation of wealth and commodities in Taiwan and South Korea.

Grabowski, R. (2002) indicates that the reforms on land have enhanced production profitability, broadened the domestic economy, reduced joblessness and unemployment in both agriculture and industry sectors, and created more similar growth patterns. In such countries, the growth of global economies came before (or along with) that of the international marketplace. Land redistribution is a long-lasting phenomenon. If effective government measures are not implemented, price of land may

increase thus affecting land distribution and acquisition through statutory and systematic exclusion. Therefore, we can deduce that structural reform, economic development, and political administration are essential in the land distribution process.

The fact that the early 1990s land reform plan in South Africa ever emerged represents one of its more intriguing characteristics. In the initial periods of the transformation, the conversation in South Africa over property and agricultural legislation appeared to be irredeemably segmented. The ANC was in favour of mass land reforms. An urban-based progressive movement was influenced by a constructive model of production of employment relationships.

The concession on the ownership provision is typically the main emphasis of stories of this transition. However, it fails to tackle the issue of why this accommodation was so universally accepted. Establishing a strategy that seemed to integrate the goals of peaceful settlement, rehabilitation, economic integration across borders, and opportunities for the poor was primarily made possible by various legislative measures. This was made conceivable by how informed individuals portrayed these incredibly dissimilar undertakings as components of a compelling story of modernity. The program received approval from a broad range of political viewpoints.

Grabowski, R. (2002) observes that one conversation concentrated on economic effectiveness, conservation, and state food production issues. According to this perspective, land redistribution necessitated eliminating the regulatory arrangements that had shielded ineffective landowners from market forces and established a repressive land policy in the country. The goal was a practical, internationally interconnected, and deracinated commercialized agricultural industry. A second paradigm framed the issue of structural adjustment in terms of national forgiveness, reparations, and restitution. The necessity to address the contentious political heritage of illegal occupation and

displacement served as the foundation for advocacy for agrarian reform. This speech had two distinct mannerisms:

A patriotic, African nationalist movement that underlined the wrong of illegal imperial occupation and questioned the validity of the post-Apartheid racist regimen discrimination in land distribution employment and economic development because such regulations had detrimental effects on the society. A fundamentally liberal language emphasizing reparation, forgiveness, and restitution within a post-1910 context was strongly connected to reforms and land distribution (Ntsebeza, 2003). A third conceptualization of unfairness saw human rights violations as the critical fulcrum point. From this vantage point, land and agricultural policy must develop a legislative framework to defend and empower the weak and underprivileged. A fourth school viewed land redistribution as kickstarting agricultural production" and regarded it as promoting fair productivity expansion and agricultural change.

Impacts of Land Reforms on Acquisition of Land in South Africa

According to Cavanagh, E. (2014), there is a lot of intellectual contention on how well small-scale farming can manage land reform challenges. Small producers are uncertain to be capable of satisfying the requirements of the urban poor for affordable food, even if small-scale farming could prove more productive in some ways and is definitely highly employment intensive. Producers are also poorly equipped to compete in centralised, buyer-driven production chains (Mather, 2005). More importantly, even if small producers might theoretically achieve all of these criteria, there is still the issue of achieving those goals in practice. Outcome depends on the path taken, and change will indeed be expensive. In order to determine whether or not there are realistic and practical alternatives for transformation, it is necessary to look beyond broad and intellectual debates about the advantages of small- vs large-scale agriculture.

According to Ntsebeza (2003), if attention is only paid to property ownership and ecosystem processes, it will be impossible to address how farming and huge businesses are reshaping the agro-food industry to serve their own interests. A liberal agrarian strategy should thus concentrate on challenging power dynamics throughout the food supply chain.

The situation has reached a breaking point: commercial reorganization of agribusiness both domestically and internationally is causing mechanisms of unemployed de-agrarianizing for vast excess masses who have been driven off the property but have not been taken up into non-farm jobs (Li, 2007). Creating strategies to restrain corporate interests and, at the very least, ensure that value-stream management occurs in more pro-poor methods is one challenge. Another is figuring out how to encourage the growth of regional food markets that are only partly dominated by big businesses and allow local producers and regional traders to compete. The economics of land redistribution that ensue then look considerably more moderate (Akram-Lodhi, 2007).

Ntsebeza's (2003) reasoning challenges the heroic image of "land reform" that is frequently presented in Left-leaning mainstream culture. It is appropriate to envision structural transformation as a part of a much larger but more confined social and economic development cycle in South African rather than as a core, independent institution of huge land redistribution.

Impact of Land Reforms on Poverty Reduction, Creation of Employment and Economic Development in South Africa

Ntsebeza, (2003) observes that the numerous activities that make up the way of life of the poor rural African people of South Africa have traditionally been entwined with urban capabilities. In order to analyse some aspects of how the rural poor endure, this section looks at how property, labour, and livelihood opportunities are interconnected in modern South Africa. In addition to being embedded in migration connections and various livelihood strategies, modern rural lifestyles are also classified

here into four broad sectors. They first develop through a variety of agrarian and land-based pursuits. Second, agricultural, and non-farm small-scale, with unstructured economic factors frequently supporting them. Third, individuals typically follow South Africa's relatively advanced system of public transfer payments, and fourth, they often follow culturally ingrained norms of social cooperation and mutual understanding.

Akram-Lodhi (2007) indicates that rural lives' intricacy and fragility are evaluated from the perspective of such four categories and configurations of social stratification with which they are interwoven. The behaviours of movement and displacement, make up the impoverished rural lifestyles. It may be helpful to think of rural dwellers as straddling the urban-rural divide. The three central dynamics—limited options for low-skill jobs, restricted agrarian pursuits, and restrained accumulation opportunities include but are not limited to economics because social processes and societal norms and standards also have a bearing on them.—

Cavanagh, E. (2014) observes that long-standing customs of rural repatriation, investments, and consolidation were reconfigured at the same time as the 1980s saw the breakdown of racist influx management and formalized male demographic change. Even though inequality and joblessness are at significant concentrations, the shadow economy is relatively modest by emerging economy norms, occupying only about a fifth of the population. There are several causes behind this, but some of the most important ones are the effects of slavery and Apartheid, which prevented Africans from starting their businesses, numerous credits, communication, talent gaps, and high infrastructural expenses. However, these circumstances exist in a setting that blends the constraints of underdeveloped countries with those of a strong, dominating formal sector, thereby "crowding out" financial chances for small or unstructured businesses.

In this approach, the same issues that consistently harm the chances for agricultural production also hinder irregular economic activities and boost the susceptibility of the socially vulnerable.

Nevertheless, numerous rural residents participate in multiple kinds of unlicensed economic growth regardless of the obstacles they confront. The juxtaposition of a progressive taxation system and (relatively) large transfers helps moderate South Africa's economic inequality, which is among the highest in the world. State financial transfers cause a 7% reduction in the Gini coefficient, while social remittances have a much more significant impact on lowering deprivation among the lowest income group. The impoverished people in South Africa are so deprived that receiving social assistance helps many beneficiary families leave the lowest income group.

Du Toit (2012) indicates that transfer payments are also linked to high social costs, such as bettering nutritional intake and lowering mortality and stunting. Additionally, social transfer beneficiaries sometimes share their earnings with family and friends that are not their intended recipients, especially when those dependents are women. State transfer payments have several other impacts outside poverty alleviation, such as changes in family demographics, the employment market, and the economy. Regarding household demographics, several homes are practically built around a single retiree because state transfer payments frequently constitute the most regular influx of income into rural locations. The agricultural poor's means of subsistence largely depend on various land-based privileges, unregulated agricultural and non-farm businesses, public aid programs, and interpersonal exchange norms.

Discussion

South Africa went through a period of colonialism characterized by the displacement of people, forceful eviction of households from their ancestral lands, discrimination, and segregation. After the advent of democracy, the ANC government decided to redistribute land to the original households that were pushed away from their ancestral land. The government of the day believed that the distribution of land would lead to economic development, poverty eradication, rural growth and

development, and improvement in agricultural production, and these activities would eradicate poverty and inequality. When SA took on a restitution program, giving back the land was administratively heavy, and the government offered families money instead of the land. Those families were given a fraction of the land value in Rands and were not compensated for the opportunity cost of getting money as opposed to land. Families who wrongfully got land during the apartheid era were offered market-related prices.

The government developed different policies and programs to improve rural livelihoods, creating employment and improving the economy. The effective programs which the government undertook to redistribute land were the RDP and Market based approach. The RDP aimed at distributing land to small farmers across South Africa. The government would purchase land and then distribute it to the citizens. The program was good on paper but failed to achieve its objectives of settling landless individuals and households. One of the challenges faced by the program was the need for political goodwill and funding. The program needed to meet its objectives and address the issue of land redistribution.

The state introduced the market-based land reforms in 1990, through which willing buyers would meet willing sellers. The program, from inception, was good on paper, but low-income families needed help to raise the necessary resources required to purchase land from the sellers. The negotiations for land between the seller and buyer could not materialize as an agreement could not be reached between the groups. The provision of loans could drive away low-income families as much paperwork could be required to make the program successful. The market-based approach did not meet its objectives, as households who lacked a good plan and strategy for developing the land were pulled out of the process. The land redistribution program is needed to meet the objectives of poverty eradication, employment, and economic development. The government could have bought different land parcels and settled its citizens to ensure they acquired the most required social capital.

Market-led Approach

The land is viewed as primarily an economic commodity, and markets are organizations where individuals are treated equally, according to the two underlying tenets of market-led agrarian reform (MLAR). In the opinion of MLAR's supporters, the collaboration of landowners is the key to the effective execution of property reform. This idea guides the MLAR. Hence, the process is a unilateral program; landowners who choose not to dispose of it will not be forced to do so. Just the property of landowners who do so voluntarily would be affected. This strategy tries to eliminate the hostile environment that has pervaded reform measures. In return, the committed sellers receive 100% instant cash payments calculated according to the complete market worth of their properties (Neves & du Toit, 2012).

The MLAR method incorporates a "demand-driven" strategy for beneficiaries and property targeting, meaning that only low-income households who desire property and those properties in high demand among potential purchasers are selected for the restructuring (Lahiff, 2007). Only people with sufficient human resources, prior earnings, and understanding of how to take advantage of the chances would choose to engage in the Pprograms. Locals with stronger ties to landlords improved access to social networking sites, and knowledge of the local real estate market will indeed be considered by MLAR. In addition to the prospective investors, a "self-selection" procedure is used to identify the best recipients.

Lahiff (2007) indicates that less qualified households and persons would be excluded since their colleagues would not let them negotiate the land acquisition and loan accessibility. The MLAR program's primary goal is establishing and growing productive and competitive single farmlands. Homeowners must, however, organize to increase their negotiating power during the property acquisition negotiations. A beneficiary organization must be established to leverage cost advantages

in the supply and demand of land. Additionally, the architecture uses a decentralized implementation strategy for quick transactions, openness, and compliance.

Lahiff (2007) indicates that establishing a comprehensive legal, organizational, and legislative framework that guarantees fair competition for all participants should be the national government's primary responsibility. MLAR depends on local authority organizations for revenue collection and land acquisition arbitration because of this situation. Since local governments are thought to be more accessible to the general public, they should also be more receptive to the genuine requirements of their respective populations. Using localized marketing intelligence networks offered by local governmental agencies, the MLAR addresses some informative inadequacies that have hindered government agencies' administration of land redistribution.

Borras (2003) indicates that the MLAR approach is also quicker as it employs existing property sales practices to conclude a transaction. In addition, it was anticipated that land prices will be reduced since landowners will receive 100% cash payments rather than the phased cash-bonds settlement they would receive within the state-led model. In the meantime, "the current model would encourage, rather than weaken, land markets," which is a clear departure from the traditional process. A more open land market could be made possible by eliminating restrictions on property transactions and leases. MLAR supporters claim that reducing the difference among arable land valuations and market rates of the property makes estates cheaper and boosts repayment capabilities, since property purchasers would then find it simpler to pay back debt from the economic capacity of the property directly.

The financing method used by the MLAR concept is flexible loan-grant funding. A set quantity of cash is distributed to each participant. The recipient can spend the money, yet a condition states that any proportion used to acquire property is deemed a credit and must be paid back by the beneficiaries (Borras, 2003). Whatever is left over after land acquisition is provided to the

beneficiaries as a loan, which they must utilize for post-land transferring infrastructure development without paying it back. This adaptable strategy prevents potential fund exploitation and instils the idea of co-sharing liabilities, so recipients do not develop a dole-out mindset.

As it is stated that "loans are preferable to subsidies since they are direct, accessible, may be focused, and their distortionary impacts are modest," the MLAR also strays from the practice of providing payments to everyone (Neves & du Toit, 2012). Since farmers will seek the greatest return on their investment, this technique is also believed to lower the property price significantly. Because it eliminates massive, inefficient regulatory agencies, (ii) land costs are cheaper, and (iii) recipients pay 100% of the property costs. Although the strategy relies on financial institutions for the development's long-term fundamental funding, the process requires sovereign governments to fund the program's initial development.

The MLAR program is also anticipated to get funding from bilateral and multilateral aid organizations, particularly on the "loan front" for improvement after land transfers. In other words, the MLAR structure has developed aims and techniques entirely at odds with the state-led strategy. The MLAR premise that landowners and tenants may openly and equitably bargain, act as willing consumers and vendors, and establish political influence relationships misses the structure and characteristics of these power structures in most rural regions of emerging economies.

Legislative power is necessary for the impoverished rural subordinate groups to articulate their requirements effectively. In many situations, the social, political, and economic climate that makes the poor's land-based requests necessary restricts the organization and communication of expectations. The rural poor have land demands but frequently need help to effectively express them due to their lack of political clout, which results from their social status (Neves & du Toit, 2012). Due to their inability to properly communicate their needs within the restrictions imposed by the MLAR program, several low-income individuals are likely to forfeit their previous (and superior)

entitlements to specific farm fields. More typically, the MLAR paradigm tends to downplay the significance of the unequal legislative power distribution among various socioeconomic groupings with an attachment to the land.

Land reform is a crucial issue, particularly considering that the MLAR model's central mechanism revolves around 'negotiating' between stakeholders. It is unthinkable that a dispossessed poor peasant might enjoy the same amount of negotiating leverage as a wealthy landowner in a transaction for land acquisition when there is an imbalance of class consciousness and, consequently, of political authority. Finally, the notion that decentralization ensures transparency and oversight, administration effectiveness, and quick reform efforts are seriously disputed. A network of "local autocratic enclaves" makes up the rural politics of most emerging economies today (Neves & du Toit, 2012). In this regard, a wealth of information in the substantial literature on decentralization is pertinent to the contemporary debates over land redistribution.

In most developing economies currently, agrarian reform—one that would be genuinely progressive and built on the central tenets of social justice and economic growth—remains essential. The MLAR approach, however, does not take into consideration that the market cannot perform a redistributive purpose like the government could. The MLAR's initial application in Brazil and Colombia offers tangible proof that the concept does not function as intended by its advocates (Neves & du Toit, 2012). It does not distribute the land as documented in different manifestos and government policies which aim to redistribute land to poor households. The MLAR's advocates are not realistic about the results of the program and its achievements.

State-Led Land Redistribution Reforms

The ANC administration, the first democratic government in South Africa, inherited a nation devastated by the extreme incidence of inequality, a rapidly deteriorating unemployment issue, and gross disparities in income brackets. A comprehensive socio-economic regulatory structure was

implemented in 1994 as part of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), which sought to eradicate the remnants of the past by redressing inequities and establishing a dynamic and modern South Africa. The introduction of the RDP was motivated, in part, by the premise that South Africa was noted as having among the most considerable income inequalities and, as a result, a very high prevalence of destitution. The RDP acknowledged that inequality afflicted many individuals, particularly those who resided in agricultural areas and was the single biggest hardship in the nation.

The program recognized several issues that needed to be tackled to combat abject poverty. They included providing property and buildings and granting utilization of sanitation facilities and potable water. The program acknowledged that it was essential to meet people's basic requirements and promote the advancement of human resources. The program identified an approach based on four foundations to end impoverishment and ensure the poor were able to actively engage in economically active practices (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). The pillar was responsible for providing equal access to opportunities for all South Africans to increase their capacity and family income, economic output and efficiency. .

The creation of a welfare system as well as other entitlement programs were made to safeguard the underprivileged, the older adults, the disabled, and some other disadvantaged populations by bettering their living environment through improved access to fundamental social as well as physical amenities, affordable healthcare, youth development, and training (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). The program accepted that land was the most fundamental demand of the rural populace and that this need was a product of the previous regime's racist behaviour. A comprehensive and coordinated land reform program must be established to successfully deal with the issues of disparity, unemployment, and low standards of living brought on by "inequities of forced relocation and the historical lack of accessibility to land," according to the policy. In order to shift land from the ineffective, indebted, environmentally harmful, and largely white-dominated primary farm industry to every person who

desires to generate money through agriculture in a more responsible agrarian economy, the RDP envisioned a drastic reform program.

In order to increase both productivity and revenue, the land reform program (as envisioned by the RDP) aimed to promote the utilization of land for farming and provide valuable land (Kloppers & Pienaar, 2017). The foundation of the transformation program is the transfer of land to people who require it but cannot purchase land, as well as restitution for individuals whose land was taken from them due to the apartheid government. Land allocation, reparation, and tenure reform were cited as the three critical components of agrarian reform throughout the RDP (Carnegie ET AL., 1998). The goal of the agrarian reform program was to give those who had previously been denied the opportunity to own farmland ownership of land as well as to reinforce the property ownership of groups who had already occupied the land.

The RDP's impressive goal for distribution was the distribution of 30% of all white-owned arable land to black South Africans by 2001. Restoring property to South Africans whom racist laws and traditions had evicted since 1913 was the goal of land reparation. The administration needed to invest significant resources and build a system that facilitated land management in order to accomplish these goals (Ngam, 2021). A high proportion of South Africans had lost their land as a result of historical discriminatory policies, and in other cases, they had been forcefully removed and transferred. The growth of human capital is essential in the effort to eradicate poverty.

The main goal of the whole RDP was to offer individuals the opportunity for growth so that they could both enhance the quality of their individual lives and help improve the condition of their community (Ngam, 2021). The program recognized that although the administration had the primary duty of guaranteeing human resources development, the free market and society organizations should be enabled to actively engage in delivering educational experiences.

Recommendations

South Africa has developed different policies to redistribute land to peasant South Africans. The practical approaches used are the reconstruction and development program and Market Based Approach, which have faced different challenges in their implementation. The RDP should have redistributed 30% of land to poor Africans to eradicate poverty, give land ownership rights, increase employment, and enhance economic development. The market-based approach did not achieve its goals of land redistribution, where poor Africans would get loans and purchase land from the settlers. The program needed help in identifying sellers willing to sell their properties. In both programs, there was a need for political goodwill and government intervention to make the process succeed.

Developing an inclusive policy that will enhance land redistribution in South Africa is necessary. In places where South Africans were forcefully removed, the state should use forceful expropriations and resettle Africans in those areas. The government should also actively participate in market-led approaches. The process should involve the government playing a central role in identifying land, purchasing it, and allocating it to peasant farmers. The legislature should also develop different policies to put a price ceiling on the value of land to make it accessible to several low-income families looking to purchase land from the settlers. If the strategies are implemented, the government can achieve its objectives of poverty eradication, creating employment, and economic development.

Conclusion

The purpose of the paper was to investigate whether land redistribution can reduce inequality and poverty in South Africa.

Poverty and inequality are one of the main concerns facing many people in South Africa. It is a problem that dates back many centuries due to unequal land distribution. Since the colonial period, huge tracks of land have been under occupation by fewer people. The white population, which is fewer, has had large pieces of land for agricultural purposes. The Blacks and Indian occupy small pieces of land, rendering them poor due to unequal land distribution. The majority of rural residents in South Africa are poor since they do not have pieces of land for agricultural purposes. This problem makes this population lack land where they can practice agriculture and increase their income. According to studies examined in the systematic review, land redistribution can help reduce inequality in South Africa. Authors such as Aliber (2015) defined land redistribution as the mechanism of providing land to the poor and other marginalized groups for productive and residential purposes. Furthermore, literature has demonstrated that, while the policies of land redistribution have not been fully implemented effectively by the South African government, it is an appropriate way of solving the rising levels of inequality and poverty. Eight of the twelve articles reviewed in this paper indicate that land redistribution can indeed have a positive impact on addressing poverty, unemployment, and economic development. The articles also indicate that market-led land distribution did not achieve its intended objectives and thus a more aggressive government led land distribution approach may be what South Africa needs to witness a significant reduction in inequality and poverty.

The disproportionate allocation of land in the nation was among the initial problems the first democratically elected government had to deal with. The South African government attempted to prove its commitment to eliminating the social inequality of the past by launching a reform process backed by constitutional foundation. This program, which has three pillars—restitution, land ownership, and tenure security—has not yet been completed. The South African government initiated an ambitious agrarian reform initiative to transfer 30% of productive farm production occupied by white South Africans to black South Africans by 2014 and resolve all transfer

applications by 2005, however this was not achieved as only 10% of the intended land was redistributed and many land disputes were left unresolved. Regrettably, the land reform effort has not had much success in South Africa and additional legal measures like forcible expropriations are likely required. Finally, land redistribution can be an effective tool in addressing poverty and inequality if government commitment and political willpower accompany it.

References

Akram-Lodhi, A. H. (2007). Land, markets and neoliberal enclosure: An agrarian political economy perspective. *Third World Quarterly*, *28*(8), 1437–1456. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701637326

Aliber, M. (2015). Reducing poverty and inequality through redistributing assets, securing rights, and democratizing decision-making in rural areas. University of Fort Hare, South Africa

Besley, T., & Burgess, R. (2000). Land reform, poverty reduction, and growth: Evidence from India. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *115*(2), 389–430.https://watermark.silverchair.com/115-2-389.pdf?token=

Borras, S. M. (2003). Questioning market-led Agrarian Reform: Experiences from Brazil, Colombia, and South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *3*(3), 367–394. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0366.00059

Carnegie, J., Roos, M., Madolo, M., Moahloli, C., & Abbot, J. (1998). *The rocky road towards sustainable livelihoods: land reform in Free State, South Africa*. International Institute for Environment and Development.

Cavanagh, E. (2014). The promise of land: Undoing a century of dispossession in South Africa. *Social Dynamics*, *40*(2), 429–432. https://doi.org/10.1080/02533952.2014.932173

Dorner, P., & Thiesenhusen, W. C. (1990). Selected land reforms in east and Southeast Asia: Their origins and impacts. *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature*, *4*(1), 65–95. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8411.1990.tb00025.x

du Toit, A. (2012). Real acts, Imagined landscapes: Reflections on the discourses of land reform in South Africa after 1994. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *13*(1), 16–22. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12006

Grabowski, R. (2002). East Asia, Land Reform, and Economic Development. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue Canadienne D'études Du Développement*, *23*(1), 105–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2002.9668856

gov.za. (1997). White Paper on South African Land Policy. *Department of Land Affairs.* https://www.gov.za/sites/default/files/gcis_document/201411/whitepaperlandreform.pdf

Hall, R., & Mtero, F. (2021). Land and Agrarian Development in South Africa. *The Oxford Handbook of the South African Economy*, 239–260. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780192894199.013.12

Jacobs, P., Lahiff, E., & Hall, H. (2003). Evaluating land and agrarian reform in South Africa. Journal of Agrarian Change, 14(4), 586–592. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12082

Kloppers, H. J., & Pienaar, G. J. (2017). The historical context of land reform in South Africa and early policies. *Potchefstroom Electronic Law Journal*, 676–706. https://doi.org/10.17159/1727-3781/2014/v17i2a2183

Lahiff, E. (2007). 'willing buyer, willing seller': South Africa's failed experiment in market-led Agrarian Reform. *Third World Quarterly*, *28*(8), 1577–1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590701637417

Neves, D., & du Toit, A. (2012). Rural livelihoods in South Africa: Complexity, vulnerability and differentiation. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, *13*(1), 93–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12009

Ngam, R. N. (2021). Government-driven Land and Agrarian Reform Programmes in Post-Apartheid South Africa–A Brief History (1994-2021). *African Sociological Review/Revue Africaine de Sociologie*, 25(1), 131-152.

Ntsebeza, L. (2003). Land rights and democratisation: Rural Tenure Reform in South Africa's former Bantustans. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *52*(1), 68–95. https://doi.org/10.1353/trn.2003.0032

O'Laughlin, B., Bernstein, H., Cousins, B., & Peters, P. E. (2012). Introduction: Agrarian change, rural poverty and land reform in South Africa since 1994. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 13(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12010

Renes, J. (2009). Agrarian Transformations. In International Encyclopedia of Human Geography, Volume 1 (pp. 58-64). Elsevier, 83–89. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-102295-5.10448-2

South African History Online . (2021). Retrieved from https://www.sahistory.org.za/article/group-areas-act-1950

Sugden, F., Agarwal, B., Leder, S., Saikia, P., Raut, M., Kumar, A., & Ray, D. (2020). Experiments in farmers' collectives in eastern India and Nepal: Process, benefits, and challenges. Journal of Agrarian Change, 21(1), 90–121. https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.12369

Walker, C. (2017). The land question in South Africa: 1913 and beyond. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia of African History. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190277734.013.79