

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE IMPACT OF LAND
RESTITUTION ON SUSTAINABLE RURAL LIVELIHOODS IN
NORTH WEST PROVINCE. A CASE STUDY OF MOLOTE
VILLAGE (EASTERN DISTRICT)**

A RESEARCH REPORT

Submitted by

KHOSANA MALEBO DANIEL



060043774V

North-West University
Mafikeng Campus Library

**STUDENT NO: 10119248
SUPERVISOR: PROF. H. O. KHAYA**

**SUBMITTED AS A PARTIAL REQUIREMENT FOR A DEGREE IN
MASTER OF SOCIAL SCIENCES (SOCIOLOGY) IN THE FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH WEST
(RSA)**

08 January 2001

LIBRARY MAFIKENG CAMPUS
Call No.: TH 333.7313 2014 -08- 04 KHO
Acc. No.: NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY

Contents.

Acknowledgement	(i)
Declaration	(ii)
Abstract	(iii)
List of Tables	(iv)
Chapter One: Background of the Study	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Rationale of the Study	6
Aim and Objectives of the Study	6
Literature Review	7
Hypothesis	10
Significance of the Study	10
Methodology	11
Study Area	11
Subjects	12
Methods of Data Collection	13
Procedure	13
Data Analysis	14
Limitations of the Study	14
Ethical Considerations	15
Theoretical Perspectives	15
Organization of the Findings	18
Chapter Two: The Socio-economic and Demographic Characteristics of The Resettled Community Members in Molote Village	19

Chapter Three: The impact of Land Restitution on the Living Conditions of the Rural Households in Molote Village	24
Chapter Four: The Changes Brought by Land Restitution on the Livelihoods of the Rural People in Molote Village	28
Chapter Five: The Role of Non-Government Organizations and Government in Supporting Land Restitution to foster Sustainable Livelihoods in Molote village	31
Chapter Six: Conclusion and Recommendations	36
References	39
Annexure.	

Acknowledgement.

I would like to thank all the people who went out of their ways to help me make this research a success. My first gratitude to Prof. H.O. Kaya (Department of Sociology) who guided me through this research by opening his office doors for consultations. Secondly to the respondents in Molote village, including all the key-informants, who provided valuable information for this research. Special thanks to A. Monnakgotla (Chief of Bakubung ba Ratheo) and R.C Moloko (CPA – administrator) for their cooperation during the interview sessions and gave me access to the subjects. I also extend my thanks to E. Tau (Department of Land Affairs) and T. Mokone (TRAC) for supplying me with supplementary reading materials.

My gratitude also goes to Isaac Mokaila who assisted during data collection and Senosi Ntswaki for her inputs during the data analysis stage. I also appreciate support and advice given by O. Ntsoane during difficult times.

Thanks to my sponsor, National Research Foundation (NRF) for their financial support without which the expenses to this research would have unable me to undergo this research. However, NRF is not liable for the contents of this study and the ideas expressed in it cannot be linked to NRF.

Lastly, I dedicate this study to my mother, F.B Khosana, who encouraged me to do my Masters degree.

Declaration.

I declare that the dissertation for the Degree of Masters of Sociology at the University of North West hereby submitted, has not been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other University, that it is my own work in design and execution and all materials contained herein has been duly acknowledged.

.....
Signed: Malebo Daniel Khosana

Abstract.

Through the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994, the first democratically elected government returned land to various communities which lost land because of discriminatory Apartheid land policies. One previously dispossessed community to benefit from such land restitution policy was the Bakubung ba Ratheo of Molote village situated near Magaliesburg.

When their land was returned to them, the Bakubung were living in conditions that were below the poverty line. To redress this situation, government through its integrated rural development approach instituted specific projects designed to assist the community to be engaged in agricultural activities in order to have self sustaining livelihoods.

Despite some shortcomings such as unequal participation in the communal projects, initial outcomes showed that the community was on its way to realizing the objective of farming. This could be achieved through efforts that ensure long-term sustainability of communities such as Bakubung.

List of Tables.

Table 2.1. Percentage Distribution of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Table 2.2. Percentage Distribution of Educational Level of the percentage Distribution of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Table 2.2. Percentage Distribution of Educational Level of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Table 2.3. Percentage Distribution of Occupational Status of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Table 3.1. Percentage Distribution of the Composition of the Rural Households of the Respondent Community Members in Molote village.

Table 4.1 Percentage Distribution of the Sources of Livelihoods of the Heads of Households in Molote village.

Chapter One.

Background of the Study.

1.1 Introduction.

Throughout Africa the question of land acquisition and utilization has been a subject of controversy. Even prior to the colonial conquest of Africa by European powers land has been central to the hearts and souls of many Africans (Mazrui.1989) The relationship to the land by communities in Africa, South Africa included, turned bitter during the colonial era. In the case of South Africa land encroachment by imperial powers resulted in the passing of the 1913 Land Act which dispossessed the majority of Africans (South African Year Book, 1999).This Act brought inequality, injustice and terrible division among many black communities. For instance South Africa has been characterized by unequal access to land among its citizens. This emanates from the fact that in this country White minorities, who are economically and politically powerful, enjoy extensive land ownership. In this regard land is owned by minority white people who are predominantly commercial farmers in South Africa to the disadvantage of majority of black people who only occupy small portions of land.

The apartheid system used racial policies to distribute land to South Africans. These policies gave Whites access to large acres of productive land while Blacks were denied land ownership let alone access to productive land. The statutes that did injustice to Blacks include Native Land Act of 1913, Group Areas Act of 1950 and 1966, etc. These statutes deprived Blacks their rights to own land and freedom to fully participate in better socio-economic activities that would enhance their livelihoods.

Chambers (1993) refers to livelihoods as the means of gaining a living or the means of earning money to live on. Employment can provide a livelihood but most livelihoods of the poor are based on the multiple activities and sources of food, income and security. On those grounds blacks in South Africa lack these means, particularly land. "It became evident that from the time that white settlers arrived in South Africa, black people faced

increasing landlessness, poverty and insecurity on the land due to racial laws” (Land Reform Programme, 1998: 8).

Subsequently, Ramphela, et al (1991:3), argue that due to massive forced removals that took place, stable communities were uprooted and compelled to settle in unsuitable areas. Through this unjust laws, people were separated from their natural environment, which provided them with basic needs such as free access to natural resources like water, food stuffs and material used for shelter and provision for other amenities. This situation forced Blacks to live under unbearable conditions without sustainable livelihoods.

Blacks were forcefully removed without their concern and were located at what was known as ‘black spot’ in the former homelands. Since this force removals were not according to proper land use plan, shortage of natural resources such as land, water, fuel energy etc were depleted due to overcrowding. During this condition competition among people becomes too fierce for natural resources especially land. Popenoe (1995: 445) points out that as human beings adapt, they compete among themselves and with other life forms for the use of scarce resources.

May, et al (1998) further defined livelihood strategies that include some combination of the following income-generating activities: agriculture; self-employment in small and micro-enterprises; wage labour; legal claims against the state, such as pensions; claims against employers. Several other types of income-earning activities may include paid domestic labour, illegitimate activities (such as drug trafficking, prostitution and petty theft), the sale of household assets, and use of the environment (such as for cultivation, grazing, fishing, and as a water source)

According to UNDP (1999); conceptually livelihoods connote the means, activities, entitlements and assets by which people make a living. Assets, in this particular context, are defined as not only natural/biological (i.e., land, water, common-property resource, flora, fauna), but also social and political (i.e., community, family, social networks, participation empowerment, human (i.e., knowledge, creation by skills), and physical

(i.e., roads, markets, clinics, schools, bridges). Such a developmental plans can most suitably be implemented in communities that own land.

Given the above, land restitution should not only be viewed as a method of giving back the dispossessed land to its rightful owners, but as a way of sustaining their livelihoods. In other words, having access to their land should place them in a position to continuously fend for themselves and their families through land utilization.

The advent of the new South African government of national unity in 1994 brought changes in the social, political and economic lives of South Africans. In order to tackle racial imbalances pertaining to land ownership and rights, land reform policy was formulated and old laws amended. This policy consists of three main components i.e., land redistribution, land tenure and land restitution. This study investigated the land restitution's impact on sustainable rural livelihoods with special focus on opportunities created by the new laws and policies in South Africa.

Further, land reform policies are necessary in South Africa because development and better life depend on land utilization. Land as a natural resource is capable of providing material needs such as food from land cultivation and specific soil and grasses to make building material for shelter, etc. In this manner, land ownership in developing countries such as South Africa determines livelihoods. This is attributed to the fact that (Zetterstein: 1983: 17), God has given [people] the land, and it is from the land that [they] get raw materials which [they] reshape to meet [their] needs. Be it as it may, there is still poverty in rural areas due to declining livelihoods.

Sustainable livelihoods interrelate with humans' rights to own land and its resources. Therefore, if people are landless they cannot achieve rural strategies that enhance sustainable livelihoods. These strategies "involve a variety of different household members in such activities as home gardening, exploiting common property resources, share - rearing livestock, family splitting, and stinting ... (United Nations Development

Programme: 1999). In this sense giving land back to the people who were historically dispossessed of their land, is a necessity for sustainable rural livelihoods.

Legislature and courts in South Africa have tackled landlessness, particularly among the people who were previously dispossessed of their land by passing the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994. The South African Parliament passed the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994, to restore or compensate people for land rights they lost because of racially discriminatory laws passed since 19 June 1913. Restitution can mean restoring the land itself or providing alternative land or monetary compensation or other relief (Land reform Programme: 1998: 19).

However, there were rural areas where the previously dispossessed people used unlawful means to regain their land back in South Africa. Although Goedgevonden, a village near Ventersdorp (North-West Province) was not a brief for this study; it serves as an example of unlawful occupation of land. Goedgevonden community members, like Bakubung, (Jacobs, 1997) were forcefully removed over a period from 1976/77 to 1979. Some were dumped near Rustenburg and the remaining people were removed to Vrisgewacht, which was incorporated into Bophuthatswana in 1983.

On the 9th April 1991, 450 members of the Goedgevonden community reoccupied the land. Court cases were brought against them by the Government and white farmers (who had been allowed to lease the land after incorporation into Bophuthatswana) and an attack by white right wingers did not weaken the resolve of the community and they stayed on the land up to date. As a result they stayed on their land without secure tenure until their land restitution claim, which was on the hands of the land courts has been finalised. Lack of protection by land reform Acts enshrined in the land restitution policies disrupt developments in this rural area because there are no proper channels to follow in bringing developments and bridging conflicts among the residents in terms of sharing land among themselves. Such communities could not get redress for injustices that were inflicted on them by the past discriminatory policies.

Despite the fact that there are proper mechanisms of giving the people (particularly the previously dispossessed), their land back in the North West Province and other provinces in South Africa, there are problems concerning how livelihoods in rural areas, especially where land restitution has occurred, can be improved. This study investigated land restitution's impact on sustainable rural livelihoods in North West Province (South Africa) a case of Molote Village.

Molote village, a community of Bakubung ba Ratheo tribe were dispossessed of their land which they occupied since 1785. Framework Development Plan (1999: 5) points out that Bakubung ba Ratheo tribe was forcefully removed from their ancestral land in 1966 as a result of the former South African Government's forced removal legislation. Ever since the removal of the community, the Bakubung have been scattered and divided in several different locations. A large portion of the community was relocated to Ledig near Rustenburg, but others settled in areas like Johannesburg, Pretoria and elsewhere throughout South Africa. After the coming into power of the new democratic South African government, the Bakubung tribe was granted permission to re-occupy their ancestral land in March 1994. This was enabled by the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 22 of 1994.

Statement of the Problem.

The statement of the problem in this study was made out of the research questions rather than declaratory statements. The following research questions were used to guide the researcher in formulating the objectives of the study and the potential outlook of the chapters of this study.

- What are the impact of land restitution on the living conditions of the rural households in terms of food, shelter, etc in Molote village ?
- Did land restitution bring changes to the rural people's livelihoods in terms of increasing survival strategies such as subsistence and commercial farming, employment, etc. in the study area?
- What is the role of non- government organizations in terms of supporting land restitution to foster sustainable rural livelihoods in the study area?

- What are the government policy strategies, programmes and financial assistance methods instituted to support land restitution in terms of fostering sustainable rural livelihoods in the study area?

1.2 Rationale of the Study.

Restoring the previously dispossessed land to its rightful owners has been conducted from 1995 up to date in South Africa. However, its impact on the resettled people's livelihoods particularly in rural areas was and is still not adequately studied. In other words, land, as a resourceful asset should contribute to the social welfare of the rural people by providing them with more strategies of subsistence to meet their basic needs after land restitution programmes have been applied. This study therefore investigated how the restituted land was used and the role of the government to this effect in North West Province.

1.3. Aim and Objectives of the Study.

1.3.1 Aim.

The study investigated the impact of land restitution on sustainable rural livelihoods in North West Province in terms of improving the means of survival such as employment opportunities, subsistence and commercial farming, etc. with specific reference to Molote community.

1.3.2 Objectives of the Study.

The study looked at the following specific objectives:

- The impact of land restitution on the living conditions of the rural households in terms of food, shelter, etc. in Molote.
- Changes brought by land restitution on the livelihoods of the rural people in terms of increasing their survival strategies such as subsistence and commercial farming, employment opportunity, etc in the study area.
- The role of non-government organizations in terms of supporting land restitution to foster sustainable rural livelihoods in Molote.

- The government development policy strategies, programmes and financial assistance methods instituted to support land restitution in terms of fostering sustainable rural livelihoods in the study area.

1.4. Literature Review.

It was necessary to review related literature because it gave more insight into the problems that were caused by land disposessions and how land restitution can help in this matter on the basis of the fact that land restitution can improve rural livelihoods. It also enabled the researcher to see how other researchers have dealt with this problem. Consequently, the research could fill the gaps that were left by previous researchers. Moreover, the research advanced a debate on the land question and its effect on sustainable rural livelihoods particularly of the people who were previously dispossessed of their land.

Restitution of Land rights Act 22, of 1994, is important for the South Africans who were previously dispossessed of their land in the sense that restoration of their land enables them to gain the means of subsistence, i.e., livelihoods from the land. Thus, land restitution process is justified by the South African Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, Thokozile Didiza (in Annual Report: 2000: 2), from the view that it (land restitution process entrenched in the Restitution of Land Rights Act), provide for the restitution of land rights of all the dispossessed persons...on the one hand, while guaranteeing the protection of property rights, enjoyed exclusively by only a few white people, over decades on the other hand.

The word livelihood, i.e. the means of support or subsistence, according to Chambers (1993: 146) can include food, health, a strong family, wealth and income. It can be described as a level of wealth and of stocks and flows of food and cash, which provide for physical and social wellbeing and security against impoverishment.

United Nations Development (1999) points out that the idea of sustainable livelihoods began as an approach to maintain or enhance resource productivity, secure ownership of

and access to assets, resources and income - earning activities as well as to ensure adequate stocks and flows of food and cash to meet basic needs...

Given the above, it becomes evident that the people in the restituted lands, e.g. Molote community depends on land and its resources for survival of the community members. On those ground it should be highlighted Adams, et al (1999: 4) that for those who rely on local rural resources for their livelihoods, a secure place to live, free from threat of eviction, with access to productive land and natural resources are essential... As such, Molote community enjoy secure land tenure derived from land reform policies.

In the context of Goedgevonden in North West Province, land ownership is not secure. This stems from the fact that this farming community settles in the state owned land. The implication thereof, is that they do not legally own the land despite the fact that they have been granted the rights to settle on it. Consequently, they lack access to assets, which is one of the prerequisites for sustainable livelihoods.

However, not all the claims qualify for land restitution. This emanates from the fact that there are two institutions, which were vested with the responsibility of assisting during the land restitution process by the Restitution of Land Rights Act of 1994, i.e., the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights and the Land Claims court. The White Paper on South African Land Policy (1997: X1) states that a restitution claim qualifies for investigation by the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights provided the claimant was dispossessed of a right in land after 19 June 1913, as a result of racially discriminatory laws or practices, or was not paid a just and equitable compensation. The Commission on Restitution of Land Rights' task is to deal with all claims for restitution of land.

The land dispossession cases that took place prior 1913 are the responsibility of the Minister of Land Affairs. It was argued in (White Paper on South African Land Policy: 1997: X1) that the claims arising from dispossession before 1913 may be accommodated by the Minister in terms of preferential status in the Land Redistribution Programme

providing that claimants are disadvantaged and will benefit in a sustainable manner from the support.

The Land Claims Court on the other hand is responsible for reviewing negotiated solutions. Land Reform Programme (1998: 21) points out that this court also reviews the Minister's decision on feasibility. If accepted, the settlement is made legally binding through a Court Order. The court can order the restitution of land rights in the form of:

- return of the original land
- alternative land
- monetary compensation
- other alternative relief comprising a combination of the above
- priority access to government housing and land development programmes.

Given the above, the South African Minister of Land Affairs, Thokozile Didiza (in Annual Report: 2000: 2) argues that she is charged with the responsibility to deliver land for development and change the structure of land ownership in South Africa, in the context of the existing constitutional and legislative framework within which land reform is taking place in general, and land restitution in particular.

There is a belief among experts (or officials) in the department of land affairs (South Africa) including Thoko Didiza, that since the inception of the land reform policies and programmes, especially land restitution, restoration of land has been a success. However, one tends to ask him or herself whether this contention is valid or not? If valid, it means the standard of living of the people in the restored land should improve. Are there chances of improvements as far as their livelihoods are concerned? These questions surface because cases might arise whereby land is restored to the communities that cannot adequately use it to sustain their livelihoods. Consequently, the people in such land become more impoverished.

According to the South African Chief Land Claims Commissioner Adv. Wallace Mgoqi (in Annual Report: 2000: 4), the experience of Riemvasmaak is a good example. He

points out that little regard was given to what happens after people, coming from different and divergent life experiences, are restored to land. Both the minister and land claims court now insist on development and resettlement plans as a prerequisite for finalizing a land restitution claim where people are restored to previously dispossessed land.

This idea will reduce the problems that the people experience on their return to their original lands in terms of improving their livelihoods and gaining the rewards of land restitution. "The greatest reward and impact on improving the livelihoods ... will come through investment in the infrastructure, and access to markets, so creating sustainable livelihoods" (International Agricultural Development: 1999: 4).

1.5. Hypothesis.

Land restitution is likely to bring changes on the livelihoods of the rural people in terms of increasing the survival strategies such as subsistence and commercial farming, employment, etc in the study areas.

1.6. Significance of the Study.

This study was significant in the sense that various organizations both government and non- governmental including the community of Molote would benefit from it. It would assist these beneficiaries as follows:

- It would provide information on how restituted land can be used to improve rural livelihoods to the Community Based Organizations (CBOs) in the study area. They, in turn, will disseminate it to the resettled people.
- It will enlighten various government departments in collaboration with Non - governmental organizations (NGOs) and on how to back up or support the land restitution process with rigorous development strategies and programmes that have the capability to improve the livelihoods in the restored rural areas.
- Provide information to the Department of Sociology and students pertaining to how land restitution can have an impact on sustainable rural livelihoods.

1.7. Methodology.

This was a case study investigating the impact of land restitution on sustainable rural livelihoods in Molote village (Eastern District) in North West Province (South Africa). A case study enabled the researcher to get a comprehensive understanding of the problem in the rural area under study, i.e., Molote village. Further, the study used the triangulation methods, i.e. qualitative and quantitative research methods. A combination of these methods was used to get a detailed examination of the problem under investigation.

1.7.1 Study area.

The area selected for this study was Molote village near Koster (in North West Province). The area was selected on the basis of the resettled people's duration of settlement in their previously dispossessed lands after land restitution has been executed. For instance Molote community members were resettled in 1994. As such it will be less difficult to investigate the impact that land restitution have made on the people's livelihoods in this rural community. This was based on the fact that Molote residents, i.e. Bakubung ba Ratheo, have been resettled in their restituted land for several years.

Further, land restitution process occurred in the study area through land restitution courts unlike violent settlement procedures. Molote village also known as Molote City, was chosen because of the following reasons. Firstly, its land was previously dispossessed by the apartheid regime from its inhabitants. Consequently, the government had to intervene to address this injustice. This made Molote village a restitution case which was handled by the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights and Land Claims Court.

Secondly, all the procedures involved in a restitution process were followed to enable the government and other stakeholders to develop the community. Developments involved providing infrastructure such as installing electricity, housing, water supply, telecommunication, etc which would enable the resettled people to establish their livelihoods. The procedures also involved establishing a Communal Property Association (CPA) which was currently being registered. As such an Executive

Committee was elected to act as governing body of the CPA and to facilitate the development process.

The Communal Property Associations Act 28 of 1996 requires CPAs to be juristic persons “in order to acquire, hold and manage property on a basis agreed to by members of a community in terms of a written constitution, and to provide for matters connected therewith”.

Moreover, drawing a business plan was also among the required procedures required that was followed by Bakubung/Molote community. This was done in order to facilitate developments in accordance with the principles of land restitution programme. The business plan relates specifically to the restitution claim of the returning households. Therefore all time plans, funding plans for both current and returning residents was concurrent planning to prevent possible conflicts and confusion.

Prior forced removal in 1966 Molote was a traditional rural area comprising of traditional institutions such as tribal chieftaincy, which oversees that the community operates harmoniously. However, with the advent of the new South African dispensation tribal chieftaincy started to loose meaning in Molote City. Despite that the chief of Molote was elected to serve in the village Executive Committee.

Thirdly, the livelihoods in Molote are likely to be derived from land use. This call for research to find out whether restoring land to the Molote community use land to achieve their livelihoods or not.

1.7.2 Subjects

The study comprised the following subjects:

- A random sample of 50 respondents from the community under study, i.e. Molote village, consisting of male and female adults from 18 years and above. They provided valuable qualitative information that have shown whether their conditions of living has changed since their land was restored as well as the effects of land on their

sustainable rural livelihoods in terms of improvements in the strategies of meeting their needs.

- The key – persons were the village Chief and his tribal officials, village committee members, etc in the rural area under study, government departments and NGOs' and other relevant stakeholders, e.g., District Councils, etc. They gave valuable information pertaining to the development initiatives from their respective departments and organizations, particularly those that can have information pertaining to the impact of land restitution on rural livelihoods.

The statistical characteristics of the respondent community members in Molote village were recorded on the tables in the following way:

Molote: (N= 50)

Molote: Males (N = 25) Females (N = 25).

1.7.3 Methods of Data Collection.

A combination of data collection methods was used in this study.

- A questionnaire for the randomly selected respondents in Molote village.
- An interview schedule for the key – persons.
- Focus groups comprising of six to ten participants from the chosen study sample. A combination of data collection methods was used to enable the researcher to cross-check the data to ensure its reliability and validity.

1.7.4 Procedure.

A letter of introduction issued by the department of Sociology at University of North West was used to introduce the research to the Chiefs and their tribal authorities, relevant local councils, committees as well as the subjects in the study areas. This was done to enable the researcher to gain access to the population, i.e., subjects and key– persons (i.e. respondents) selected from the sample.

1.7.5 Data Analysis.

Data analysis followed both qualitative and quantitative approaches because a combination of data collection methods, which was used prior to this stage, had extracted huge data from the respondents. Thus, qualitative data such as the respondents' views on the impact of land restitution on sustainable rural livelihoods, etc. is subjected to content analysis. This implies that this data is treated in themes, i.e. thematic expressions.

Quantitative data, on the other hand, inclusive of statistics from the key – persons is subjected to descriptive analysis. Therefore, tables were used to analyze quantitative data, e.g. univariate, bivariate, etc.

1.7.6. Limitations of the Study.

The study confronted unresponsive and non-cooperative respondents among the sample during data collection stage in particular. Such respondents could not answer all the questions in the questionnaire. Some key- informants were also unwilling to be interviewed or provide relevant assistance to the researcher. For instance some had a tendency to deny the researcher access to written documents relevant to the study.

Time- frame allocated for this investigation also posed as a limitation to the study based on the fact that the researcher was a full time post-graduate doing course work. Therefore there was insufficient time to follow all the components of the research process. Geographical location of the study area also posed as a limitation. The researcher resides in Mafikeng which is far from Molote located near Magaliesburg. However, the researcher managed to get all the potential respondents.

Further, the data collected was not representative enough to all the residents in the village due to absent community members. This stems from the fact that some community members do not stay in this rural area on a full time basis. They were not available to give their responses. For e.g. domestic workers, literate professionals who are employed in big corporations in Johannesburg and other towns in South Africa, youth who are at

tertiary educational institutions and those who moved to urban areas to seek employment opportunities.

1.7.7. Ethical Considerations.

Despite unresponsive, non-cooperative respondents including those who were unwilling to offer assistance during this research process, they were not obliged or forced to participate in this study. They received a thorough explanation of the objectives of this study and how important and valuable is their participation. This aroused their interests to participate out of free-will.

Furthermore, no respondent was bribed for his/her participation. The researcher did not buy any favours from the key-persons or authorities to get access to the respondents or any assistance. Thus, the researcher took the ethics of social science research into consideration throughout the process of this investigation.

1.7.8. Theoretical Perspectives.

This study is approached from a conflict perspective based on the fact that the land issue is sensitive. Its sensitivity arises out of the historical deprivation and denial by the apartheid regime for blacks to possess land. The Land Act of 1913 was central in dispossessing the rural people of their land, which is the most important resource for achievement of sustainable livelihoods. However, functionalist perspective will also be included due to the fact that solutions to the social problems cannot be advanced from one social perspective.

The problem of declining livelihoods particularly in rural areas has arisen due to the power relations between whites and blacks in terms of land ownership. Their relations were characterized by racial discrimination policies that catered for the needs of whites while jeopardizing those of the blacks. Bernstein, et al (1992) argued that in South Africa, while commercial farming by Europeans was heavily subsidized, restrictions on land purchase or leasing increasingly confined Africans to the 'reserves' where gross overcrowding and reinvention of traditional land tenure ensured that individual holdings

were too small to provide a living, and wage labour in the mines or on European farms became inescapable. Thus, conflict between blacks and whites was made inevitable.

Social divisions between whites and blacks in South Africa, i.e., classes in Marxist terms (Haralambos and Holborn, 1991: 786); resulted from the differing relationships of members of society to the means of production. The structure of all society may be represented in terms of a simplified two class model consisting of a ruling class and subject class. The ruling class owes its dominance and power to its ownership and control of the means of production. The subjection and relative powerlessness of the subject class is due to its lack of control of the means of production.

Given the above, it become evident that land dispossessions in South Africa were the whites' aim to attain their material needs. In this sense South Africa portrayed the Marxist materialist view, which individuals apply to pursue their selfish interests. The whites control the means of production, i.e., raw materials found on the land, which was previously owned by blacks. On the contrary, blacks form the bulk of their workforce. In other words they contribute to the productions and profits realized by whites. Since blacks have no control over the means of production, they are forced to sell their labour to the white farms and industries. They do this in order to obtain their interests, i.e., basic needs. This perpetuates conflict between whites and blacks over survival strategies.

However, in functionalist terms, the labour situation does not reflect 'forced labour' in the sense that blacks are supposed to work in order to achieve their needs. As such, work is a necessity on the basis of social values that are agreed upon by the members of the society, i.e. value consensus. Haralambos and Holborn (1991:773) argue that value consensus forms the fundamental integrating principle in society if members of society are committed to the same values, they will tend to share a common identity, which provides for a basis for unity and cooperation. They go on to argue that from shared values derive common goals. Values provide a general conception of what is desirable and worthwhile.

Given the above, it is desirable for blacks to work because achievement of their goals depend on those who have the means of production. Similarly, those who own the means of production depend on black workers for attainment of their goals too. In this sense social stability depend on interrelated functions of the parts of the society. For instance, government depends on farmers for the country's economic growth; the farmer depends on the government for subsidies and loans to carry on their agricultural activities on a continuous basis. Thus, the conflict that might arise would have solutions (Parsons cited in Haralambos and Holborn, 1991: 774), which must be organized in the form of ordered, stable social institutions, which persist through time.

However, ownership of the means of production devolved more power to the whites to an extent that their (Haralambos and Holborn, 1991: 783) control over the environment increase[d]. Control over the environment enabled whites to gain their livelihoods at the expense of blacks. For instance they controlled blacks in terms of where to stay, e.g in overcrowded "homelands" which deplete natural resources.

The post apartheid South African government intervened to address the land issue in an equitable way with land reform and its restitution programmes, which give the dispossessed people their land back. This laissez faire intervention was an attempt to enable blacks to improve their rural livelihoods. However, conflict seems to arise from this approach, which appear to be unfair to those (whites) who dispossessed blacks in the last century. Mushi (1999: 21) points out that land reform, especially restitution is about livelihoods, if it fails, the lives of the ordinary people will never change. Without intervention from the government and other role players, land reform will just become another failure.

In employing the conflict overview to the land restitution society become much more complex. This results from inequalities from the past land management and control that is currently experienced by the resettled people. Prior to their forceful removal they were not a homogenous group in terms of economic status, privileges, etc. Unfortunately, for Marxist view of two antagonistic classes, there will be more than two groups when they

return to their land. Max Weber's rejection of Marxist view of two-class model emphasizes that (in Haralambos and Holborn, 1991:793) social structure consists of many groups, not just two classes. The resettled communities are more heterogeneous and susceptible to conflict than before. For example, a particular group might strive for greater prestige or status rather than economic power.

This situation is evident in South Africa where among the resettled people there are rich peasants and poor peasants and those who need land only for shelter. In this regard their interests are heterogeneous. Thus, land restitution may not be solely for achieving rural livelihoods.

1.7.9. Tentative Organization of the findings.

- Chapter One provides introduction which includes background of the study and the methodology that was pursued.
- Chapter Two examines the demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the resettled people such as their level of education, occupation status, etc.
- Chapter Three focuses on the impact of land restitution on the living conditions of the rural households in terms of food, shelter, etc. in Molote village.
- Chapter Four focuses on the changes brought by land restitution on the livelihoods of the rural people in terms of increasing their survival strategies such as subsistence and commercial farming, employment opportunities, etc in Molote village
- Chapter Five looks at the role of non-government organizations' in terms of supporting land restitution. It also examines the government development policy strategies, programmes and financial assistance methods instituted to support land restitution in terms of fostering sustainable rural livelihoods in Molote village.
- Chapter Six provides recommendations and conclusion of the study.

Chapter Two.

The Socio – Economic and Demographic Characteristics of the Resettled Community Members in Molote Village.

Sustainable rural livelihood in the restored lands, particularly in Molote was handled differently by people. In other words, they were involved in different socio-economic activities to make living. This situation was perpetuated by the different socio-economic activities they adopted from the areas in which they were relocated by the apartheid regime. Some of these activities were not realized from interacting with the natural environment, especially land. For instance they were employed in industries, cafes, domestic service, etc in alien areas such as Ledig, Rustenburg, etc (ex Molote inhabitants). But a minority number of the people removed from Molote worked in white owned farms.

Subsequently, as they return back to their ancestral lands, they were compelled to practise these acquired socio-economic activities to achieve their livelihoods. This became a catastrophe for some due to lack of industries, cafes, etc where they can get employment for survival in their restored communities. In this manner, most of the respondents in the restored communities were impoverished. This chapter presents the socio-economic characteristics of the resettled community members in both Molote village in terms of age distribution, educational levels and their occupational status.

2.1 Age Distribution.

There were various age groups in Molote as it is a norm in modern societies. The age groups range from children aged 0 – 12 years, teenagers, youth, adults and the elders. This posed as an indication that the communities under study have the necessary requirements for ensuring progress of their rural economies. In other words there were able-bodied (or energetic) youth and adults who can utilize the restituted land for the basic needs of their societies.

Further, with land in their disposal, the matured age groups can see to it that the dependent age groups (i.e children) get access to healthy food and grow in a nurturing

environment. However, this study concentrated mainly on adults aged 18 and above. table 2.1 below gives the percentage age distribution of the respondent community members in Molote villages.

Table 2.1. Percentage Age Distribution of the Respondent Community Members in Molote

Age Distribution	Molote	
	Males	Females
18 – 24	16	4
25 – 30	20	8
31 – 36	8	48
36 +	56	40
TOTAL	100	100

Table 2.1 above shows that the respondent community members aged 37 and above, were dominant among males in the rural community under study. This implies that most of the adult community members in this age group had experienced forced removals from their areas several decades ago. As such they are conversant with the impact that land restitution have had on their dispossessed lands.

Further males are dominant in Molote village with 16% in the 18–24 and 20% in the 25 – 30 age range. On the other hand females made only 4% in the 18–24 category and 8% in the 25 – 30 age range. Women were dominant over males with 48% in the 31–36 age range.

The above statement implies that there were more energetic males in Molote from 18 to 30 years. This means that there was more labour power in Molote village. Although there were more women from 31 years and above, they could not influence the rural economy through their interaction with nature, i.e land. This stems from the fact that they were approaching the old age stage which gradually reduce their participation in the socio-economic activities. Kimmel (1990: 315) hypothesized that as individuals age they

simultaneously are released from social roles. Hence women in Molote, in their late 30s would not be in a position to be engaged in agrarian activities that need machineries such as tractors, etc and chemicals such as fertilizers for ploughing.

2.2 Educational Level.

Haralambos (1985) emphasizes that education fosters personal development and self-fulfillment. It encourages the individual to develop his mental, physical, emotional and spiritual talents to the full. Education equips the people with knowledge and tactics of survival and self-reliance. The study of educational level of the respondents community was important since rural livelihoods depend on the expertise (i.e. know-how) and training that the community members possess from the educational institutions. As such, in order for land restitution to have positive impact on sustainable rural livelihoods, the community members should possess education both formal and informal to enable them to improve their livelihoods.

Table 2.2 Percentage distribution of Educational Level of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Educational Level	Molote	
	Males	Females
No schooling	24	0
Primary	28	80
Secondary	48	20
Tertiary	0	0
TOTAL	100	100

According to table 2.2, the highest educational level that was reached by most of the respondent community members in both villages is secondary school. Secondary school in this regard encompasses those who did standard 6 up to standard 10. However, there were some who broke away from school before reaching standard 10 among the respondents.

Male respondent community members outperformed the female as far as education is concerned in Molote village. Forty percent (40%) of the males in this village had secondary education. On the other hand only 20% among females in had managed to reach secondary education. However, in the primary category, i.e. the lowest educational level, female respondents were dominating the males with 80% in Molote. The males whose education ended in primary made 28%. Twenty four percent of males in did not go to school at all, while there were no females in this category.

The above implies that males were in a better chance of getting employment opportunities as a livelihood than women. This stems from the fact that in both villages a larger number of men had reached secondary educational level, which devolved tactics and skills of creating survival strategies for themselves.

2.3 Occupational Status.

Employment is one of the strategies involved in sustaining rural livelihoods. Given the fact that majority of the population in the rural areas has received education up to secondary level, it become evident that employment is scarce in rural areas. Occupational chances in rural areas are derived mainly from agricultural activities. But most of the rural people have no skills for agricultural activities. It therefore becomes difficult for the rural people to be engaged in these activities. Table 2.3 below gives the percentage distribution of occupational status of the respondent community members in Molote.

Table 2.3 Percentage Distribution of Occupational Status of the Respondent Community Members in Molote.

Occupational Status	Molote	
	Males	Females
Farm worker	24	0
Domestic worker	0	12
Self-employed	20	16
Unemployed	56	72
TOTAL	100	100

Table 2.3 shows that unemployment is high in the rural area under study. It is evident that females were the most affected with 72%. In other words, these women were not involved in any socio-economic activities for their livelihoods. Women who were involved in domestic work made only 8% in the study area. Men were not involved in the domestic employment sector due to the perception that domestic work is women's domain. Those who were self-employed made 16%. Women were not involved in farm work in both villages.

Men were also affected by unemployment although not in large numbers like women. Twenty five percent of men in Molote were farm workers, while 17% were self-employed in both agricultural and non-agricultural activities. This implies that the restored land was adequately used in terms of achieving livelihoods.

Chapter Three.

The Impact of Land Restitution on the Living Conditions of the Rural Households in Molote Village.

The living conditions indicate the status of the people's welfare. This includes their access to basic necessities such as food, shelter, clothing, health and education. The living conditions of the respondents in Molote village will be the yardstick to measure the impact that land restitution had had on their livelihoods. This chapter focus on the impact of land restitution on the living conditions of the rural households in terms of food, shelter, etc in Molote village.

Bernstein (1992:90) refers to a household as the basic unit of within which people live. Similarly, Brown and Forde (1990) define household as a group of people occupying the same hut or house. It consists basically of a man with his wife and their unmarried children, but often also includes one or more married sons, brothers, or even daughters with their respective spouses and children.

The able-bodied adults within the households have the responsibility to see to it that the restored land is utilized to improve the living conditions of members of their households, particularly their dependants. On those grounds this study found that there were households that were led by both males and females in Molote. These households consisted of male and female dependants including children, youth and elders. The heads of households acted as bread winners in order to secure better living conditions for the dependants within their households. Table 3.1 below gives the percentage distribution of the composition of the rural households of the respondent community members in Molote.

Table 3.1 Percentage Distribution of the Composition of the Rural Households of the Respondent Community Members in Molote Village.

Composition of Household	Molote Village	
	Male	Female
Breadwinner	56	84
Dependants	44	16
Total	100	100

Table 3.1 above shows that 84% of the respondent community members in Molote were female heads of households and 56% were male heads. The heads of households as breadwinners were tasked to provide their households with basic necessities such as food, clothing and shelter or housing. In addition, 44% males and 16% females were dependants in the study area. They depended on their heads of households' incomes for food and other basic needs.

It becomes evident from the above table that majority of the households were headed by females in Molote. This implies that majority of households headed by females were facing living conditions which were beyond poverty line. This stemmed from the fact that most of the women in Molote were unemployed (see table 2.3). The respondent community members pointed out that women were not given access to large hectares of land to plough apart from their backyards. They argued that as a result of that, they get food from their backyard garden plots. Others pointed out that pension grants for some elders enable them to purchase food at the shops.

Given the above, Molote villagers argued that they relied on shops as sources of food. Apart from the pension grants, some female heads who were involved in domestic work could buy food with their wages. The self-employed heads of households who generate income with this socio-economic activity could also buy food. Their reliance on shops for food rather than producing from their land was caused by the fact that they could not produce basic consumption goods such as salt, cooking oil, soap, etc, from the land.

This implies that farming activities such as cultivation of garden plots, ploughing fields and livestock were sources of food for a small number of households in this community. Despite the fact that majority of the heads of households relied on shops for food, there were some heads of households who used their restored land for food production. Food produced from from cultivating backyard garden plots, ploughing fields and livestock keeping would not be possible without land restitution.

3.3 Health and Housing.

Health and housing are issues that needs to be considered when the previously dispossessed people get their land back. The World Health Organization cited in Bernstein (1992: 218) defines health as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being. On those grounds, being healthy means not being sick, and on a day to day basis most biomedically trained professionals working for health programmes... provide health services to the society.

The respondent community members in Molote highlighted that there were non health facilities in their community. They had to travel to Mathopestad which is 16 kilometres away from Molote for health services. According to them, an alternative was Koster, which is approximately 50 kilometres and Magalieburg with 42 kilometres away.

Similarly, housing was also a problem in the study area. This arise from the fact that 72% of the houses in Molote were one roomed cement houses and the remaining 28% were shacks. Despite that housing was not worse in Molote like in other rural areas in the province. The administrator of the CPA in Molote pointed out that these one roomed house were an attempt to remove the residents out of the shacks into better houses. This was enabled by the settlement grant from the Department of Land Affairs to support land restitution in terms of improving housing.

3.3 Education.

There were no adequate educational facilities in Molote village. An old house was used as a primary school which ended in standard 5. The respondent community members in

Molote pointed out that children who passed to standard 6 went to Mathopestad schools on a daily basis. The respondent community members therefore argued that their children had problems to get education. This was due to the fact that they had to travel long distances, i.e. 16 kilometres, on foot to school.

Molote had no access to tertiary education. Community members who need to acquire tertiary education were compelled to move to Johannesburg, Potchefstroom and Mafikeng. The respondent community members argued that community members who were lucky to acquire tertiary education after the forced removal were not in the village.

Chapter Four

The Changes Brought By Land Restitution on the Livelihoods of the Rural People in Molote village.

The changes brought by land restitution on the means of subsistence, i.e. livelihoods of the rural people who were previously dispossessed of their land, are determined by the ways in which they approach their restored land to realize their livelihoods. In this regard socio-economic activities would put more emphasis on farming activities. This is due to the fact that farming activities are derived from the land. This chapter focuses on the changes brought by land restitution on the livelihoods of the rural people in terms of increasing their survival strategies from their land.

Land restitution can enhance non -farming activities which could boost the rural livelihoods. For example, employment opportunities could be created for the local people in sectors such as health, education, and small business. The services from this sectors are necessary in the resettled communities as they enable them to meet their basic needs.

The livelihoods of the respondent community members in Molote village were maintained by sources of livelihoods of the heads of households. This sources were entitlements to pension grants, involvement in agricultural and non-agricultural activities on the restituted land and wage employment elsewhere. Table 4.1 below gives the percentage distribution of the sources of livelihoods of the household heads in Molote.

Table 4.1 Percentage Distribution of the Sources of Livelihoods of the Heads of Households in Molote Village.

Sources of Livelihoods	Heads of Households
Pension grants	44
Wage employment elsewhere	16
Agricultural activities	24
Self employment *	8
Casual work*	8
Hunting	0
TOTAL	100

*Sources of livelihoods that constitute non-agricultural activities.

Table 4.1 below shows that pension grants was the primary source of livelihood for 44% heads of households in Molote. Despite that, pension grant is not a land restitution grant. However, it was important for the resettled household heads who were legible for receiving it. The respondent community members in Molote pointed out that it was important because on their arrival at the restored land, there were no sustainable sources of livelihoods particularly those that are derived from usage of the land.

On the other hand 16% of the respondent heads of households in the study area were employed for wages in the neighbouring towns and farms. For example in Koster and Magaliesburg. This implies that some heads of households did not return to their land in order to use it as a livelihood. They pointed out that they use it for better shelter for their household. These respondent heads of households argued that they are not congested in their village as they used to be while they were living in Vrisgewacht and other areas where they were dumped during forced removals.

Despite the above, wage employment within the study area was a way of living for some local people. Wage employment was revolving around non-agricultural activities which includes teaching in Molote. For example, there were teachers who worked at a local primary school. The Chief of Molote pointed out that although the building that housed the school was dilapidated, it received support from the North West department of education in terms of resources and manpower. He further argued that this was a short-term attempt to give education to the young children while they were waiting for the government to build a school for them.

Self-employment was also a way of living in Molote village. Eight percent (8%) heads of households were self-employed in non-agricultural activities within the village. According to the respondent heads of households in the study area self-employment comprised of shoe-making and repairs, and tuck shop operating. Allen and Thomas (1992: 19) state that people who are self-employed have some control over the tools (and land in the case of agriculture) required for their production.

Casual work in the study area consisted of 8% of heads of households. It involves being employed to use skills possessed on a temporary basis. Unlike self-employed the employee is provided with necessary tools required to enable them to fulfill the required task. In other words casual workers do not own the tools they use to do their work. As such heads of households who were casual workers in Molote, were employed by local people temporarily to perform tasks such as plastering, making 'stoeps', clearing grass in the compound and repairing fences.

However, 24% heads of households in the study area used their restored land for agricultural activities. The respondent community members pointed out that there were people who were employed in the communal maize and sunflower agricultural project operated in the land of Bakubung/Molote. They further argued that this project was under the tribal authority and the Executive Committee.

Among the heads of households who use land for agricultural purposes (24%), some heads used it in a self-employment manner. These heads of household pointed out that they derived their livelihoods from their backyard gardens and livestock farming. However, livestock farmers did not have their private land for grazing their livestock. Communal grazing land was used by livestock farmers.

The statistics of agricultural activities in Molote village shows that most heads of households depended on agricultural activities which was lesser than those depending on pension grants. This arise from the fact that agricultural activities were prominent because it have a direct link with land restitution unlike pension grants. Moreover, some heads of households had no access to pension grants due to their age limit. But having access to their land enabled them to be involved in agricultural activities in large numbers than other sources of livelihoods. This implies that giving the rural people their land back have had an effect in improving their livelihoods in terms of enhancing their involvement in agricultural activities.

Chapter Five.

The Role of Non Government Organizations and Government in Supporting Land Restitution to Foster Sustainable Livelihoods in Molote Village.

Non Government Organizations (NGOs) and government play a vital role in supporting land restitution in order for it to improve rural livelihoods. Intervention of NGOs and the government as the agents that can assist the resettled rural communities to establish sustainable ways of making their living. This chapter looks at the role of NGOs and the government in terms of supporting land restitution to foster sustainable livelihoods in Molote. It will also examine government development policy strategies, programmes and financial assistance methods instituted to support land restitution in the study area.

Bernstein (1992: 296) states that NGOs are usually established by groups of people who have a common 'cause' – such as fighting poverty and powerlessness – which they might try to achieve through providing finance, technical or advisory services, training and so on.

However, these groups of might not be the residents of the community they intend to assist. For instance, The Rural Action Committee (TRAC) and Land Access Movement of South Africa (LAMOSA) are NGOs that serve rural communities which are not in their geographical location – meaning that they are external agents. Their role is to provide support for the small, locally based groups of the rural poor to enable their projects to improve their livelihoods.

Since the South African government had assisted the previously dispossessed to regain their land, their role in terms of enhancing their livelihoods should be more visible. South African government through provincial departments and district councils had issued funding to communities whose lands were restituted to develop their land in terms of providing housing, water and electricity (South African yearbook, 1999). However, the funds seemed to be insufficient to improve their livelihoods. As such “financial assistance should be increased” (Roberts 1999: 18)

Among the respondent community members in Molote 56% agreed that there were NGOs that operated in their village after their land was restituted to foster livelihoods. However, 44% of the respondent community members disagreed pointing out that they had no knowledge about NGOs. They argued that they were assisted by government in their restitution case and the developments that ensued after they were resettled are attributes of the government.

Majority of the respondents i.e. 56% who agreed that NGOs assisted them provided arguments on how NGOs executed their roles in an attempt to support land restitution in their village. They cited TRAC and LAMOSA as the NGOs that empowered them. There were initiatives that were targeted at capacity building for the villagers. For instance workshops were held to encourage them to participate in decision – making processes concerning sustainable use of their land, which will improve their livelihoods. Moreover, they received training in brick making which was offered by Independent Development Trust (IDT). The respondent community members also pointed out that they were advised on how to use their backyards for gardening.

Subsequently, the NGOs had strategies they used to enhance livelihoods in the restituted areas such as Molote village. According to the respondent community members in Molote, training and advice offered by NGOs was supplemented with equipments and apparatuses to kickstart the projects after training the unemployed people in the study area. For example, machinery and bags of cement were supplied by IDT to sustain the brick-making project. In this manner, the people especially youth who participated in this project would be enabled to generate income from selling the bricks they produced.

Given the above, an official from TRAC pointed out that their role in support of land restitution to enhance sustainable livelihoods is to facilitate developments in the restored rural communities such as Molote. She further stated that they use their capacity to secure funds for development of these areas from the government and donors. This they did by assisting Molote Executive Committee to draft a business plan, which was a

requirement before they can get the settlement grant from the Department of Land Affairs (North West). Consequently, 90 houses were built for the resettled households.

Similarly, the government also support land restitution program in terms of enhancing sustainable livelihoods in the restored communities. According to a planner in the Department of Land Affairs (North West) pointed out that after land restitution has been finalized by courts, an integrated rural development approach was pursued by the government to support land restitution in terms of developing Molote village. He further argued that the government through this approach gives the project to other relevant government departments like agriculture, to assist the people returning to their land with development strategies and agricultural necessities, e.g seeds, fertilizers, tractors, etc, which will boost their livelihoods. He concluded that there was no way an integrated rural development approach can fail to deliver development needed in the restituted lands.

There are grants issued by the Department of Land Affairs for people who received their land through the land restitution process. For example, the Settlement/Land Acquisition Grant, Grants for Households, etc. Applicants can use the grants for improvements like housing, provision of water, sanitation, internal roads and fencing. According to Land Reform Programme (1998: 18), applications for financial assistance to carry out some more improvements on existing, secure land holdings can be made to other relevant governments such as Water Affairs and Forestry, or Housing

The above views seems to be true because the respondent community members in Molote argued that their houses were built by the government. The CPA administrator specified that they were built by the settlement grant from the Department of Land Affairs. Other basic needs such as water was supplied by the Department of Water Affairs and Rustenburg District Council. Respondent community members pointed out that four boreholes have been sunk to supply water for agricultural purposes. Supply of bulk water for household use have also been completed.

The respondent community members pointed out that the policy strategies instituted by government in Molote to enhance their livelihoods were enacted through projects such as pig farming, poultry farming, food plot project and the communal maize and sunflower project. Since these projects were based on farming, the North West Department of Agriculture was the provider for capacity building of the emerging farmers in Molote. They further argued that in the food project people were trained how to optimally produce crops from their plots on a small scale basis. This department also provided support systems including seeds for agricultural activities.

In addition, the respondent community members pointed out that they received three tractors and implements from the North West Department of Agriculture for their communal maize and sunflower project. This was to enable them to plough the fields and secure food for Bakubung tribe. This communal farming project currently uses 200 hectares of land.

On the other hand, a member of the Molote Executive Committee who was involved in pig farming project highlighted that this project including poultry project never succeeded in Molote village. He argued that this was because the Department of Agriculture targeted the individuals who already had pigs and poultry. As a result there were no funding for these projects. However, they had only visits from extension officers who taught them how to take care of pigs and poultry breeding mechanisms and when to sell them. But this did not sustain their projects due to financial constraints. Similarly, the food plot project also faded away because of misunderstandings that erupted between the people and their leader. Despite that the communal maize and sunflower project is the only project that had emanated from the government policy strategies instituted in the study area.

5.1 Factors Leading to Failure of the Government Development Policy Strategies in Molote Village.

In terms of the Restitution of Land Rights Act 22 of 1994 this land belongs to the Molote community. This devolved the choice of applying any land use pattern they deem fit to

enhance their livelihoods. The land use pattern used in Molote community was based on the communal land holding. This implies that the land should be used to benefit the community as a whole.

However, the above view is does not apply in the land use pattern applied in Molote. The respondent community members argued that there were community members who were not using this land optimally, especially women. For instance the only viable project derived from the government development policy strategies was ran by men, i.e. communal maize and sunflower project. They further argued that the village chief denied even some men in the village an opportunity to work in this project. They argued that he chose the people he liked for placement in the project. Thus, conflict erupts due to lack of definition of who should use communal land and who should not.

However, according to the Molote CPA administrator, this was perpetuated by the fact that the tribe had insufficient crop farming machinery to create employment for the whole nation. The government provided only three tractors with few equipments for the community. Moreover, 20 hectares of land that the community used for ploughing was also insufficient to create employment for the whole community members. This means some community members would not gain access to the communal land reserved for ploughing.

Despite the above, the people who did not have access to communal land cultivated crops in their backyard gardens to make a living. The respondent community members pointed out that they used hand forks and hoes to cultivate the soil. Kraal manure was used to fertilize the soil. With little income they generate from crops sales and other sources they bought basic needs such as clothing and food to supplement the ones they produced from their backyard gardens.

Chapter Six.

Conclusion and Recommendations.

Black South Africans have been denied land ownership and rights to its natural resources by racial policies. These policies were strengthened by statutes such as the Native Land Act of 1913, Group Areas Act of 1950 and 1966. As a result, blacks were forcefully removed from their stable communities to overcrowded reserves where their livelihoods were difficult to achieve. In 1994, the new South African government enacted the Restitution of Land Right Act, 22 of 1994, to restore land or compensate people for land rights they lost due to the racially discriminatory laws. This research was therefore conducted to find out whether land restitution have had an impact on sustainable rural livelihoods; with specific reference to Molote village.

The age distribution of the respondent community members in Molote indicated that this community had the necessary human resource for ensuring progress of their rural economy. In other words, there were enough able-bodied (or energetic) youth and adults who can utilize the restituted land for their basic needs.

Majority of the respondent community members were aged 36 and above amongst were pensioners who were unable to participate in the socio-economic activities. Despite that, majority of those who qualify for pension grant derived their livelihoods from it.

Women headed households were not given access to large hectares of land as opposed men who were involved in commercial communal maize and sunflower project. Hence female headed households faced living conditions which were below poverty line. This was also aggravated by the fact that most of the female heads of households could not be employed.

Given the above, it becomes evident that households were not largely affected by land restitution in terms of food security. For some it was supplemented by pension grants from elders living in the households.

Health, housing and education were addressed in an unsatisfactory manner in this study area. The integrated rural development government approach seemed ineffective in terms of improving health conditions in Molote village. This stems from the fact that there were no health facilities in this village; backyard garden plots were the only available asset in their possession for agricultural activities; pension grants became the sole supplement for household needs.

Although housing was partially addressed through the Settlement Grant from the Department of Land Affairs, it remained a problem with regard to large sized families who were expected to share a one roomed house.

The changes that were brought by land restitution on the livelihoods of Molote villagers were determined by their sources of livelihoods unlike their educational status. Since Molote was a land restitution case their sources of livelihoods were supposed to put more emphasis on land related activities such as farming as opposed to self-employment opportunities and non-farming labour activities. Hence the high performance of community members with regard to agricultural related activities such as livestock farming and backyard garden.

It is imperative to observe the pivotal role played by NGOs and government support institutions in facilitating positive social changes including capacity building to members of Molote community. The government on the other hand made developments possible through the integrated rural development approach. However, these developments did not have a direct impact on the livelihoods of the villagers. This stems from the fact that water that was installed for agricultural purposes was used by only those who were involved in communal maize and sunflower project. Those who were not part of it saw no value of this water supply.

The communal maize and sunflower project is the only viable project remaining in Molote, while others have flopped. This shows that application of land restitution can

bring changes on rural livelihoods. This however, depends on how the resettled communities use their land.

Recommendations.

This study recommends that the available government grants should increase the money offered to support the land restitution program. Projects such as pig and poultry farming failed due to financial constraints among the participants.

Government and NGOs should supplement their capacity building programmes on land use with entrepreneurial skill training. There was capacity among the respondents in terms of how to use land, but no knowledge on the basics such as management of farming as an enterprise and application for funds from donors on an individual capacity. This demonstrate the weakness of developmental programmes to build on the indigenous as promulgated by “People First”.

This study further recommends that gender issues be addressed by NGOs and government through workshops in the study area. In these workshops women should be encouraged to participate in any activity that involves utilization of the communal land. Training on how to use machinery such as tractors should also be offered to women as it was done on men by the Department of Agriculture.

Furthermore, communal maize and sunflower project should not be run by the same men on a continuous basis. Teams should be established and participate interchangeably in this project. The roles of the team members should also be changed among themselves. This would enable all community members to participate equally irrespective of gender in using the communal land to run the communal projects.

Lastly, the study further suggests that in the case of Molote, the traditional governing body and the village association should meet to charter a common development strategy within the parameters of rural integrated approach so that it benefit all villagers.

REFERENCES.

- Adam M, et al., 1999. Natural Perspectives. "Land Reform and Rural Livelihoods in Southern Africa". No 39. February. London ODI.
- Allen and Thomas 1992. Poverty and Development in the 1990s. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Bernstein H, et al 1992. Rural Livelihoods: Crises and Responses. United Kingdom, Oxford University Press
- Brown and Forde 1990. African Systems of Kinship and Marriage. London, Oxford University Press.
- Communal Property Associations Act, 28 of 1996.
- Chambers 1993 Rural Development: Putting the Last First. England, Longman Scientific and Technical.
- Didiza T. 2000. Annual Report. "Foreword by Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs". Commission on Restitution of Land Rights Publication. Pretoria.
- Framework Development Plan 1999. Bakubung Ba Ratheo-Molote. TRAC (unpublished).
- Haralambos M 1985 Sociology: Themes and Perspectives. London, Unwin Hyman.
- Haralambos M and Holborn 1991. Sociology: Themes and Perspectives. London, Collins Educational.
- International Agricultural Development 1994. "Sustainable Livelihoods". Vol 19 No 2 P.4.
- Jacobs, G. 1997 DRA Fieldworker Formation: Organisational Biography. TRAC, (unpublished)
- Kimmel D. 1990. Adulthood and Aging. London. John Wiley and Sons.
- Land Reform Programme 1998. Department of Land Affairs, Pretoria.
- May J, et al 1998 Poverty and Inequality in South Africa. Office of the Executive Deputy President. Pretoria.
- Mazrui A 1989. The Africans: A Triple Heritage. London, BBC.
- Mgcqi W, 2000. Annual Report. "Chief Land Claims Commissioner's Overview". Pretoria, Commission on Restitution of Land Rights.
- Mushi M. 1999. Land Info. "Government Intervention Needed For Land Reform". Department of Land Affairs, Vol 6 No2. P.21.

- Popenoe 1995. Sociology. New Jersey, Englewood Cliffs.
- Ramphela M, et al. 1991. Restoring The Land. Panos Institute. London.
- Roberts A 1999. Land Info. "Breaking Poverty Through Restitution" Department of Land Affairs. Vol 6 No 5 P.18.
- South African Year Book 1999. South African Communication Services(SACS) Publication.
- The White Paper on South African Land Policy. 1997. Department of Land Affairs, Pretoria.
- UNDP, 1999. Sustainable Livelihoods(SL), New York.

ANEXURE -A
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ADULT COMMUNITY MEMBERS.

Topic: An investigation into the impact of Land Restitution on Sustainable Rural Livelihoods in North West Province. A Comparative Study of Molote Village and Goedgevonden Farm.

Objectives:

- The impact of land restitution on the living conditions of the rural households in terms of food, shelter, etc.
- Changes brought by land restitution on the livelihoods of the rural people in terms of increasing their survival strategies such as subsistence and commercial farming, employment, etc.
- The role of non government organizations in terms of supporting land restitution to foster sustainable rural livelihoods.
- The government development policy strategies and programmes instituted to support land restitution in terms of fostering sustainable rural livelihoods.

INSTRUCTIONS.

Answer all the questions in the questionnaire.

Tick with (X) in the given spaces.

Give opinions/explanations in the space provided.

Date of the interview Place

SECTION 1

PERSONAL DATA.

1.1. Sex: Male () Female ()

1.2. Age: 18 - 24 ()

25 - 30 ()

31 - 36 ()

37 + ()

1.3. Education level: No Schooling ()

Primary ()

Secondary ()

Tertiary ()

1.4. Occupational Status: Farm worker ()

Domestic worker ()

Self employed ()

Unemployed ()

1.5. Marital Status: Single ()

Married ()

Divorced ()

Widowed ()

Separated ()

1.6 Role in the household.

Breadwinner ()

Dependent ()

1.7 Household size.

No	Sex	Age	Relationship	Education	Occupation

SECTION 2

2.1 Duration of residency in the restituted area:

1 yr ()

1 - 2 yrs ()

3 - 4 yrs ()

5+ ()

2.2 What type of shelter do you have?

Mud house ()

Shack ()

Cement house ()

2.3 How many rooms does your house have?

1 room ()

2 rooms ()

3 rooms ()

4 + ()

2.4 How do you get food?

Shops ()

Garden ()

Fields ()

2.5 What are your sources of income?

2.6 Did land restitution bring changes on your livelihoods? Yes () No ()

2.7 If yes, what are the changes?

2.8 If no, what do you suggest should be done to support the restitution programmes to make it effective in terms of improving livelihoods?

2.9 How do you use land to make living?

Commercial farming ()

Subsistence farming ()

Hunting ()

Any other, specify

2.10 Do you have useful natural resources such as minerals, wild animals and plants, etc. in your restored land? Yes () No ()

2.11 What are those natural resources

2.12 How do you use them to make living?

Wild animals

Wild plants

Minerals, if any'

2.13 Are there Non Governmental Organizations operating in your area? Yes () No ()

2.14 If yes, name them

2.15 What is the role of these NGOs' in terms of supporting land restitution process to bring about sustainable rural livelihoods in your area?

2.16 What are the strategies used by NGOs' to improve the livelihoods in your area?

2.17 Are the government policy strategies, and programmes instituted in this area that you know about, which was used to support land restitution process to enable it to improve the livelihoods? Yes () No ()

2.18 If yes, what are those policy strategies and programmes?

2.19 Who are the beneficiaries of land restitution in you area?

2.20 Which legal procedures (Acts/Bills) were followed to allocate the land after it was restored?

2.21 Do you have access to land? Yes() No ()

2.22 If no, what are the causes of lack of access to land?.....