



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

AGRICULTURAL RESTRUCTURING
IN
SOUTHERN AFRICA

**Papers presented at an
International Symposium
held at Swakopmund, Namibia**

24-27 July, 1990

Edited by

**Csaba Csáki
Theodor Dams
Diethelm Metzger
Johan van Zyl**

**International Association of Agricultural Economists
in association with
Association of Agricultural Economists in Namibia
(AGRECONA)**

First published in 1992 by the Association of Agricultural Economists of Namibia
P.O. Box 21554, Windhoek, Namibia.

© International Association of Agricultural Economists.

This book is copyright. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Enquiries should be made to the publisher.

Printed in Namibia by Windhoek Printers & Publishers (Pty) Ltd,
P.O. Box 1707, Windhoek, Namibia.

Distributed by the Association of Agricultural Economists of Namibia,
P.O. Box 21554, Windhoek, Namibia.

ISBN 99916/30/10/4

IDEOLOGY AND THE RESTRUCTURING OF AGRICULTURE: A CASE STUDY FROM SOUTH AFRICA

A Fischer

This paper concerns itself with ideology and the restructuring of agriculture. As an anthropologist, I am familiar with life in a rural village in South Africa and with agricultural production in such a rural settlement. Rural life in South Africa has been formed and transformed over the past century by a distinct set of interrelated historical, political and economic forces. A microlevel analysis of settlement agriculture in its broader historical, political and economic context can provide valuable perspectives on the relation between ideology and the restructuring of agriculture, and the sociological consequences of ideologically-informed agricultural intervention on the level of its implementation.

This is therefore a case study of the restructuring of agriculture in the Mhala district of Gazankulu, the "homeland" of Tsonga-speakers in the North-eastern Transvaal. It inquires into the historical reasons for the present agricultural situation in Seville, a small rural settlement in Mhala, by examining the relationship between, on the one hand, the "restructuring of agriculture", and changes in the political order of South Africa on the other. Gazankulu was created as a "homeland" for Tsonga-speaking people between 1969, when the Machangana Territorial Authority was established, and 1973, when self-government was granted by the South African Government. Gazankulu is composed of five administrative districts, consisting of four geographically dispersed areas; Mhala is the southernmost district. Seville is the name of a small settlement in the Mnisi Tribal Authority area in Mhala district. As a former white-owned farm taken over by the South African Development Trust in the 1960s, almost all the families living on Seville in the 1980s had been tenants of the earlier owners. During the period of labour tenancy their homesteads had been dispersed and their fields scattered over suitable land. When the Trust took over the land it was planned according to "betterment" principles: A settlement of about 1 600 ha was established, the people were relocated into a central village, and separate arable and grazing areas were demarcated. Since then, each household staying on Seville has had access to both arable and grazing land, and to the other resources such as fuel and building materials.

A major development intervention in Seville followed in the 1970s. Seville was chosen as the site of a cattle improvement scheme planned for the Mnisi Tribal Authority area. Two hundred hectares of land were fenced in, a predator-proof cattle kraal was erected and certain livestock-owners from the Mnisi Tribal Authority area were invited to join the scheme. In 1979 the scheme was extended to approximately 1 000 hectares, leaving the 60 households living on Seville with less than 600 ha for communal grazing and arable land. Members of the scheme have free access to a very expensive infrastructure, preferential marketing facilities, registered stud bulls, and the labour of workers on the payroll of the Department of Agriculture. The scheme is soundly managed by officials of this Department who are highly skilled in the technical aspects and committed to the improvement of commercial cattle farming. The people of Seville, however, have many reservations about the scheme. Even today they are deeply concerned and unhappy because the extension of the scheme continues

to threaten disruption of the subsistence agriculture on Seville. This situation is the result of the ideologically determined restructuring of agriculture in Mhala to meet economic needs emanating from the ideology of racial separation.

IDEOLOGY, DEVELOPMENT AND AGRICULTURE

Moulded by the racial ideology of the state, ethnic nationalism emerged as the dominant framework for, and the "national development" of ethnic units as the main goal of development. And because development was conceived of in ethnic terms, it has since the 1950s not only referred to economic issues, but also to the constitutional interventions which eventually resulted in the creation of ten "ethnic national" entities or "homelands" on the land demarcated for Africans by the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts. In this way, development has been determined by the ideologies and policies of the state. And as agriculture was seen as the economic base of African reserves, ideologically determined agricultural intervention dominated the economic development of the reserves from the 1930s onwards.

However, the racial ideology required agricultural intervention in the countryside even before reserves or homelands were created. In the early decades of this century these interventions resulted in a major restructuring of agriculture in South Africa.

Between 1870 and 1930 South Africa was a predominantly agrarian society. White settler farmers competed with black farmers for both land and local markets as both white and black farmers responded to the expanding agricultural markets created by industrial capital (Beinart, 1984:63). To allow white farming to expand, severe restrictions were imposed on independent black farming. These restrictions included the abolition of black share-cropping on white-owned land; the control of tenancy; and, most serious of all, the imposition of possessory segregation under the 1913 Land Act, which prevented Africans from purchasing land outside the reserves (Davenport, 1987:391-2). These laws and the Trust and Land Act of 1936 structured and organized access to land and other agricultural resources and separated black from white farming, limiting black farming to the reserves. An increasingly intensive use of land within the reserves, overstocking and serious soil erosion in many of these areas by the late 1930s followed inevitably. The restructuring of agriculture to safeguard white farming therefore resulted in conditions in the reserves which required drastic action to "save the soil". These agricultural interventions to "save the soil" as well as later interventions have been inextricably bound with the broader racial policies.

The policy of racial separation unfolded through several stages after Union: segregation was followed by a short-lived period of trusteeship in the late 1930s, and then by apartheid and separate development. As in the case of the underlying ideology, these different formulations of the racial policy determined and continue to determine agricultural development in the reserves. However, homeland agriculture was in itself a crucial aspect of these policies of racial domination. As the racial policy unfolded and the development policies of the state were adapted, agricultural development priorities were continually redefined and altered accordingly.

Segregation, South Africa's colour policy from Union in 1910 until the Second World War, aimed at the territorial separation of black and white in South Africa. The chief segregationist measures, the 1913 and 1936 Land Acts, created the reserves, and agricultural intervention in these areas was intended to provide a livelihood for the African population in the reserves. Conservation and reclamation measures, experimental farms and extension and demonstration services were all means to save the soil from further deterioration and to

expand agriculture in the reserves. But these measures were also strictly subjected to the ideology and politics of segregation. Even though their primary aim was to improve peasant agriculture in the reserves (Beinart, 1984:68), they were all intended to increase the capacity of the reserves to accommodate the African population. In 1942 Smuts, who came to power during the war, presented "trusteeship" as an alternative formulation of racial policy. Concerned about the increasing deterioration of the soil in the reserves, Smuts warned that "erosion is the biggest problem confronting the country, bigger than any politics" (Beinart, 1984). This concern "set in motion the 'rescue operation' which came to be known as 'betterment' in the 1930's" (Davenport, 1987:394), and the early Betterment Proclamation of 1939 intended mainly "to save the soil" by means of planned settlement (Davenport, 1987:394). The Nationalist government took up the idea of trusteeship in 1948, and combined it with the goal of segregation in the new policy of apartheid. This policy intended not simply to segregate, but also to establish separate black and white communities in South Africa. The state, as self-appointed trustee, assumed the responsibility of developing the African community. Apartheid was a political, as well as an economic solution to the racial problem, and since it envisaged a political dispensation of separate representation, apartheid required the creation of alternative political structures for Africans. Constitutional intervention therefore became a dominant aspect of "development". After passing the Bantu Authorities Act in 1953, the state embarked with firm determination on a program of "constitutional development" and tribal, regional and territorial authorities were instituted in the African areas. Over the next thirty years the constitutional status of these areas developed from "self-management" to "self-government" and in some cases (though this was not foreseen in the 1950s), to "independence". These changes to the constitutional status of African areas decisively affected agricultural policies and priorities.

When the Nationalist government appointed the Tomlinson Commission in the early 1950s to make recommendations about the socio-economic development of the African areas, Tomlinson's central proposals involved the development of self-sustaining small farmers on "economic units" and the diversification of economic activity to reduce the numbers dependent on the land for a living (Davenport, 1987:395). But even though Tomlinson's recommendations for the stimulation of a peasantry were modest, what emerged when the government reacted to the Commission's recommendations was an ideological preoccupation to cram as many Africans as possible into the reserves. This seemed far more important than any formula for successful farming. The "economic units" the government allowed permitted only subsistence, and not commercial, agriculture. It could provide only a marginal income, and most people continued to rely heavily on income from migrant wage labour (Davenport, 1987:345).

In the 1960s apartheid moved towards the "homeland" policy. The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959 used the territorial base provided by the Land Acts to establish a new political dispensation of "ethnically" differentiated homelands to be developed as separate ethnic units. The implementation of this homeland policy of separate development influenced homeland agriculture decisively. Agricultural resources and particularly land, which had previously been regarded primarily as public assets for the benefit of the people of the reserves, became, in official eyes, resources for the benefit of ethnic units to provide income for homelands. As homelands developed towards self-government, the idea of dividing available land into "economic units" for subsistence farming became progressively outdated. The new development goals accorded increasing priority to the strength of overall

homeland economies rather than the promotion of subsistence farmers. As the homelands became "national states", development became "national development". The "national" interest of "ethnic national units" became the chief development priority, the development of their "national" economies the overriding development goal. The commercial use of "national" resources has dominated agricultural development ever since. An expanding commercial agriculture has become one of the means by which to lend credibility to the constitutional status of the "national states".

Agricultural development in contemporary Gazankulu must be seen as part of this unfolding policy of ethnic nationalism (Sharp, 1985). In 1973, before self-government was granted to Gazankulu, steps involving land reclamation, soil conservation and planned settlement were undertaken in order to develop subsistence agriculture for "the Bantu of Busbuckridge area" (rather than for specific "ethnic groups") (Fischer 1987). With the shift to the policy of "ethnic national development" since the late 1960s, the area has, however, been divided between two distinct "homelands" - Gazankulu (for Tsonga-speakers) and Lebowa (for Sotho-speakers). Mhala became part of Gazankulu. When self-government was granted to Gazankulu in 1973, the homeland's "national interest" became the chief development priority. Land in the Mhala district was now officially regarded as a "national" resource, to be used productively in the "national" interest. The economic circumstances of the people in Mhala were ignored, and their patterns of agriculture and land use that had developed because of earlier agricultural interventions in the area were now being regarded as an unproductive use of resources. Planners purposefully embarked on the restructuring of homeland agriculture from the dominant subsistence mode of agricultural production to the increasing commercial use of Gazankulu's agricultural resources.

SEVILLE: FROM SUBSISTENCE AGRICULTURE TO COMMERCIAL FARMING

In 1969 the Mnisi Tribal Authority Area was replanned as part of the Machangana Territorial Authority. Settlement agriculture was structured according to "betterment" principles on "economic units". But in Mhala "economic units" of 6 ha arable dry land and 15 head of cattle on communal grazing could not even provide in the subsistence needs of a household. At that time settlement agriculture was still structured within a subsistence framework and had to be supplemented by migrant remittances and other income resources. Determined by the ideological needs of the state, subsistence agriculture was an important instrument to accommodate as many Tsonga-speakers as possible in the Mnisi and other tribal authority areas. To increase its economic capacity, a number of agricultural projects were planned for the Mnisi area. Only one of these projects however materialized: the cattle improvement scheme developed at Seville. The Seville scheme was initiated in the early 1970s to promote cattle farming within a general subsistence framework in the Mnisi tribal area.

Initially it was to serve as a demonstration unit. Afrikaner stud bulls were obtained, a number of cattle owners from the Mnisi area were invited to bring their best cows to the scheme and farmers' days were organized to demonstrate stockkeeping principles to cattle owners. It was hoped that the use of stud Afrikaner bulls would upgrade the quality of cattle in the area, and that farmers' days would improve cattle farming. At the end of 1974, however, the Seville scheme collapsed, because officials lost interest mainly as a result of their becoming involved in the planning of a commercial project on the neighbouring farm of Utah. Before the Seville scheme was abandoned officials of Gazankulu had already

planned a new commercial cattle scheme on Utah. As officials serving the self-governing Gazankulu, they directed all their attention to this project on which they planned to settle 8 commercial cattle farmers, and Seville was allowed to deteriorate. But in 1977 the Seville scheme was replanned to operate according to generally accepted principles of commercial cattle farming. The scheme was extended to 1 000 ha and divided into camps according to veld type and stocked according to the generally accepted carrying capacity for the region of 7 to 10 ha per M.L.U., allowing 120 to 140 head of cattle on 1 000 ha of grazing. Membership was limited to a maximum of 20 *de jure* inhabitants of the Mnsi Tribal Authority Area who qualified on the basis of the number and quality of their cattle. This excluded the vast majority of the population, as only the most prosperous had herds large enough to meet the selection qualifications to allow them to become members. The first step in the implementation of the planning proposals was to withdraw all communal grazing rights on the 1 000 ha of Seville that were to become the basis of the scheme. In this way the cattle owners of Seville lost their grazing on the additional 800 ha which were added to the original 200 ha and fenced in. The replanning of Seville was part of the restructuring of agriculture to meet the needs of a self-governing national state. Seville was replanned because subsistence production came to be regarded, as a result of changes in the constitutional status of the homeland, as a waste of a national resource. Today Seville functions as a commercial venture to use an agricultural resource commercially in the "national" interest of Gazankulu. It is managed together with the cattle projects on the neighbouring farms of Utah where cattle farmers farm commercially with 520 cattle on 2 600 ha, and the "commercial beef producing unit" on the farm Dixie where 2 commercial farmers were settled in 1986. These projects are managed together as commercial enterprises. Besides sound cattle-management practices, the excellent facilities and indispensable services provided by the Department of Agriculture are proof that the projects are technically well-planned and well-managed. However, these services and facilities are provided at considerable costs.

Compared to Utah's budget in the mid-1980s of ± R200 000 p.a., financial support to subsistence cattle farming on communal grazing is insignificant. This clearly indicates the preference commercial agricultural projects officially enjoy in present-day Gazankulu.

The restructuring of agriculture from subsistence production on "economic units" to commercial farming on a project basis represents an ever-growing concern with a self-supporting Gazankulu economy at the expense of Gazankulu's people. This profoundly affected the relations between the parties involved in restructuring settlement agriculture. At the microlevel of its implementation, this ideologically-determined restructuring of agriculture developed into relations of domination, dependence and dispossession.

DOMINATION

Commercial cattle farming in the national interest of Gazankulu could be implemented at Seville only through domination. Access to the settlement's agricultural resources had to be restructured and therefore the land people had access to since the period of labour tenancy had to be expropriated. The planners of agricultural development in Gazankulu at the time were mainly seconded officials from Pretoria. As active mediators of the "national interest", they commercialised the major part of the agricultural resources of Seville through different manifestations of domination. In planning the Seville scheme and in implementing the planning proposals, planners showed extreme insensitivity to the needs of the people living

on Seville. Their needs, which were constantly subordinated to the interests of commercial cattle farming, were almost totally disregarded. And, as access to the settlement's resources were reorganised and restructured, their use of and their historical rights to these resources were ignored. By way of an elaborate development rhetoric, planners also kept the people uninformed. In contrast to the explicit exposition in the planning proposal of the technical detail of commercial farming, such as a rotational grazing system, selection principles, etc., the restructuring was vaguely motivated in terms of the benefit the scheme will have for the whole "tribe". And when the planning proposals were explained at a general meeting, all were treated to "braaivleis en pap". Men from Seville who attended the meeting remember that planners explained that fencing would relieve the burden of caring for their cattle, and so their children would be free to attend school. Whatever else was explained, they left without realising the real implications of the scheme. Planners, as representatives of higher bureaucratic authorities, could furthermore manipulate the local authority structure to request the replanning of Seville and to accept the planning proposals. A principal strategy of achieving acceptance was to involve the chief, who was co-opted as a member of the planning committee. By involving the chief, administrative legitimacy was rendered to the scheme. The chief's acceptance of the proposals on behalf of his subjects in the Mnisi tribal area and his "signature on the map" eventually proved to be the planners' main instrument in handling the disillusioned local population's opposition and resistance to the scheme.

Planners could dominate the situation through various bureaucratic measures to get the proposals "legitimately" accepted, but they could not make their plans work; to restructure settlement agriculture in the "national interest", they needed the cooperation of individuals.

DEPENDENCE

The support of individuals from the Mnisi tribal area was a vital prerequisite for the operation and the administrative "success" of the Seville scheme. Planners depended on people who could provide cattle, and when the Seville scheme was initiated in the early 1970s the largest cattle holders from the Mnisi area were approached to become members. This strategy to guarantee the administrative functioning of projects became "general" practice in the development of commercial cattle farming in the area.

When the Seville scheme collapsed, members had to take their cattle back to the communal grazing where they lived. A central figure in the initial stages of the Seville scheme, a wealthy entrepreneur, was however allowed to transfer his cattle to the Utah scheme on which a predator-proof kraal, camps and water troughs had already been established. More than 2 years were to elapse before other commercial farmers were formally settled on Utah. The presence of his cattle on Utah guaranteed, from a planning point of view, the commercial use of an agricultural resource even before the planning of the project was completed. But the administrative benefits for planners were small compared to those he received: the exclusive use of Utah's infrastructure and grazing for approximately 2 years.

Planners depended on the cooperation of another prominent former member of the collapsed Seville scheme to re-instate the scheme after it was replanned. In 1979, when planners were still establishing the infrastructure, this man from Seville was allowed to graze his cattle on the scheme for as long as the scheme was not yet in operation. He eventually had exclusive use of the scheme for nearly 2 years. In 1981, when he and only 10 others were allowed to become members of the scheme, the chief agricultural officer approached

him for additional cattle. The initial 66 cattle supplied by the 11 members of the scheme was far below the carrying capacity and the demands of commercial farming. By 1984 he had more than 40 head of cattle on the scheme, while other members were restricted to 6 head each. His share of the cattle on the scheme had almost doubled: measured against the stock losses people in Mhala suffered because of the drought of the early 1980s, he was indeed soundly rewarded for his share in the administrative success of the Seville scheme.

In 1985, when Dixie was developed as a "commercial beef-producing unit" open to "interested farmers", planners again relied on these 2 wealthy farmers to provide commercial herds. Since 1986 they have been the only two members of this project which represent a further step in commercialising agriculture in Mhala. The development of a commercial cattle industry through the projects on Seville, Utah and Dixie provided both of them with relative prosperity. Because planners relied on them, they were involved in all these schemes and projects. Today they no longer keep a few animals on overgrazed communal grazing; they have emerged (with massive institutional support) as wealthy commercial farmers. Dependence created their privileged position. This, however, happened at the expense of the dispossessed people.

DISPOSSESSION

Subsistence cultivation provides no income to the inhabitants of Seville, but it does provide the bulk of their food supply and therefore relieves the strain on their limited incomes. Despite high risks, because of drought, predators, and foot-and-mouth disease, stock provides the most accessible opportunity for capital accumulation. In the context of limited job and financial security, stock also functions as a means of providing security in unforeseen circumstances and crises. Stock is further valued because cattle are the main instruments for labour-intensive cultivation. The development of the Seville scheme undermined the security cattle provide, and poses a serious threat to cultivation.

Because of the Seville scheme the inhabitants of Seville lost 1 000 ha of grazing. While the scheme carries, in accordance with the carrying capacity of the region, a maximum of 150 M.L.U. on 1 000 ha, the 400 inhabitants of Seville are restricted to approximately 500 ha of grazing carrying between 300 and 400 head of cattle and at least 250 goats. The investment possibilities and security livestock provides could not remain unaffected by the extension and subsequent loss of a major part of their grazing. Besides the grazing they had to forfeit, the population was no longer allowed to gather firewood or building and construction material from the portion of Seville which became part of the scheme. Because of the loss of the major part of the grazing, planners rezoned the remaining part of the settlement. This rezoning threatened to deprive the population of the fertile fields they had worked for the past 2 to 3 decades. So far, the people have resisted the rezoning, but they will lose these productive soils on which they produce the bulk of their food if the rezoning is enforced by the administration.

Up to 1984, the people of Seville were supplied with water from an open reservoir approximately half a kilometre from the village. A borehole next to it provided water to the reservoir, and to a single drinking trough on the scheme. But the replanning of the scheme required a drinking trough in every camp, and the provision of water to the whole of Seville was developed at the end of 1984 to meet this requirement of commercial cattle farming. A big reservoir was erected at the highest point on the scheme approximately 2 km from the borehole. Water pumped from the borehole to the reservoir is relayed to the 8 drinking

troughs providing water to the 150 head of cattle on the scheme. The same system provides water to the village. The water is pumped away from the village to the new reservoir and then relayed back past the pump and old reservoir to the village - a distance of approximately 3 km. In contrast to the efficient system of the scheme where water is available in every camp, a single tap in the village must provide water to about 60 households and close to 400 people on Seville.

The restructuring of agriculture because of the needs of commercial farming could also mean the final "dispossession" or "proletarianisation" of the people who were forced to forfeit rights to land in the interests of Gazankulu. In this game of domination and dependence, they are the losers. Sociologically analysed, the interrelated processes of domination, dependence and dispossession empowered the privileged, disillusioned the people, and involved planners in the daily activities of the scheme.

THE PLANNERS AND THE PRIVILEGED

Dependence developing from domination maintains a very fragile relationship between the planners and the privileged. Contrary to the original planning proposals, the planners are also deeply involved in the daily running of the scheme. They manage the scheme for the privileged, who manipulate their dependence to gain maximum benefits for themselves. Planners are pre-occupied with more planning, better infrastructure, better facilities, cattle numbers and effective cattle management. Statistics indeed reflect higher calving percentages and no losses due to the drought. Together with the impressive technical achievements, these meet the expectations and interests of Gazankulu. However, this is evidence not only of the planners' expertise and their commitment to the development of commercial farming, but also of the extreme lack of participation of members. The planning proposals emphasize the active participation of the members to promote the principles of commercial cattle farming in the community. But they are members because of the personal privileges and advantages membership offers, and not for the collective good of the "tribe". Their aim is to maximize their privileges and advantages, and not to share them. To achieve this they manipulate the dependence developing from domination. Planners who initially planned to establish 8 commercial farmers with a total of 520 cattle on Utah had to reduce the number to 5 farmers in order to accommodate the increase in the cattle numbers of the wealthy entrepreneur who had had exclusive and free access to Utah for more than 2 years. Today, members are allowed a maximum of about 100 head of cattle. But this man had become a wealthy cattle farmer, and by the time farmers could formally apply for membership, his son became a member of the Utah scheme as well. By establishing his son as one of the farmers on Utah, his share of the 520 permitted cattle was increased to more than 200. With the passing of time his growing herds on Utah and on the communal grazing in 2 other settlements qualified him to become the first member of the "commercial beef-producing" project developed at Dixie.

In 1984, the 151 head of cattle on Seville surpassed the maximum numbers planners allowed according to carrying capacity. After the 1982 and 1983 drought more people were anxious to join the Seville scheme. New members, however, could only be accommodated if members with more than 6 animals reduced their numbers. This matter was raised by the chief agricultural officer at a meeting in 1984. Although the matter was raised generally, it was principally aimed at the wealthy farmer from Seville, whom planners depended on to guarantee the administrative success of Seville. It was clear, however, that he would not

accept this. And while his privileges were in the balance he would not cooperate with the planners. He emphasized that, because initially there were too few cattle on the scheme, planners requested him to bring his cattle onto the scheme; now that they did not need him, he had to decrease the number of his cattle. He made it quite clear that he would only decrease the number of his cattle if ordered to do so by the chief; the scheme, he maintained, did not belong to the officials, but to the chief, and the officials could not force him to remove his cattle. The issue dragged on for the whole of 1985. Since early in 1986, however, he became the second farmer to be settled on Dixie, and his surplus cattle on the Seville scheme were transferred to this commercial project.

THE PEOPLE

Through the development of the scheme, the inhabitants of Seville were deprived of their major resources for grazing, firewood and building materials; rural production on their fertile arable land was seriously threatened; and their need for water was subordinated to the needs of sophisticated commercial cattle management practices on the scheme. Disillusioned by the rezoning of their fields, an old man declared: "At first they fenced the Manyeleti for game, then the scheme for cattle, and now they want to take our fields for cattle as well". Commenting on the same issue, a middle-aged man born in Seville explicitly stated what is implied in the previous quote: "Cattle is more important to them than people".

These remarks reflect perceptions that resources essential for human survival are expropriated for the sake of commercial farming (and tourism). Bound to these perceptions are the experiences of the community of commercial agriculture increasingly depriving them of control of subsistence agricultural resources. These experiences are reinforced by a history of subordination and domination within the South African context. The senior generation reacted to this experience by idealizing the agricultural "freedom" they enjoyed as tenants on the farm before it was transferred to the Trust. They were familiar with conditions on the farms under circumstances of less bureaucratic intervention and therefore less domination. Almost all of them recalled nostalgically that they could "stay where they wanted, plough as much and where they wanted, and graze their cattle all over the farm". In reality, as labour tenants they were subjected to farm owners. These references to the past are actually statements about the present restructuring of agriculture, and express the restrictions, rules and regulations which they presently experience as agriculture is restructured to meet the present needs of Gazankulu. The younger generation's reaction is expressed in apathy, suspicion and scepticism towards Gazankulu. These reactions also manifest themselves in sporadic unorganized resistance and the constant refusal to accept the rezoning of their fields, despite charges laid against them in an attempt to enforce the demarcation. Their defense plea: "But where will we find other food?" is an accusation against the forced restructuring of settlement agriculture in the ideological interest of Gazankulu.

CONCLUSION: IDEOLOGY AND INEQUALITY

National development in Mhala and the restructuring of settlement agriculture add to the general scepticism on the village level of bureaucratic institutions such as "Gazankulu". This scepticism is implied in comments and statements such as: "Gazankulu only helps some"; "They choose only a few".

Fundamentally, however, these statements express the consequences of the ideologically determined restructuring of agriculture in Mhala. On the level of its implementation it

increased rural differentiation and inequalities. In the context of the unfolding history of racial and development policies in South Africa, the restructuring of agriculture in Mhala caters for the needs of a very small elite. This elite is indispensable to the continued existence of Gazankulu, as is part of a process to give credibility to the "self-governing" or "national" status of Gazankulu. So much for the consequences of agricultural intervention dominated by "apartheid" and "apartheid" institutions such as Gazankulu. But there is an inherent relation between ideology, domination, dependence and dispossession, and therefore between ideology and inequality. By demonstrating this relation, the paper intends to awaken some awareness of the inequalities ideologically informed agriculture can create. Ideology cannot guarantee an equitable agriculture. If agriculture in a future South Africa is restructured to meet the needs of another ideology, existing inequalities may simply be replaced by other inequalities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beinart, W. 1984. Soil erosion, conservation and ideas about development: a Southern African exploration 1900-1960. *Journal of Southern African Studies*. 11(1): 52-56.
- Davenport, T.R.H. 1987. Can sacred cows be culled? A historical review of land policy in South Africa with some questions about the future. *Development Southern Africa*. 4(3): 388-400.
- Fischer, A. 1987. Land tenure in Mhala: Official wisdom 'locked up' in tradition and people 'locked up' in development. *Development Southern Africa*. 4(3): 502-519.
- Sharp, J. 1985. Development, politics and culture in South Africa: a sceptical comment. *Development Southern Africa*. 2(1): 134-162.