

---

# Unpacking the ‘Emergent Farmer’ Concept in Agrarian Reform: Evidence from Livestock Farmers in South Africa

Lovemore C. Gwiriri , James Bennett , Cletos Mapiye   
and Sara Burbi 

---

## ABSTRACT

South Africa has historically perpetuated a dual system of freehold commercial and communal subsistence farming. To bridge these extremes, agrarian reform policies have encouraged the creation of a class of ‘emergent’, commercially oriented farmers. However, these policies consider ‘emergent’ farmers as a homogeneous group of land reform beneficiaries, with limited appreciation of the class differences between them, and do little to support the rise of a ‘middle’ group of producers able to bridge that gap. This article uses a case study of livestock farmers in Eastern Cape Province to critique the ‘emergent farmer’ concept. The authors identify three broad categories of farmers within the emergent livestock sector: a large group who, despite having accessed private farms, remain effectively subsistence farmers; a smaller group of small/medium-scale commercial producers who have communal farming origins and most closely approximate to ‘emergent’ farmers; and an elite group of large-scale, fully commercialized farmers, whose emergence has been facilitated primarily by access to capital and a desire to invest in alternative business ventures. On this basis the authors suggest that current agrarian reform policies need considerable refocusing if they are to effectively facilitate the emergence of a ‘middle’ group of smallholder commercial farmers from communal systems.

## INTRODUCTION

Global food insecurity, particularly after the food crisis in 2008 (HLPE, 2012), has led to increased interest in the role smallholder agriculture can

---

The authors would like to thank IASC and its affiliated farmers for participating in the study, and to acknowledge the invaluable linkages and information provided by DRDAR, DRDLR and NAMC. The authors would also like to thank Busisiwe Mayaphi for valuable research assistance, and to gratefully acknowledge the constructive comments of the anonymous reviewers of this article. This work was supported by a PhD scholarship funded through the Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience, Coventry University, UK.

play in addressing food security in sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) (Muyanga et al., 2011; Sitko and Jayne, 2014). The ability of smallholder agriculture to achieve household and national food security and reduce rural poverty, however, remains strongly contested (Aliber and Hall, 2012; Sitko and Jayne, 2014). Debates have focused on land tenure (Lahiff, 2016; O'Laughlin et al., 2013), policy (Hall, 2009), support mechanisms (Aliber and Hall, 2012; Okunlola et al., 2016), production models able to transform subsistence smallholder agriculture into commercial agriculture (Aliber, 2011), and the appropriate conditions and strategies to sustainably intensify production (Pretty et al., 2011).

Agrarian reform, as a mechanism for commercializing smallholder agricultural production in SSA, has had mixed success and remains controversial (Cousins and Scoones, 2010; Peters, 2009). It is often underpinned by an assertion that production under communal tenure is inherently lower than under private tenure, the veracity which has been contested by several scholars (e.g., Mafeje, 2003; Moyo, 2003). These authors argue that in many parts of SSA, this dualism is less apparent because communal production systems have, at various points in time, been able to respond to market demands and produce competitively at a commercial level, without the need for conversion to private tenure. Indeed, it has been argued that this was also true of South Africa for a brief period in the latter half of the 19th century, particularly in parts of the Eastern Cape, where small-scale African farmers successfully engaged in commercial production to meet the needs of an expanding settler market for grains such as barley, oats and wheat, as well as wool (Bundy, 1988; Keegan, 1983). However, this expansion of the African peasantry in South Africa was short-lived and was systematically eroded during the late 19th and early 20th centuries by a series of laws that limited both where Africans could live and the size of their landholdings, culminating in the Native Lands Act of 1913 (Commey, 2013; Lahiff, 2016). The complete restructuring of landholdings in homeland areas into relatively small (2–3 ha) arable plots ensured that Africans could not produce beyond a basic subsistence level and created the highly skewed communal–commercial divide that still characterizes agricultural production in South Africa (Lahiff, 2014, 2016).

The South African policy approach has broadly aimed to encourage smallholder farmers into commercial production through redistribution of land. However, more than 20 years after the country's transition to democracy, the achievements of land reform remain debatable (Lahiff, 2016). While commercialization of smallholder agriculture has continued to be a key feature of South African agrarian reform policy (Mtero, 2012), provincial strategic plans (ARDRI, 2013) and agricultural support policy (GCIS, 2016), the reality is that achieving this goal remains a major challenge. Beginning with the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) phase (2000–04), the agrarian reform process in South Africa focused on creating a class of so-called 'emergent' farmers, who have access to commercial

farmland on either a freehold or leasehold basis and are able (in theory) to transform from subsistence to commercial production (Hebinck et al., 2011). In spite of this, by 2010, 90 per cent of redistributed land was classified by the government as ‘no longer productive’ (Africa Research Institute, 2013: 3).

Hall (2009: 3) suggests that the creation of conditions that enable farmers to produce and participate in local and national markets will be critical to the success of agrarian reform, referring to a ‘missing middle’ — the untapped potential of smallholder farmers to produce not just sufficient for their own consumption but also an excess for marketing. Cousins (2010: 16) argues that ‘reforms will contribute to reducing rural poverty in South Africa only if they create the conditions for a broadly based accumulation from below’, complemented by petty commodity production, creating the conditions required for the emergence of small-scale capitalist farmers who are well-supported to bridge the dual agricultural gap. However, rather than focusing on creating the conditions necessary to support this ‘middle’ group of emergent farmers, agrarian reform policy in South Africa has continued to classify all land reform beneficiaries as ‘emergent’ farmers and entitled them to government support regardless. This includes, for example, relatively wealthy entrepreneurs who accumulate from above by using land reform to get access to farms for large-scale commercial production. That such a wide variation in accumulation strategies is possible as an ‘emergent’ farmer in South Africa, raises questions about the utility of the emergent farmer concept and the effectiveness of the policies that underpin it in facilitating the desired transition of smallholder farmers from subsistence to small-scale commercial production.

This article critically examines the emergent farmer concept within the context of agrarian reform policy in South Africa. In particular, it seeks to identify the different classes of emergent farmers that currently exist and to understand the dynamics of accumulation within them. It begins by reviewing the emergent farmer concept within Southern Africa, how it has evolved and the agrarian reform policies that have shaped it. It then draws on case material from emergent livestock farmers in Eastern Cape Province, to examine the class differentiation apparent amongst them, the evidence (if any) for the emergence of a coherent ‘middle’, and the implications of this for policies designed to support them.

## THE EMERGENT FARMER CONCEPT

In Southern Africa, the emergent farmer concept is vague and defies easy definition. In agrarian reform rhetoric, it has been applied either interchangeably or in conjunction with other terms, such as ‘emergent smallholder farmer’ or ‘small-scale commercial farmer’ (Bernstein, 2010; Cousins, 2010). It has frequently been used as a blanket term for all land reform beneficiaries, but

as Poulton et al. (2008: 10) point out, there remains a 'common, but erroneous, assumption that all these farmers "emerge" from the ranks of local smallholders', when in fact this is clearly not the case. But what exactly is an emergent farmer? Emerging from what, and to what?

An interrogation of the literature suggests that currently 'emergent' farmers are characterized by a range of different accumulation strategies and varying levels of commercial productivity. At one end of the spectrum, emergent farmers exist as fully commercialized farmers. Several scholars (see Benjaminsen et al., 2006; Cousins, 2010; Jayne et al., 2015) have identified this group of farmers as emergent black commercial farmers. In Zambia, Jayne et al. (2015: 3) describe emergent farmers as 'medium-scale holders of between 5 hectares and 100 hectares, many of whom reside in urban areas' and have careers in non-farm sectors, labelling them 'emergent investor farmers'. In South Africa, Cousins (2010: 4), drawing on the Comprehensive Rural Development Programme of 2009, describes them as 'financially capable, aspirant black commercial farmers (black business people who will mostly farm on a part time basis)'. In both cases, this group largely consists of farmers from a non-agricultural background, who invest in acquiring agricultural land. This idea is supported by Hall and Kepe (2017: 123), who term them 'black capitalist farmers'.

Emergent, black commercial farmers have largely acquired land through deliberate shifts in the tenure system by African governments to support access to land by a financially endowed cohort of business people with no previous agrarian base. Jayne et al. (2015) argue that a deliberate agrarian reform policy and public spending portfolio contributed to the development of emergent black commercial farmers in Zambia, through the creation of private tenure. In some instances, agrarian reform in SSA primarily consisted of conversion of customary tenure into private tenure (Mafeje, 2003). In Zambia, the 1995 Land Act permitted conversion of 280,000 ha of customary land to free leasehold and 1 million ha to block farms. Access to block farms required a 'non-refundable application fee of ZMK 250,000–ZMK 3,500,000 (roughly US\$ 50–US\$ 700)' (Sitko and Jayne, 2014: 197), which promoted land access by a relatively well-off elite class of farmers. Similarly, access to land under LRAD in South Africa required personal contributions of a minimum of ZAR 5,000 (US\$ 385),<sup>1</sup> promoting access to land by a wealthier elite class. In Zimbabwe, a 'black elite' of 'urban petty bourgeoisie' who accessed land based on political affiliation to the ruling party is described by Marongwe (2011: 1071). Cousins (2010: 16) describes this Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) type of agrarian reform as a form of 'accumulation from above', as it has benefited a small number of large-scale black commercial farmers. Aliber and Hall (2012:

---

1. ZAR is the official South African currency, the South African Rand. Conversions in this article used the official exchange rate of 1 September 2018, of ZAR 1 = US\$ 0.077.

560) employ the term ‘accumulation for the few’, while Tilzey (2017: 3) refers to a ‘resurgent landed oligarchy’.

There are also black commercial farmers who have emerged or transformed themselves from the ranks of existing small-scale communal farmers (Jayne et al., 2015). These constitute a second class of emergent farmers and are primarily former smallholder farmers from communal areas who were already producing commercially and who accessed private land through agrarian reform. Cousins (2010: 4) describes them as ‘expanding commercial smallholders’, who produce significantly above subsistence, and utilize surplus production income for capital agricultural accumulation. Aliber and Hall (2012: 548) refer to them as ‘sustainable commercial smallholders’ while Jayne et al. (2015: 15) refer to ‘commercialized African farmers’.

There is also a third group of emergent farmers, consisting of smallholder farmers who were producing only at a subsistence level in the communal areas, but who have nonetheless accessed private farmland through agrarian reform. Cousins (2010: 17) argues that through this process of ‘accumulation from below’ and related ‘petty commodity production’, these farmers, having been given access to land, might produce beyond subsistence, and reinvest and engage in capital accumulation from agriculture. Both this group and the second group described above probably best represent the ‘missing middle’ (Hall, 2009: 3) and ‘entrepreneur’ farmers (Cousins, 2010: 16), who are potentially able to bridge the current dichotomy in South African agriculture.

The ‘missing middle’ concept has also found application more broadly within SSA. In Zimbabwe, Scoones et al. (2011b: 976) identify ‘a core group of “middle farmers” ... who are gaining surpluses from farming, investing in the land from off-farm work and so are able to accumulate from below’. Similarly, in Kenya, Neven et al. (2009: 1805) report that suppliers of supermarket horticulture products consist of emerging ‘middle class farmers’, whose scale of production lies between traditional small farmers and commercial export farmers. Poulton et al. (2008) describe them as small-scale commercial or ‘investor’ farmers primarily producing for the market. The underlining characteristic of this ‘middle’ group is being able to produce beyond subsistence levels and to market surplus produce to enable forms of reinvestment and accumulation in agriculture.

### **Emergent Farmers and Agrarian Reform: Evidence from South Africa and Zimbabwe**

The emergent farmer concept not only includes a wide range of classes of farmers but has also been strongly shaped by specific dynamics of agrarian reform within different countries and how these have changed through time. Here we use South Africa and Zimbabwe to illustrate how these differences have played out and the types of emergent farmers that have resulted.

In Zimbabwe, land reform had two main stages, namely the 'willing buyer, willing seller' model (1979–99) followed by Fast Track Land Reform programme (FTLR) from 2000, both intended to encourage smallholder production above subsistence levels. The willing buyer, willing seller model had, by 1999, resulted in the transfer of 1.4 million ha of land consisting of small-scale, 5 ha commercial units (Scoones et al., 2011a). Dekker and Kinsey (2011: 996) argue that these resettled holdings are commonly misconstrued to have constituted the 'core of a new small-scale class of commercial farms', but were not actually intended for commercial production. Regardless, this first stage of agrarian reform seems to have been broadly founded in the ethos of accumulation from below. From 2000, FTLR redistributed over 7.6 million ha from 4,500 existing farms to smallholder farmers, accounting for 20 per cent of the total land transferred (Scoones et al., 2011a). FTLR, though chaotic and disorderly (Chiweshe et al., 2015), distributed larger landholdings, resulting in A1 (subsistence-oriented) and A2 (commercially oriented) smallholder farmers with mean holdings of 37 ha and 318 ha respectively (Scoones et al., 2011b). This shift in approach to agrarian reform resulted in a broadening of the dynamics of accumulation that remains apparent in Zimbabwe and has resulted in the variety of 'emergent' farmers now in operation. These range from farmers who failed to make the transition and remain largely at a subsistence level, through a middle group who are producing and marketing surplus, to the emergence of a class of commercial (A2) black farmers producing on much larger farms. This represents a conceptual shift from a focus on accumulation from below to accumulation from both below and above, the latter involving an elite group of beneficiaries as identified by Marongwe (2011).

In South Africa, agrarian reform has followed a market-led, tri-component approach, consisting of land restitution, based on the 1994 Restitution of Land Rights Act; land tenure reform; and land redistribution, grounded in the Provision of Land and Assistance Act of 1993.<sup>2</sup> Slow progress in achieving its primary objective of redistributing 30 per cent of farmland (24.6 million ha) has resulted in land reform evolving over three stages. The first was the Settlement and Land Acquisition Grant (SLAG) from 1995 to 1999; the second was the LRAD from 2000 to 2005; and the latest is the Proactive Land Acquisition Strategy (PLAS), operational since 2006. Each stage represented a shift in policy and targeted beneficiaries in response to perceived failures of the previous phase. SLAG targeted the rural poor, smallholders or small-scale farmers, with the intention of creating capacity for them to engage in commercial production or become 'profit makers', as Ncube (2018: 2) suggests. SLAG was underpinned by a basic strategy of accumulation from below (Cousins, 2010) or growth from below (Shepherd

---

2. All of these have been extensively reviewed: see, e.g., Aliber (2011); Hall and Kepe (2017); Jacobs et al. (2003); Lahiff (2007, 2016); O'Laughlin et al. (2013); Okunlola et al. (2016).

and Scott, 2018). In contrast, the primary beneficiaries of agrarian reform under the Mbeki administration (1999–2008), particularly during the LRAD phase, were the financially endowed elite, encouraged to become ‘emerging commercial farmers’ (Cousins, 2010: 3) or ‘black capitalist farmers’ (Hall and Kepe, 2017: 123). Lahiff (2007) indicates that there was a deliberate shift in emphasis in the land redistribution policy from 2000, from the poor to the better-off.

However, despite these clear shifts in the targeting of land reform beneficiaries, government policy has continued to treat them as a homogeneous group. For example, the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries consistently refers to the 240,000 ‘emergent’ farmers that have been created through the government’s agrarian reform programmes (DAFF, 2012), even though this might include at one extreme former communal farmers who have accessed farms collectively but produce almost nothing for commercial sale and, at the other extreme, wealthy investor farmers on large farms who are focused purely on commercial production. The enormous variation in what currently constitutes an ‘emergent’ farmer in South Africa is further complicated by other fundamental differences between them, for instance in the size of their landholdings. For example, Bradstock (2005) found landholdings ranging in size from 14 to 346 ha for households in land redistribution projects in Limpopo province. Likewise, in Eastern Cape Province, Aliber et al. (2006) reported landholdings ranging from 135 to 1,055 ha in their study of 42 farmers, all of whom were considered by government as ‘emergent’ farmers.

In the context of the highly variable application of the emergent farmer concept at different points in time and in different countries, it is difficult to arrive at a specific definition of an emergent farmer. Thus, the working definition we take into our analysis of smallholder farmers in South Africa is necessarily quite broad. We define emergent farmers as farmers who are able to produce and market agricultural produce beyond subsistence levels and reinvest and engage in capital accumulation in agriculture from below. They should be successful vertical integrators of agricultural production and marketing; they contribute to poverty and unemployment alleviation and, importantly, are able to demonstrate how they have ‘emerged’ from one form to another, for example, from petty commodity production to small-scale capitalist production. They should constitute a ‘middle’ group between subsistence farmers and ‘investor’ commercial farmers, regardless of whether the latter group has benefited from any form of land reform. In this sense the definition acknowledges not only the ability of farmers to produce at commercial scale but also the way in which they reached this point — that is, through a process of accumulation from below rather than solely through the investment of existing capital in an alternative enterprise. Thus, we do not rule out the inclusion of fully commercialized farmers within this definition, as long as they have emerged from a subsistence context.

**THE CASE OF COLLECTIVE LIVESTOCK MARKETING IN EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

To better understand the class-based divisions that characterize emergent farmers in South Africa, we use a case study of collective cattle marketing amongst emergent farmers in Eastern Cape Province. We draw on published studies, unpublished secondary data and primary data associated with custom feeding programme (CFP) initiatives designed to support cattle production amongst emergent farmers. Primary data were collected through in-depth interviews with 60 of the 155 farmers within the Ikhephu Agricultural Secondary Cooperative (IASC) and secondary data were collated from IASC records.

**The Policy and Practice of Emergent Livestock Farming in Eastern Cape**

Of the 240,000 farmers categorized by the government as 'emergent' farmers in South Africa, those who have livestock own some 5.7 million cattle, or about 40 per cent of the national herd. It has been estimated by the government that 87,000 of these emergent farmers have the potential to produce on a commercial scale (DAFF, 2012). To support entry and competitiveness of emergent farmers in livestock markets, the meat industry was deregulated in 1996 through the introduction of the Marketing and Agriculture Act No. 47. However, the contribution of the emergent and smallholder livestock sector to the national economy has remained relatively low (Soji et al., 2015). Sotsha et al. (2017) argue that, while deregulation increased market access for emergent and smallholder farmers, it opened up market competition from established commercial farmers for local markets, mostly benefiting those emergent farmers who were aiming to become fully commercial. According to Aliber et al. (2006: 22), while emergent farmers occasionally marketed excess products, 'the evidence from Elliot land reform beneficiaries, at least as of late 2004/early 2005, was that they were barely marketing at all'.<sup>3</sup> Senyolo et al. (2009) found that emergent farmers occasionally sold their produce in the informal market, suggesting that they were unable to compete in the deregulated market.

Within the smallholder farming sector of the Eastern Cape, the market offtake for cattle has been reported at just 5 per cent (e.g., Musemwa et al., 2010; Sotsha et al., 2017). This is despite the Eastern Cape having the highest provincial cattle population, accounting for 23 per cent of all cattle in South Africa, the majority (over 60 per cent) being in the communal sector (Grant et al., 2004; Mkabela, 2013). Therefore, the potential to produce beyond subsistence levels in the province remains largely untapped. Low cattle

---

3. Elliot is a town in Sakhiziwe Local Municipality, in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa.



market offtake in communal areas has mainly been attributed to poor animal condition and weight (Mapiye et al., 2009), high mortality due to diseases and parasites (Scholtz and Bester, 2010) and low reproduction rates (Nqeno et al., 2011). Barriers to effective market participation (Thamaga-Chitja and Morojele, 2014) and overstocked and overgrazed rangelands due to contested and dysfunctional communal grazing institutions (Bennett et al., 2013) exacerbate the problem. Sikwela and Mushunje (2013) attribute the lack of market opportunities to the dissolution of the former Bantustan Agricultural Development Corporations at the end of apartheid and a failure to replace them.

Cattle marketing into the formal sector in South Africa mainly involves commercial feedlots, which account for 75 per cent of the beef slaughtered through formal channels in South Africa (Chingala et al., 2017), estimated at 1.4 million cattle annually. However, until recently, commercial feedlots in the Eastern Cape were limited in number, hence smallholder and emergent farmers were typically excluded from formal marketing channels. In response to the livestock marketing challenge in the Eastern Cape, the Eastern Cape Red Meat Project was introduced in 2005, steered by the ComMark Trust (ComMark, 2013).<sup>4</sup> Subsequently, the National Agricultural Marketing Council took over the project in 2009 through a national initiative called the National Red Meat Development Programme and has since established 10 communal CFPs and one commercial CFP within the Eastern Cape (Sotsha et al., 2017).

A CFP is defined as an agricultural activity ‘established to specialize in finishing farmers’ cattle, especially in communal areas, on a fixed fee service basis’ (Ntombela et al., 2013: 4). According to Marandure et al. (2016), a CFP acts as a centre that manages and finishes cattle using subsidized, commercial feed prior to marketing on behalf of the farmers. The main objective is to enhance formal market participation of emerging and smallholder farmers by improving live body weight and carcass quality of cattle and providing market information and infrastructure on a collective basis (Ngetu, 2013).

### **Emergent Farmer Categories**

Ikhephu CFP is a commercially focused enterprise supporting cattle farmers who have accessed freehold farmland through the agrarian reform process and private purchase. It is located in Elliot in Eastern Cape Province and operates under IASC, a secondary cooperative established in 2009. The cattle farmers utilizing Ikhephu CFP are clustered into five primary cooperatives, which all subscribe to IASC. Ikhephu CFP serves 155 ‘emergent’ farmers

---

4. Making Commodity and Service Markets Work for the Poor (ComMark) was a project that ran from 2003 to 2007, with the aim of improving the operation of commodity and service markets for the poor in Southern Africa.

Table 1. Cattle and Land Ownership for Farmers under IASC, Eastern Cape Province, 2016 (n = 155)

Metric	Cattle Ownership				Totals
	0–50	51–100	101–150	>150	
Number of farmers (n = 155)	86	39	19	11	<b>155</b>
Total cattle	2448	2789	2341	1709	<b>9287</b>
Mean cattle ( $\pm$ SEM)	29 $\pm$ 1.5	72 $\pm$ 2.1	123 $\pm$ 3.3	213 $\pm$ 28	<b>60 <math>\pm</math> 4.3</b>
Min–max cattle numbers	0–50	51–100	102–150	162–398	
Mean land size in cattle ownership category (ha)	325	489	603	664	<b>419 <math>\pm</math> 21.7</b>

Source: Authors' fieldwork.

with farm holdings amounting to some 64,000 ha in total, of which 10,000 ha are arable. It has a capacity of 500 animals and started operating in 2014 on a 126 ha municipal plot. Ikhephu CFP enforces age restrictions at intake, only accepting weaner steers of about 150–180 kg live weight, with a view to them reaching a target market weight of 350–400 kg within 90 to 120 days.

After accessing land and becoming part of IASC, overall herd size amongst the 155 IASC farmers increased from a mean of just 25 cattle per farmer to a mean of 60 cattle per farmer. However, a closer look at the distribution of cattle indicates that 25 per cent of farmers still owned less than 25 cattle, 55 per cent owned less than 50 cattle, and over 80 per cent owned less than 100 cattle reared on less than 500 ha (Table 1). Table 1 also indicates that owners of larger cattle herds also generally had larger farms.

Membership of IASC also enabled cattle farmers to benefit from support programmes sourced and channelled through the cooperative such as the Livestock Improvement Scheme (LIS), Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative of South Africa (AsgiSA) programme and the Abroad Spectrum Trading (AST) programme which distributed Bonsmara, Brahman, Angus and Drakensberger cattle on a loan basis. Several cattle farmers also made effective use of the CFP to sell cattle commercially. We analysed how the farmers engaged with the CFP in 2016 and categorized them on that basis.

IASC records indicate that from January to December 2016, Ikhephu CFP sold 409 animals, generating over ZAR 2.7 million (US\$ 207,900) (IASC 2016, unpublished), equivalent to an average sales value of ZAR 6,680 (US\$ 514) per animal. However, a deeper analysis of the sales data demonstrates that the 409 cattle sold belonged to just 55 different farmers out of the 155 livestock farmers who are affiliated to the CFP. Furthermore, of these 55 farmers, just 13 sold 246 of the cattle, underlining that a relatively small number of more commercially focused livestock farmers are responsible for most of the sales. The emergent farmers interviewed at Ikhephu could be organized into three broad categories based on the dynamics of their accumulation and production, that is, a combination of how they accessed their land, the number of cattle they sold and their access to different support

*Table 2. Key Characteristics of Identified Farmer Categories under IASC, Eastern Cape Province, 2016 (n = 60)*

Metric	Category 1 (n = 43)	Category 2 (n = 12)	Category 3 (n = 5)
Landholding range	10–379 ha	349–510 ha	491–1600 ha
Mean cattle sales	3 cattle per annum	16 cattle per annum	27 cattle per annum
Gender ratio	32 male: 11 female	10 male: 2 female	5 male: 0 female
Main income source	Social grants, primarily pensions, HIV-Aids grants, old age grants, child support grants	Cattle sales and social grants, primarily pensions and old age grants	Cattle sales and non-farm income from other businesses
Land access mode	Land reform through government grants, as individuals or groups	A combination of land reform government grants and personal purchase, as groups or as individuals	Multiple farms, accessed using non-agricultural funds. At least one farm accessed through land reform government grants
Access to cattle support programmes	Limited access	Some access	Access to multiple programmes
Accumulation mode	From below	Primarily from below	From above

Source: Authors' fieldwork.

mechanisms. These characteristics are summarized in Table 2, and the three categories are elaborated below.

### *Category 1. Subsistence Farmers on Private Farms*

This first category consisted of 43 farmers who sold a mean of three cattle each in 2016 (range = one to five cattle). Their farms had been accessed through the land reform process, either as individuals or as groups using pooled government grants. Four of the farmers were initially in group arrangements, but these had largely fragmented due to challenges with group dynamics such as conflicts over resource access and use. The farmers in this first category hardly marketed cattle; had irregular cattle sales (28 farmers sold only once per year mainly to raise capital to meet immediate household needs); and employed family labour. Most of the farms were not mechanized and had very few working livestock-watering dams, with 40 per cent of the farms having no dams at all. It is noteworthy that only three of the 43 farmers in this category had been able to access any of the cattle support programmes that were available. Furthermore, only nine of these farmers had their own means to transport cattle to the market, and 34 of the farmers did not have any prior training or education in agriculture. Most of these farmers were former communal farmers, farm workers and pensioners, who have remained largely subsistence-oriented, with only very limited evidence (if any) of petty commodity production. These farmers spread risk by keeping

active marketing and production linkages with their former communal areas. They all had land parcels in their former communal areas, which they still used to produce crops for home consumption, and 32 of them still held livestock in their former communal areas. The typical attributes and production strategies of farmers in this category are exemplified by Farmer X (Box 1).

*Box 1.*

Farmer X, a former farm worker, initially accessed her 330 ha farm in 2003 as part of a group of 10 previously unrelated individuals who pooled their finances, received matching funds from government and accessed the farm under LRAD. The group collapsed due to severe conflicts over resource use and access, and the other farmers left, resulting in Farmer X eventually being the only farmer. She had 32 crossbred cattle and 68 sheep. She sold two cattle and eight sheep in 2016, to repair a broken-down cart and pay school fees for two children: one steer was sold through Ikhephu commercial CFP and one in the communal areas. Farmer X hired a vehicle locally for ZAR 1,800 (US\$ 139) to transport the animal 35 km from the farm to the CFP. She summarized her situation thus:

My animals are few, so I do not sell cattle that often. It is not worth it to send animals to Ikhephu CFP, I do not have my own transport and when I hire, the transport is expensive. I sell to my community now. I do not have a house here at the farm, so I stay at my homestead in Ngcobo and come here occasionally. My life is in Ngcobo, life has not changed much for me after getting the farm. The farming business is hard, we have little support. I did not go to school for it, I have grade 12, I use my own experience to farm.

The largest proportion of household income is from grants, and occasional income from maize sales. Farmer X did not benefit from any of the locally available livestock support programmes. The partially fenced farm had one dam which dried up during the drier months and had no fenced cattle camps. She hired a tractor and implements for cultivating 6 ha of arable land and hired three labourers from the communal area during harvesting. Farmer X did not receive any visits from extension or veterinary services in 2016.

*Category 2. Small-scale Commercial Farmers*

The second category consisted of 12 farmers who could be classified as small-scale commercial farmers, each selling between 11 and 20 cattle in 2016. These farmers had regular cattle sales averaging 16 cattle per annum and derived a much larger proportion of their incomes from these sales. A few of them were able to permanently employ an average of two farm labourers, and most also hired additional labour from the communal areas during periods of peak labour demand. Three of the farmers were formerly in group arrangements, through pooled matching funds under LRAD, the

groups having collapsed for various reasons. Four of the farmers had purchased their farms using personal capital from either their pension packages or loans, and the other five had accessed the farms as individuals under government LRAD grants. It can be noted that even though some had purchased farms using their pensions or loans, and might be thought of as 'urban investors', they were still practising subsistence farming in their communal areas whilst employed, and hence essentially 'emerged' into small-scale commercial farming from a communal background. Most of the farms were moderately mechanized but had only a few functional livestock dams, most of which dried up during the dry season. Four of the farmers had joined cattle loan programmes but were struggling to repay the loans. Half of the farmers had their own vehicles to transport livestock to the market, the rest relied on hiring them. These farmers all marketed both formally through Ikhephu CFP and informally in their former communal areas. Two of the farmers possessed professional agricultural qualifications, and two had attended livestock production courses. Of the 12 individuals in this category, seven were former communal farmers, three were pensioners and two were currently employed, one in teaching and the other in the roadworks department. Farmers in this category are typified by farmer Y (Box 2).

#### *Box 2.*

Farmer Y had previously farmed in the communal areas and worked as a civil servant. Upon retiring, he used his pension and multiple loans to purchase his farm for ZAR 900,000 (US\$ 69,300) and to buy additional cattle. He regularly sold cattle and sheep in both the formal and informal sector, to meet his loan repayments, leaving very little to reinvest in agricultural reproduction. In 2016, he had 78 cattle, 564 sheep and 52 goats on the 418 ha, partially fenced farm. Farmer Y had accessed 22 Bonsmara cattle through a ZAR 100,000 (US\$ 7,700) NERPO (National Emergent Red Meat Producers Organization) loan, and nine Drakensberger cattle through the AST cattle programme loan; he had a vehicle loan from West Bank and a tractor loan from the Land Bank. He summarized the problems he had with trying to raise sufficient capital from livestock sales:

Most of the livestock income goes on servicing the loans. Since I am paying a farm loan, which increased the cost of the farm to almost ZAR 2 million (US\$ 154,000) due to interest, and a cattle loan, I am left with very little income for implements. I therefore also had to get a vehicle and tractor loan to expand productivity, hence I have more loans to pay off. We survive on my wife's salary.

Farmer Y produced rain-fed maize from 22 ha for livestock feed, the rest of the arable land being infested with invasive black wattle (*Acacia mearnsii*). In 2016, he raised ZAR 191,200 (US\$ 14,722) from the sale of 13 cattle and 51 sheep, to help service the ZAR 150,000 (US\$ 11,550) quarterly loan payment, pay school fees and purchase farm implements and inputs. Livestock marketing was difficult for Farmer Y due to the

dilapidated dirt road which connected the farm with the main tarred road into Elliot. This 9 km stretch of track which the farmer had constructed at his own cost (having purchased the farm without road access), was mostly inaccessible during the rainy season. He had two tractors, several implements for ploughing and planting and a vehicle, and the farm was equipped with three functional dams. Farmer Y employed three permanent labourers and utilized additional labour from his former communal area during peak periods. Farmer Y continued to have strong links with his former communal area, producing maize (mainly for subsistence) on 10 ha and holding some cattle there, most of which were crossbreeds inherited from his mother. He also utilized the shearing shed in his former communal area to shear the sheep from his farm, as he could not afford a shearing shed and equipment on the farm. Farmer Y had no formal training in agriculture, relying solely on the experience he had accumulated as a communal farmer.

### *Category 3. Fully Commercialized Farmers*

The third category comprised five fully commercialized, large-scale farmers who sold between 21 and 30 cattle each in 2016, averaging 27 cattle each. All the farmers in this category had access to more than one farm, three of the farmers owning three farms each, with at least one of the farms having been accessed through a government LRAD grant. The farmers were involved in other businesses outside agriculture such as real estate, consultancy, transport and funeral insurance, and effectively constituted 'investor' farmers. These farmers frequently sold cattle to the commercial CFP. Two of the farmers were stud breeders of specified breeds in South Africa, possessing state-of-the-art equipment at their farms. The farmers permanently employed three to ten farm labourers at each of their farms and had mean herds of 150 cattle each. These farmers had at some point occupied influential positions in their respective cooperative committees and had managed to access all of the government support programmes available, securing cattle and farm implements on farms which had multiple working dams. All these farmers were business people, for whom farming constituted only a fraction of their income portfolio. The farmers seemed to be well-connected socially and politically and also had access to loans from financial institutions. This category was exemplified by Farmer Z (Box 3).

#### *Box 3.*

Farmer Z had three farms: two farms of 280 ha and 700 ha had been purchased privately, and one 370 ha farm had been accessed through an LRAD government grant. These farms — all of which have at least four functional dams — are highly specialized in terms of different forms of

commercial production: the 280 ha farm holds 19 Bonsmara bulls and 230 Dohne Merino-crossed sheep; the 700 ha farm has 261 Bonsmara female and weaner cattle and 200 mutton Merino sheep; and the 370 ha farm is retained predominantly for maize production, achieving a yield of 10t/ha in 2016. Following a vaccination, breeding and feed supplementation programme, the farmer sold 25 older cattle, 84 weaner cattle and 56 sheep in 2016, through both the formal and informal markets. Farmer Z also had other income sources: he was involved in the funeral insurance business, and he further augmented his income by buying specialized sheep breeds from breeders and reselling in various markets, in addition to income from sheep and wool sales from the farms. As a former Ikhephu CFP board member, he benefited from 11 cattle provided through the AST programme, 30 cattle from the AsgiSA programme, 30 cattle from the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) Nguni programme, fencing and equipment from the Department of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform, and ZAR 270,000 (US\$ 20,790) from the Biomass Fodder Production Assistance Programme. Farmer Z had access to loans if required but did not feel the need to apply for one. He had strategic connections with local government and commercial farmers, underlined when he suggested:

Knowing people is very important. I have managed to get into most programmes because I know people, and they call me when something comes up. We have a group of five commercial farmers and we bulk our cattle weaners together, and we sometimes buy from other farmers to make 500 weaners that we sell in one go. We were able to get free transport and a good price deal from the abattoir. We do this every three months, so I use money from my other business to buy my contribution of weaners to the group, and I make a tidy profit.

Farmer Z was educated up to grade 12 and invested in various specialized courses such as Dohne Merino sheep production and cattle breeding courses in colleges in Veedersburg, Ventersdorp, Bloemfontein and Sutterheim, and at Dohne Private Farming College. He has also received livestock training through his primary cooperative, Cicirha Ntungele.

## **PROSPECTS AND CHALLENGES FOR EMERGENT SMALLHOLDER LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA**

The case material underlines the considerable class differentiation that currently characterizes emergent farmers in South Africa. Indeed, the three categories of emergent livestock farmers that are identified in the analysis above are representative of the entire spectrum, from subsistence to commercial production, highlighting the lack of clarity currently being shown by policy makers in the application of the ‘emergent farmer’ label.

In the case material, the vast majority of farmers remained at a subsistence level, even though they now had access to private farmland through agrarian

reform. Despite the move from a communal to a private farming system there was no overall evidence of a change in production strategy associated with this through a recognizable shift to petty commodity production or small-scale capitalism. Post-resettlement support has largely failed to make a meaningful impact on this category of farmers (e.g., AsgiSA-EC, 2014; Cousins, 2013; Sikwela and Mushunje, 2013). Difficult group dynamics in the context of controlling management and use of natural resources (Lahiff, 2007), dilapidated roads, poor extension service access (Aliber and Hall, 2012) and lack of access to finance, all challenge the productivity of these farmers. Hall (2009) concludes that fewer than 1 in 20 land reform beneficiaries benefited from loans from the Comprehensive Agricultural Support Programme (CASP) or Micro-Agricultural Financial Institution of South Africa (MAFISA). Most of these farmers also remain excluded from livestock support programmes and hence still own low-yielding crossbred animals, which realize lower prices in the current red meat classification system (Chingala et al., 2017). A lack of functioning grazing camps and livestock dams further curtails their production potential. The failure of these farmers to make the transition to commercial production helps to explain why so much of the redistributed farmland in South Africa has been classified as 'no longer productive' (Africa Research Institute, 2013; DPME, 2013; O'Laughlin et al., 2013). Similar findings of 'underutilization' of land reform farms have been reported in Zimbabwe by Marongwe (2011).

These farmers spread risk by continuing to draw strongly on their connections with the communal areas from which they originated. Communal areas provide a suitable market for the produce they are occasionally able to sell. The lack of essential equipment such as tractors means that they cannot make effective use of the relatively large arable land areas available on their farms. Therefore, most of these farmers continue to undertake crop production in the communal fields in their home villages, where they can utilize draught power and engage friends and relatives in seasonal labour arrangements. Owing to the 'limited resources and skills to operate a market-oriented production system' (DAFF, 2018: vi), some of these farmers are reluctant or simply unable to make the shift to a more capitalist production model and therefore remain at a largely subsistence level, barely accumulating. We conclude that the inability of this category of farmers to transition to a consistent form of commercial production means that, despite being land reform beneficiaries, they cannot be considered as genuinely 'emergent' farmers.

However, the analysis did identify a relatively small group of farmers who are accumulating from below to make the transition from communal subsistence into small/medium-scale commercial production. This 'middle' category consists of farmers who emerged from rural areas, using either state assistance or capital from urban jobs to purchase their farms. Those who purchased farms using capital accumulated through urban employment were former communal farmers who had unsuccessfully applied for state assistance with farm purchase under agrarian reform. These farmers pro-



duced above subsistence and marketed their surplus produce regularly while employing external labour, characteristic of small/medium-scale capitalist farmers (Cousins, 2010). This group most closely approximates to the ‘missing middle’ referred to by Hall (2009), Neven et al. (2009) and Poulton et al. (2008) in SSA. They also meet the criteria for classification as emergent farmers, having ‘emerged’ from communal petty commodity production (Aliber and Hall, 2012; Cousins, 2010) into varying levels of capitalist production on land reform farms. If properly supported, this emergent farmer group has the potential to effectively bridge the divide in South African agriculture. However, many of these farmers face real challenges in producing to scale due to their limited access to knowledge, finance and support programmes. Particularly important for this group is a lack of available financial capital, the farmers having to draw on their own limited capital or loans, resulting in debt. These challenges have also been identified by Marongwe (2011: 1070), who reported that aspirant black farmers in Zimbabwe ‘lacked sufficient capital to invest meaningfully in commercial agriculture, did not have relevant farming experience, and were unable to put the bulk of their land into production for several years’. Due to the challenges they face, some of these farmers also spread risk by continuing to engage with their former communal areas.

Finally, the case material identified a small number of fully commercialized, large-scale capitalist farmers accumulating from above and using business capital to do so. The existence of these black capitalist farmers (Hall and Kepe, 2017) is supported by published studies from other parts of Southern Africa (e.g., Jayne et al., 2015). However, they cannot be considered as genuine ‘emergent’ farmers as they are not emerging from one class system into another, but rather are capitalist entrepreneurs (Kay, 2015; Tilzey, 2017) investing capital in an alternative enterprise. They do, nonetheless, seem to be well-positioned politically and socially for ‘elite capture’ of the support schemes available to all ‘emergent’ farmers and they continue to qualify for access to farms on this basis. The fact that they are not representative of emergent farmers and certainly do not constitute the rural poor, raises questions about the extent to which they should actually be entitled to any such support.

Many of the challenges highlighted by the case study material find resonance with those extensively documented by other authors (Aliber and Hall, 2012; Atuahene, 2011; Bradstock, 2005; Lahiff, 2016; Macleod et al., 2008). Current policy acknowledges the skewed, uncoordinated, inadequate, inefficient and ineffective support afforded to emergent farmers in South Africa (DAFF, 2018). Increasing and sustaining an effective emergent farmer category in South Africa will be difficult within the current agrarian reform approach, which helps to perpetuate elite capture of resources and support services at one end while reinforcing subsistence production at the other. In effect, the dualism within South African agriculture that agrarian reform sought to address remains largely intact. Indeed, the latest draft policy on farmer development support (DAFF, 2018) suggests a move away from

the term 'emergent' farmer and instead classifies farmers according to production capacity and annual financial turnover. Critically, this new policy maintains a requirement for farmers to have co-financing in order to access support, which might serve to prolong the exclusion of poorer farmers and reinforce their difficulty in transitioning to effective petty commodity production. Agrarian reform programmes need a more radical realignment with a much clearer focus, first, on enabling farmers who have accessed land to 'emerge' successfully into small/medium-scale capitalist production and, second, on offering more effective support for those few farmers who are already there — that is, creating and perpetuating the 'middle' group of small-scale producers who still remain largely absent from the farming system.

How to effectively support the large numbers of 'subsistent' farmers who, despite having access to land, have little ability to engage in effective petty commodity production remains a major challenge. One important step in trying to encourage any transition into the 'middle' might involve creating a comprehensive inventory of who these farmers are, what their challenges are and the knowledge gaps that characterize them. The current government proposal that all 'producers' be centrally registered and identified by a unique producer registration number (DAFF, 2018) might be a useful step in creating the database of smallholder producers that is currently lacking (Jacobs et al., 2003; Valente, 2009). This could then be used to target support to them more effectively.

For the relatively small group of farmers who are already in the 'emergent' middle group, policy may need to focus on better enabling them to service the debts they have often accumulated in making the transition. This might take the form, for example, of government or private sector co-financing to provide capital for production, especially for those farmers who purchased farms and are left with inadequate funds for production. Improved access to support programmes and addressing critical knowledge gaps might also help to sustain this group.

For the fully commercialized investor farmers, the question is not so much how best to support them (the standard mechanisms that any commercial farmer has access to can do this, for example, business loans from banks), but rather how to limit their ability to access the support mechanisms that are currently available to all 'emergent' farmers. The South African government is clearly aware of this 'double-dipping' but at present it does not seem to have a clear way of preventing it (DAFF, 2018).

## CONCLUSIONS

Current agrarian reform approaches in South Africa treat all land reform beneficiaries as a homogeneous group of 'emergent' farmers and are not conducive to offering appropriate support to farmers who, in reality, are often at very different stages in the transition to commercial production.

Our analysis suggests that in the smallholder cattle sector, three categories of farmers are apparent but only one is really representative of the transition to commercial production that an ‘emergent’ farmer should demonstrate. This small group has emerged from communal petty commodity to small/medium-scale capitalist commercial production through accumulation from below, and probably most closely approximates to the ‘missing middle’ that scholars have argued is vital in bridging the subsistence–commercial divide. The other two groups consist of the larger fraction of farmers who remain largely subsistence-oriented, at one end of the spectrum, and an elite group of already commercialized investors accumulating from above, at the other end. Neither of these groups shows evidence of ‘emergence’, and we conclude that the term ‘emergent farmer’ is thus misplaced for the majority of land reform beneficiaries in South Africa. The term has limited utility not only because it fails to focus support on those who most need it in making the transition to the ‘middle’, but also because it fails to define when and how an emergent farmer ceases to be ‘emergent’. This is facilitating the continued capture of resources by an already commercialized elite who are able to benefit from agrarian reform through land access and associated support, as ‘emergent farmers’. We suggest that the adoption of a much clearer definition of the term ‘emergent farmer’ will help to focus policy on supporting those who are genuinely ‘emerging’ into the middle ground of small-scale commercial production. Importantly, if this definition is to effectively support the transition of subsistence farmers to commercial production, it should not only recognize the aspects of production and financial turnover that are currently being mooted but also acknowledge the class from which these farmers have emerged.

## REFERENCES

- Africa Research Institute (2013) ‘Waiting for the Green Revolution: Land Reform in South Africa’. Briefing Note 1301. London: Africa Research Institute.
- Aliber, M. (2011) *Strategies to Support South African Smallholders as a Contribution to Government’s Second Economy Strategy. Volume 2: Case Studies*. PLAAS Research Report 41. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.
- Aliber, M. and R. Hall (2012) ‘Support for Smallholder Farmers in South Africa: Challenges of Scale and Strategy’, *Development Southern Africa* 29(4): 548–62.
- Aliber, M., P. Masika and J. Quan (2006) ‘Land Reform at Scale: A Case Study of Land Redistribution in Elliot District, Eastern Cape’. Land Access and Participatory Territorial Development Report No. 3. London: University of Greenwich Natural Resources Institute.
- ARDRI (2013) ‘Evaluation Report on Performance of Projects Implemented by DRDAR in Chris Hani and Joe Gqabi District Municipalities’. Alice: Agricultural Rural Development and Research Institute.
- AsgiSA-EC (2014) ‘AsgiSA Eastern Cape Strategic Business Plan: 2009–2014’. Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative of South Africa (AsgiSA) Report. Pretoria: Government of South Africa.
- Atuahene, B. (2011) ‘South Africa’s Land Reform Crisis: Eliminating the Legacy of Apartheid’, *Foreign Affairs* 90: 121–29.

- Benjaminsen, T.A., R. Rohde, E. Sjaastad, P. Wisborg and T. Lebert (2006) 'Land Reform, Range Ecology, and Carrying Capacities in Namaqualand, South Africa', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96(3): 524–40.
- Bennett, J., A. Ainslie and J. Davis (2013) 'Contested Institutions? Traditional Leaders and Land Access and Control in Communal Areas of Eastern Cape Province, South Africa', *Land Use Policy* 32: 27–38.
- Bernstein, H. (2010) *Class Dynamics of Agrarian Change*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Bradstock, A. (2005) 'Changing Livelihoods and Land Reform: Evidence from the Northern Cape Province of South Africa', *World Development* 33(11): 1979–92.
- Bundy, C. (1988) *The Rise and Fall of the South African Peasantry* (2nd edn). London: James Currey.
- Chingala, G., E. Raffrenato, K. Dzama, L.C. Hoffman and C. Mapiye (2017) 'Towards a Regional Beef Carcass Classification System for Southern Africa', *South African Journal of Animal Science* 47(4): 408–23.
- Chiweshe, M.K., L. Chakona and K. Helliker (2015) 'Patriarchy, Women, Land and Livelihoods on A1 Farms in Zimbabwe', *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 50(6): 716–31.
- ComMark (2013) 'Giving Development a Face: Eastern Cape Red Meat Project'. Pretoria: ComMark Trust. [www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/703/Eastern\\_Cape\\_Red\\_Meat\\_Project.pdf](http://www.value-chains.org/dyn/bds/docs/703/Eastern_Cape_Red_Meat_Project.pdf)
- Commy, P. (2013) 'South Africa: 100 Years of Landless Blacks', *New African* 532: 48–51.
- Cousins, B. (2010) 'What is a "Smallholder"? Class-analytic Perspectives on Small-scale Farming and Agrarian Reform in South Africa'. Working Paper No. 16. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.
- Cousins, B. (2013) 'Smallholder Irrigation Schemes, Agrarian Reform and "Accumulation from Above and from Below" in South Africa', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 13(1): 116–39.
- Cousins, B. and I. Scoones (2010) 'Contested Paradigms of "Viability" in Redistributive Land Reform: Perspectives from Southern Africa', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37(1): 31–66.
- DAFF (2012) 'A Profile of the South African Beef Market Value Chain'. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.
- DAFF (2018) 'National Policy on Comprehensive Producer Development Support: Draft 5 Ver. 2'. Pretoria: Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.
- Dekker, M. and B. Kinsey (2011) 'Contextualizing Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Long-term Observations from the First Generation', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(5): 995–1019.
- DPME (2013) 'Implementation Evaluation of the Recapitalisation and Development Programme: From its Inception in 2010 to June 2012'. Alice: Department of Performance Monitoring and Evaluation.
- GCIS (2016) 'Agriculture', in *South Africa Year Book 2015/16*, pp. 31–64. Pretoria: Government Communication and Information System.
- Grant, B., N. Vink and M. Murray (2004) 'Subsector Analysis of the Beef Industry in the Eastern Cape'. Pretoria: ComMark Trust.
- Hall, R. (2009) 'A Fresh Start for Rural Development and Agrarian Reform?'. Policy Brief No. 29. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies. [www.plaas.org.za/plaas-publication/pb29](http://www.plaas.org.za/plaas-publication/pb29).
- Hall, R. and T. Kepe (2017) 'Elite Capture and State Neglect: New Evidence on South Africa's Land Reform', *Review of African Political Economy* 44(151): 122–30.
- Hebinck, P., D. Fay and K. Kondlo (2011) 'Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa's Eastern Cape Province: Caught by Continuities', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 11(2): 220–40.
- HLPE (2012) 'Food Security and Climate Change'. Report of the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the UN Committee on World Food Security. Rome: FAO.
- IASC (2016) 'Amended Progress Report 2016'. Unpublished report. Elliot: Ikhepu Agricultural Secondary Cooperative.
- Jacobs, P., E. Lahiff and R. Hall (2003) 'Land Redistribution'. Evaluating Land and Agrarian Reform in South Africa Series, No. 1. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.

- Jayne, T.S. et al. (2015) 'Africa's Changing Farmland Ownership: The Rise of the Emergent Investor Farmer'. Plenary paper presented at the 29th Triennial International Conference of Agricultural Economists, Milan (13 August).
- Kay, C. (2015) 'The Agrarian Question and the Neoliberal Rural Transformation in Latin America', *European Review of Latin American and Caribbean Studies* 100: 73–83.
- Keegan, T. (1983) 'The Sharecropping Economy on the South African Highveld in the Early Twentieth Century', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 10(2–3): 201–26.
- Lahiff, E. (2007) "'Willing Buyer, Willing Seller": South Africa's Failed Experiment in Market-led Agrarian Reform', *Third World Quarterly* 28(8): 1577–97.
- Lahiff, E. (2014) 'Review Essay: Land Reform in South Africa 100 Years after the Natives' Land Act', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 14(4): 586–92.
- Lahiff, E. (2016) 'Stalled Land Reform in South Africa', *Current History* 115(781): 181–87.
- Macleod, N.D., C.K. McDonald and F.P. van Oudtshoorn (2008) 'Challenges for Emerging Livestock Farmers in Limpopo Province, South Africa', *African Journal of Range & Forage Science* 25(2): 71–77.
- Mafeje, A. (2003) 'The Agrarian Question, Access to Land, and Peasant Responses in Sub-Saharan Africa'. Civil Society and Social Movements Programme Paper No. 6. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.
- Mapiye, C., M. Chimonyo and K. Dzama (2009) 'Seasonal Dynamics, Production Potential and Efficiency of Cattle in the Sweet and Sour Communal Rangelands in South Africa', *Journal of Arid Environments* 73(3–4): 529–36.
- Marandure, T. et al. (2016) 'Determinants and Opportunities for Commercial Marketing of Beef Cattle Raised on Communally Owned Natural Pastures in South Africa', *African Journal of Range & Forage Science* 33(3): 199–206.
- Marongwe, N. (2011) 'Who Was Allocated Fast Track Land, and What Did they Do with It? Selection of A2 Farmers in Goromonzi District, Zimbabwe and its Impacts on Agricultural Production', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(5): 1069–92.
- Mkabela, T. (2013) 'Linking Farmers with Markets in Rural South Africa: Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation through Supply Chain Management'. Pretoria: National Agricultural Marketing Council.
- Moyo, S. (2003) 'The Land Question in Africa: Research Perspectives and Questions'. Paper presented at CODESRIA Conference on Land Reform, the Agrarian Question and Nationalism, Gaborone (18–19 October).
- Mtero, F. (2012) 'Commercialisation, Deagrarianisation and the Accumulation/Reproduction Dynamic: Massive Maize Production Schemes in the Eastern Cape, South Africa'. Working Paper No. 23. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.
- Museumwa, L., A. Mushunje, M. Chimonyo and C. Mapiye (2010) 'Low Cattle Market Off-take Rates in Communal Production Systems of South Africa: Causes and Mitigation Strategies', *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 12(5): 209–26.
- Muyanga, M., T.S. Jayne and W.J. Burke (2011) 'Pathways into and out of Poverty: A Study of Rural Household Wealth Dynamics in Kenya', *Journal of Development Studies* 49(10): 1802–18.
- Ncube, L.B. (2018) 'Farming Styles, Livelihoods and Social Differentiation of Smallholder Farmers: Insights from New Forest Irrigation Scheme in Mpumalanga Province of South Africa'. Working Paper No. 53. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.
- Neven, D., M.K. Odera, T. Reardon and H. Wang (2009) 'Kenyan Supermarkets, Emerging Middle-class Horticultural Farmers, and Employment Impacts on the Rural Poor', *World Development* 37(11): 1802–11.
- Ngetu, X. (2013) 'National Red Meat Development Programme'. Pretoria: National Agricultural Marketing Council.
- Nqeno, N., M. Chimonyo and C. Mapiye (2011) 'Farmers' Perceptions of the Causes of Low Reproductive Performance in Cows Kept under Low-input Communal Production Systems in South Africa', *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 43(2): 315–21.

- Ntombela, S., M. Lindikaya and B. Nyhodo (2013) 'Mainstreaming Subsistence Farmers through Communal Feedlot: Case of Umzimvubu Custom Feeding Program in Mount Frere'. Pretoria: National Agricultural Marketing Council.
- O'Laughlin, B., H. Bernstein, B. Cousins and P.E. Peters (2013) 'Introduction: Agrarian Change, Rural Poverty and Land Reform in South Africa since 1994', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 13(1): 1–15.
- Okunlola, A., M. Ngubane, B. Cousins and A. du Toit (2016) 'Challenging the Stereotypes: Small-scale Black Farmers and Private Sector Support Programmes in South Africa'. Research Report No. 53. Cape Town: Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies.
- Peters, P.E. (2009) 'Challenges in Land Tenure and Land Reform in Africa: Anthropological Contributions', *World Development* 37(8): 1317–25.
- Poulton, C. et al. (2008) 'All-Africa Review of Experiences with Commercial Agriculture: Lessons from Success and Failure'. Background paper for the Competitive Commercial Agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa (CCAA) Study. Rome: FAO.
- Pretty, J., C. Toulmin and S. Williams (2011) 'Sustainable Intensification in African Agriculture', *International Journal of Agricultural Sustainability* 9(1): 5–24.
- Scholtz, M.M. and J. Bester (2010) 'Off-take and Production Statistics in the Different South African Cattle Sectors: Results of a Structured Survey', *Applied Animal Husbandry & Rural Development* 3: 19–23.
- Scoones, I. et al. (2011a) 'Zimbabwe's Land Reform: A Summary of Findings'. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Scoones, I. et al. (2011b) 'Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Challenging the Myths', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38(5): 967–93.
- Senyolo, G.M., P. Chaminuka, M.N. Makhura and A. Belete (2009) 'Patterns of Access and Utilization of Output Markets by Emerging Farmers in South Africa: Factor Analysis Approach', *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 4(3): 208–14.
- Shepherd, A. and L. Scott (2018) 'Sustaining Poverty Escapes in Rural Kenya'. Policy Implications Brief. Washington, DC: USAID. <https://dl.orangedox.com/uobWiz>
- Sikwela, M.M. and A. Mushunje (2013) 'The Impact of Farmer Support Programmes on Household Income and Sustainability in Smallholder Production: A Case Study of the Eastern Cape and Kwazulu Natal Farmers, South Africa', *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 8(21): 2502–11.
- Sitko, N.J. and T.S. Jayne (2014) 'Structural Transformation or Elite Land Capture? The Growth of "Emergent" Farmers in Zambia', *Food Policy* 48: 194–202.
- Soji, Z. et al. (2015) 'Relevance of the Formal Red Meat Classification System to the South African Informal Livestock Sector', *South African Journal of Animal Science* 45(3): 263–77.
- Sotsha, B. et al. (2017) 'Factors Influencing Communal Livestock Farmers' Participation into the National Red Meat Development Programme (NRMDP) in South Africa: The Case of the Eastern Cape Province'. NAMC Working Paper No. NAMC/WP/2017/02. Pretoria: National Agricultural Marketing Council.
- Thamaga-Chitja, J.M. and P. Morojele (2014) 'The Context of Smallholder Farming in South Africa: Towards a Livelihood Asset Building Framework', *Journal of Human Ecology* 45(2): 147–55.
- Tilzey, M. (2017) 'Neo-extractivism, Populism, and the Agrarian Question in Bolivia and Ecuador'. Paper presented at the 5th International Conference of the BRICS Initiative for Critical Agrarian Studies, Moscow (13–16 October).
- Valente, C. (2009) 'The Food (In)Security Impact of Land Redistribution in South Africa: Microeconomic Evidence from National Data', *World Development* 37(9): 1540–53.

**Lovemore C. Gwiriri** (corresponding author: gwiriril@coventry.ac.uk; luvgwiriri@yahoo.com) is a research fellow at the Centre for Agroecology, Water and Resilience (CAWR), Coventry University, UK. He researches livestock systems resilience, decentralized institutions and agrarian reform. He is the author of several articles and a recipient of the Netherlands Nuffic fellowship and a CAWR PhD scholarship.

**James Bennett** (apy073@coventry.ac.uk) is a Senior Lecturer at CAWR, Coventry University, UK. His research focuses on common property institutions, rangeland management and production, agrarian reform and smallholder livestock production. He has published numerous articles in this field and was previously Editor-in-Chief of the *African Journal of Range and Forage Science*.

**Cletos Mapiye** (cmapiye@sun.ac.za) is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Animal Science at Stellenbosch University, South Africa. Cletos employs a farm-to-fork research approach to sustainable meat production and quality. He has published over 85 articles, a book chapter and several conference proceedings, and is a recipient of the TWAS–SAREP Prize 2017.

**Sara Burbi** (ab9735@coventry.ac.uk) is a veterinary surgeon and Course Director of the MSc ‘Agroecology, Water and Food Sovereignty’ at CAWR, Coventry University, UK. She is well published, and her research centres on livestock agroecology, multi-actor knowledge co-creation, and farm economics to facilitate resilient farming systems.