Chapter 11
Putting Communal Land into Productive Use Through Collaboration, Networking and Partnerships in Rural South Africa

Akwasi Arko-Achemfuor

Abstract   The nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries have seen increasing movements towards neoliberalism and globalisation across the world. A lot of countries and regions across the world have taken advantage of neoliberal policies and globalisation to access markets as well as use innovative technologies to produce goods and services. In spite of the advantages brought about by neoliberalism and globalisation to most parts of the world, some regions in the developing world have been forced to abandon some of the good aspects of their traditions and culture that have sustained and maintained them over the years. Although Africans cannot be said to be a homogenous group, certain aspects of their cultures are similar. This chapter argues that cultural hegemony has led to a situation where the people of Africa have to a large extent abandoned certain aspects of their culture and traditions that have kept their communities over centuries while they at the same time have not been able to fully adopt and adapt to other cultural traditions and systems from elsewhere. Communal ownership of land and other natural resources has been the practice of most African communities, but the advent of colonialism, imperialism and capitalism has contributed to land ownership and use falling into private ownership which most African communities find difficult to adapt to.

This chapter reports on how members of a rural community in South Africa are effectively addressing the challenges of poverty, unemployment, lack of access to private land and food security through the use of communal land in a rural community in the North West Province of South Africa. There are ongoing debates on land ownership, inequality regarding access to land for the majority black population in South Africa. Some commentators argue that communal land that is in the custody of traditional authorities, most especially in the former Bantustans, is not put to productive use to address the challenges of poverty, food security and unemployment in rural areas. I argue that the question on using communal land for rural development is crucial for socioeconomic empowerment of rural communities in

A. Arko-Achemfuor (✉)
University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa
e-mail: aachea@unisa.ac.za

particular and social science research in general. I illustrate how communal land is made available by one traditional authority to the members of the community which in collaboration with a non-governmental organisation, an institution of higher learning, a provincial administration and the private sector is putting communal land to productive use through what I refer to as putting "communalism" or "communitarianism" into practice. The lessons from this initiative can serve as a model for using communal land for sustainable livelihoods in rural South Africa and elsewhere on the African continent where communal ownership of land continues to be a major challenge to socioeconomic development of communities.

Keywords Agriculture · Communal land · Culture · Globalisation · Neoliberalism

Introduction

Development practitioners, governments, the private sectors and non-governmental organisation just to name a few advocate for a sustainable development in all communities. The concept of development has and continues to feature prominently on the development agenda that gained prominence in the 1960s and 1970s. The right to development was recognised as a human right in the 1970s and later adopted as the Declaration on the Right to Development in 1986 leading to the concept of development being placed firmly in the discourse of economics and other disciplines. The right to development was a means to address the anxieties among developing countries who feared for their just treatment in the international community's economic governance conduct (Fukuda-Parr 2012). Hitherto, development was viewed mainly from the economic perspective which centred to a large extent on economic growth. However, advocates and researchers such as Seers (1964) started to question the other important aspects of the concept which were neglected such as the social, environmental and well-being. Various approaches and strategies have been suggested and adopted by countries and organisations including the move towards sustainable development, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and, more recently in 2015, the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The sustainable livelihoods approach (SLA) has been advocated for as one of the key theories in development and poverty analysis (Ashley and Carney 1999). The approach combines a conceptual framework with a set of operational principles to provide guidance of policy formulation and development practice. Some of the key proponents of the SLA are DFID, Oxfam, CARE and UNDP who emphasise and use the approach in various projects and initiatives across the world. There are many ways of applying the livelihoods approach, but it is very important to keep or work along the underlying principles of the approach.

Chambers and Conway (1992) define sustainable livelihood as comprising the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. Livelihood is said to be sustainable when it is able to cope with and recover from shocks and stresses, maintain and enhance its capabilities

and assets both now and in the future while not undermining the natural resource base (Ndlovu 2013: 33). Sustainable livelihood as a concept incorporates the notion of complexity, change and uncertainty thereby empowering people to earn incomes to meet the current and future economic and social needs and minimise their vulnerability to external stresses.

The nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries as mentioned earlier on in this chapter have seen increasing movements towards neoliberalism and globalisation across the world. Friedman (1962) is one of the key theorists and proponents of neoliberalism. The central claim of neoliberalism is that the free market or capitalist system is maximally effective in producing and equitably distributing the economic, social, political and intellectual necessities of life in society. The free market comprises atomistic rational individuals who know their needs and wants and who contract with other individuals through the mechanism of the marketplace to satisfy those needs and wants. Drawing its cue from classical economics based on individualist notions, neoliberal theorists argue that these needs and wants motivate self-interested actions. Consequently, self-interested individuals active on a free market within and beyond their national boundaries become the most competent agents of development because the free market is able to enhance their economic status and that of their nations as a whole.

Globalisation is defined by Dreher et al. (2008: 15) as the intensification of cross-national interactions that promote the establishment of transnational structures and the global integration of cultural, economic, environmental, political, technological and social processes on global, supranational, national, regional and local levels. A lot of countries and regions across the world have taken advantages brought about by globalisation to access markets as well as use innovative technologies to produce goods and services. In spite of the advantages brought about by globalisation, some regions in the developing world have been forced to abandon some of the good aspects of their traditions and culture which have sustained and maintained them over the years. As indicated earlier on in this chapter, Africans cannot be said to be a homogenous group, but certain aspects of their cultures and traditions tend to be similar. For example, Quora (n.d.) argues that there aren't a lot of differences between African cultures possibly because the continent was "uniformised" by the Bantu migrations, the Mfecane and finally Christianity and Islam. Quora (n.d.) adds that there is only one major difference in African culture, the matrilineal (Akan) and patrilineal form of descent, everything else is simply window dressing. I argue that cultural hegemony which is the situation where an alien culture is imposed on another culture eventually comes to dominate various aspects of an indigenous culture such as the politics, economic and culture through the medium of language and western education.

Cultural hegemony has led to a situation where the people of Africa have abandoned some of the good and workable aspects of their culture and traditions that have kept their communities sustainable over centuries while they at the same time have not been able to adopt fully other cultural traditions and systems from elsewhere effectively. Iwara (2015: 120) points to the truncation of African cultural modes of development and the unsuccessful adaptation to western way of life introduced by

colonial powers. The capitalist system which is premised on individualism such as land ownership is causing conflicts and other challenges in rural South Africa and elsewhere on the continent.

This chapter reports on how communal land has been made available by one traditional authority to the members of the community, and through collaboration with a non-governmental organisation, an institution of higher learning, a provincial administration and the private sector are applying the African value of and communalism to put communal land to productive use for the benefit of the whole community. The sociocultural dimension of farming towards the livelihood of people and their adaptive management development as sustainable interventions in community-based natural resources management is examined.

The communal land use by the members of the community has enabled them to work together and support each other for them to be able to compete in this highly competitive industry despite some challenges which crop up from time to time which are addressed in the same communal manner.

Literature Review

The concept of development and underdevelopment continues to be debated among academics, NGOs, development practitioners, governments and communities across the world, most especially in the developing world. Some commentators such as Awoonor (2006) and Nyerere (1968) argue that the causes of underdevelopment are the consequences of imperialism, colonialism and hegemony on the part of the west. The two approaches normally used to analyse the concept of development and underdevelopment are the orthodox and radical approaches. Most orthodox economists are of the view that most of the underdevelopment crisis faced in the developing world today are caused by cultures, traditions and superstitions which impede their progress (Otite 2011: 125). The radical approach which Labenstein (1969) and Alperovitz and Truthout (2014) are some of its key proponents suggests that the history of the underdeveloped nations of the world in the last century can be attributed to the history of the consequence of European expansion and the functioning of international sciences, which continue to be dominated by Europe and North America. This chapter is not going to delve much into the two opposing perspectives. Suffice it however for one to point out that there might be some elements of truths in both perspectives, but what is most relevant to this chapter is moving forward although history should not be discounted.

The debate rages on in South Africa. Recently, the former leader of the Democratic Alliance (the main opposition party in South Africa today) was hauled over the coals over a tweet she posted on some of positive effects of colonialism in South Africa. This was interpreted by a section of the South African society as defending colonialism, racism and imperialism, which she denied. She stressed that this was a misinterpretation of her tweet.

The current focus appears to me, ought to be what can be done to bring development to all nations, people and communities across the world. From the 1960s, the shift has been to find ways of addressing the issues of development and underdevelopment. Seers (1964) suggested that development across the world should be measured by posing the following questions as to:

- What has happened to poverty?
- What has happened to unemployment?
- What has happened to inequality?

His view was that if the answers to all the three questions are yes, then definitely one can boldly say development has taken place. The MDGs were put into place by the United Nations just at the dawn of the New Millennium to address the developmental challenges facing nations. Analysts like Bland (2014) are of the view that a lot was achieved, but many countries in the developing countries were not able to achieve the targets set leading to the adoption of the 17 SDGs with 63 targets in 2015 to be achieved by 2030.

Many arguments are also being advanced by researchers and development practitioners regarding the achievement of the development agendas in the wake of globalisation and neoliberalism. It appears some parts of the developing world are not coping and being left behind because of their cultural and traditional systems which are not very much in line with the concepts of globalisation and neoliberalism. However, as noted earlier, this is a neoliberal position, which I outline below.

Globalisation and Neoliberalism

Citing Castells (1996), Luke and Luke (2000), Nash (2000), and Dreher et al. (2008) identify the different forms globalisation takes. Dreher et al. (2008: 15) define globalisation "as the intensification of cross-national interactions that promote the establishment of transnational structures and the global integration of cultural, economic, environmental, political, technological and social processes on global, supranational, national, regional and local levels". The ability of individuals, communities and nations to tap into the global system impacts on their development. Globalisation provides opportunities and threats for the global community which is referred to now as the global village. Nations and individuals who are able to exploit the opportunities offered by globalisation are prospering, whereas the other nations that are not able to adapt are at the mercy of the world. The phenomenon appears to be more complex than it was initially envisaged. One cannot agree more with Milana's (2012: 779) argument that UNESCO and EU processes assign specific values and meanings to globalisation which reflect a limited understanding of the complexity embedded in contemporary globalisation processes. The evidence of this includes the rise of anti-globalisation tendencies in Europe such as (Brix it) and Donald Trump's rise to the American presidency possibly on

the ticket of anti-globalisation agenda and the use of ICT for producing goods and services across the world while the application of ICT to cybercrime and terrorism is on the increase as well.

Neoliberalism appears to have emerged from neoclassical economics tradition which embraces intellectual innovations as monetarist, supply-side economics, public choice theory, New Public Management and New Consensus economics (Heilbroner and Milberg 1995). Ban (2011: 131) points out that neoliberals posit causal links between tax cuts and capital investment (rather than consumption) or between the rigidity of employment protection legislation and unemployment figures. In addition, the neoliberal policy paradigms involve reducing inflation and budget deficits (even at the cost of employment), privatisation, the scrapping of industrial policy, lower marginal tax rates and reduced corporate income tax rates, deregulation of financial instruments, decentralisation and flexibility in labour protection as well as the use of market principles in public services (Heilbroner and Milberg 1995).

In effect, neoliberalism is underpinned by the free market principle where demand and supply determine what is produced and who gets which part of what is produced. The multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are some of the key institutions that have been used to pursue the neoliberal agenda across the world. The application of neoliberal policies permeates private businesses, multinational corporations and the state sectors across the world where deregulation and rationalisation have become the "name of the game". Much as neoliberalism has become accepted across the world, certain aspects of the cultural traditions and indigenous knowledge systems that have been used and worked for Africans have not been applied effectively for productive purposes on the African continent on sustainable basis.

Application of African Knowledge for Economic Development

Citing Quijano (1990) and Ajei (2007: 153) cautions Africans to be authentic with themselves. Ajei (2007: 153) notes that, authenticity demands that we "have to stop being what we have not been, what we will never be, and what we do not have to be". An important first step towards achieving this is to harness "the usable past" and to construct an "authentic African episteme" (Mudimbe 1988). The need for Africans to adapt their IKS which have worked for them in the past and continues to work for them today is advocated for by some researchers, politicians and pan-Africanists. Hountoundji (2004: 534) suggests that an important step towards correcting Africa's scientific dependence, and bringing its indigenous knowledge to the service of its development, is for her to integrate her indigenous knowledge systems "into the mainstream of on-going research". Similarly, Awoonor (2006: 5) points out the continent's marginalisation within the context of "the globalisation myth". The concepts globalisation and neoliberalism which originate from the west "fit into the particularism of the western claim to predominant superiority in all things as the foundation for the universal", where the continent "has become not only the

consumer of other people's material culture in extenso but, more perniciously, other people's ideas thereby ignoring and neglecting the good aspects of their own culture." This observation by no means implies that all African IKS are good.

Theoretical Framework

This chapter is underpinned by Nkrumah's (1967) "communalism", the conceptual equivalent of "communitarianism" which is a theory of social organisation that has been formulated variously by its adherents and Nyerere's (1968) African socialism. The adherents of communalism seek for the cooperation of human beings rather than conflict and consensus in the making and implementation of decisions rather than dispute. Ajei (2007: 45) intimates that humanism as a philosophy underlying communalism is based on egalitarianism. This philosophy aims at the reconciliation of the individual's aspirations with group welfare. Nyerere's (1968) African socialism (Ujamaa) was guided by three main principles: equality and respect for human dignity, sharing of the resources which are produced by the efforts of all and work by everyone in an agriculturally based economy and exploitation by none. According to Nyerere (1968), Ujamaa, as the practical expression of the doctrine of African socialism, implies first and foremost the building of society on the traditional African value of familyhood which is very close to Nkrumah's communitarianism. Citing Shorter (1978), Etta et al. (2016) point out that African communitarianism or communalism is organised to satisfy the basic human needs of all its members. They give the example of the need and use of land, which is communally owned for the benefit of everyone, as it is in the case understudy here. The two theories are relevant to this chapter in the sense that they shed light on how the tried and tested African IKS can be used to address some of the socioeconomic challenges confronting Africa today. Although globalisation and neoliberal policies have become the norms in the modern world, in certain communities they appear to be contrary to the traditions and cultures of the people thereby creating strife and conflicts. For example, the conflict between the commuter taxi operators and the alleged political violence in certain parts of South Africa appears to be the result of some communities trying to apply neoliberal policies where the winner-takes-it-all under which capitalism operates. The communal use of land by community members appears to work for the communities where they are able to manage, rear their livestock and cultivate the communal land through collaboration and cooperation. The members of the community meet from time to time to discuss issues that affect the community including the use of the communal land. With the traditional leaders and those who are interested in farming, an agreement is reached out for part of the communal land to be availed to them where those who are part of the project attend training together and work in cooperatives to support each other and sustain their individual and group interests. In the chapter, I refer to, and extend, wider debates on the application of the two theories which underpin this chapter in practice. I do this by engaging with the work of authors forwarding Indigenous research approaches,

where I highlight the principle of communalism as underpinning the use of communal assets for productive purposes to ensure sustainable livelihoods. I offer an example (and ask some questions for consideration) based on my own experiences as the leader of a community engagement project that is working with a private sector organisation that is leading the initiative regarding the training and capacity building of the rural community where this initiative is taking place. I discuss in detail with examples of some elements of the application in the field of adult education, community development and empowerment in which I am involved, to help to illustrate my suggestions. I thus focus on research relationships that are established with participants and communities and on how theory can be put into practice in the application of African IKS that can be applied to address some of the socioeconomic challenges confronting the continent today to improve the quality of life of its people in a sustainable manner.

Bokamoso's Initiative to Use Communal Land for the Benefit of the Community

In this section, I discuss how the initiative was started as a pilot in one rural community in the North West Province of South Africa. The purpose of the initiative is in order for Bokamoso and its partners to address the challenges of poverty, unemployment and food insecurity in rural South Africa where communities have access to communal land. Bokamoso again intends to use the approach as a model for other rural communities in South Africa and the other parts of Africa in order to address some of the challenges they face.

The Genesis of the Initiative

The Chief Executive Officer of Bokamoso Impact Investments (Ms. Lesego Serolong), a private sector organisation whose mission is empowering rural communities through sustainable job opportunities, initiated the programme in 2015 in one remote area of the Kalahari Region in the North West Province near the Botswana in South Africa. According to the CEO (Ms. Serolong), she was given the opportunity to work in the village after completing school for 1 year as an unqualified teacher. After getting the opportunity to study abroad, she returned to South Africa with her master's degree and has made rural community development one of her primary objectives through sustainable livelihood with agriculture being the focus of the initiative. She consulted the traditional authority in Manyeledi under the leadership of the chief on how her organisation and other partners could work with the community to reduce poverty in the area which is very endemic. After the initial meeting, the chief promised to consult his community on the proposal.

Consultation with the Community to Reach Consensus

The traditional authority through a number of community meetings agreed that they wanted to be assisted to use the vast track of land which they have to develop their community and its people. The initial proposal was for the community to be helped in livestock farming which is the main economic activity which is carried on small scale by members of the community. They indicated that they would have loved cultivating food crops as they buy all their food from far because of lack of water and poor rainfall patterns in the area. They however agreed to meet BII with the proposal to be assisted in agriculture as a means to developing the community to create jobs, reduce poverty and ensure food security in the area. A memorandum of understanding was signed between the community and Bokamoso.

Consultation with Partners and Their Respective Roles

Bokamoso then consulted partners in the private sector organisations such as AFGRI, Ages Hydrology, an academic institution (University of South Africa), the traditional authority and the North West Provincial Administration to pull resources together to support the initiative which could be used as a model for sustainable rural development. BII is the leader of the initiative and responsible for establishing a hub at the edge of a large track of land which had been allocated by the traditional authority for the programme, coordination between the partners, be in-charge of the training and incubation after the training and the marketing of the produce of the farmers who graduate from the programme. AFGRI's role is to support the BII in its training and incubation and marketing of the produce. Unisa's role is to provide adult basic education and basic literacy and numeracy for interested members of the community who have no education at all or very little literacy and numeracy skills as well as provide entrepreneurship training on ongoing basis to equip the members of the programme with basic entrepreneurial skills for them to run their farming activities on sound business principles. The traditional authority's roles include making land available for the programme and mobilising the community to participate in the programme. Ages Hydrology was to prospect for water in the area for the agricultural activities. The North West Provincial Administration was to provide equipment and other inputs as well as help in the preparation of the land, fencing, etc.

Implementation of Programme

Bokamoso as the initiator and leader of the programme managed to bring the partners together to play their respective roles in implementing the programme. Twenty community members were registered and put through the ABE programme

which was sponsored by Unisa. After completing a 6 months ABE programme, they were put through an intensive basic agriculture training in vegetable, livestock and bee farming. This aspect of the training was sponsored in full by Bokamoso. The theoretical and practical training was conducted at the hub. Ages Hydrology meanwhile was contracted by BII to prospect for underground water which it did successfully and located a lot of it about two and half kilometres from the hub which it drilled and channelled to the land. The North West Provincial Administration (NWPA) provided fencing for the security of the land, equipment, seeds, a 140 metre centre pivot irrigation system and other inputs after consultation with BII, the traditional authority and the community. The centre pivot irrigation (sometimes referred to as the central pivot irrigation, water-wheel and circle irrigation) is a technique of crop irrigation in which equipment rotates around a pivot and crops are watered with sprinklers. Each of the farmers was allocated two hectares of land to produce the crops which the technical advisors in consultation with BII and the farmers agreed upon based on the market and weather conditions. The farmers are allocated individual plots to work on; they attend training together, buy inputs as a group through Bokamoso and sell their produce through the cooperative system.

Discussion

The question on land rights and landlessness among majority of the black population in South Africa continues to be a contentious issue which some commentators, researchers and development practitioners have referred to as a looming time bomb which if not addressed urgently can result in instability any time. For example, Mhlungu (2018: 14) argues that the damaged family structure in African societies is the result of lack of land. She adds that the 1913 Native Land Act not only caused enormous suffering and poverty, it also eroded family values and directly gave birth to the migrant labour system which saw a geographical disruption in African families. The need to address land rights including communal land ownership has been going through the legislation processes over the years. Communal land means land contemplated in Section 4 of the Communal Land Rights Act as land owned, occupied or used by members of a community subject to shared rules or norms and customs of that community and includes land owned by the State but used by communities as communal land (the Communal Land Tenure Bill of 2017). For example, the Communal Lands Rights Act 11 of 2004 aims to provide for legal security of tenure by transferring communal land, including KwaZulu-Natal's Ingonyama land, to communities, or by awarding comparable redress; to provide for the conduct of a land rights enquiry to determine the transition from old order rights to new order rights; to provide for the democratic administration of communal land by communities; to provide for Land Rights Boards; to provide for the cooperative performance of municipal functions on communal land; to amend or repeal certain laws; and to provide for matters incidental thereto. Communities have been complaining about delays in addressing the land question. The most recent

bill passed by parliament in 2017, the Communal Land Tenure Bill of 2017 as Section 76 Bill, aims:

> to provide for the transfer of communal land to communities; to provide for conversion into ownership of land rights in communal land to communities that own or occupy such land; to provide for the transfer of ownership to communities and community members of land acquired by the State to enable access to land on an equitable basis; to provide for the right to use by community members of land owned by the State; to provide for registration of communal land; to provide for conditions of registration of communal land; to provide for general plans for communal land; to provide for the award of comparable redress; to provide for land rights enquiries; to provide for acquisition of more land for use as communal land; to provide for the choice on the administration of communal land; to provide for the establishment of households forums by communities; to provide for community rules; to provide for the establishment of communal land boards; to provide for dispute resolution mechanisms; to provide for the provision of municipal services on communal land, to amend and repeal certain laws; and to provide for matters incidental thereto.

There has been cry from some communities that the communal land for communities that are put in the trust and custody of traditional leaders is not made available to community members for their socioeconomic development but rather some traditional rulers profiteering from them resulting in court cases and in some instances leading to violence. Twenty years have passed since the homelands were reintegrated into a unitary South Africa, yet the legacy of the colonial and apartheid past continues to haunt these areas.

> Almost 17 million people or a third of the population of South Africa reside in the former homelands, which the post-apartheid government calls 'communal areas', according to forms of communal tenure. However, for most of the people living in these areas the full recognition of their land rights remains unrealised as the South African government has been unable to develop laws and policies that sufficiently capture the nuanced ways in which people experience and regulate relations of communal tenure in their everyday lives Clark and Luwaya (2017: 3).

Clark and Luwaya (2017) acknowledge that, although the government has enacted laws to enhance the security of tenure of farm dwellers and labour tenants, there is currently no substantive legislation to secure and promote the land rights of the people living in the former homelands. They add that despite the constitutional imperatives on the state, the tenure of insecurity of those living in the former homelands persists. Meanwhile, the Centre for Law and Society (CLS) (2015: 1) points out that the government of South Africa appears to be applying the concept of "use rights" in dealing with the contentious issue of communal land. "Use rights" according to CLS (2015) refer to small areas such as household plots, while a traditional council owns and controls all development related to common property areas such as grazing land and forests. The Communal Land Tenure Policy (CLTP) (2014) specifically states that the traditional council will own and be in charge of investment projects such as mining and tourism ventures. Certainly, not all chiefs are corrupt. The allegation of abuse of power by some traditional authorities of communal land that is under their custody is often cited. Examples include the sale of residential sites cut from grazing land by traditional leaders to outsiders and massive community dissatisfaction with opaque mining and tourism deals that exclude

and fail to benefit ordinary people in KwaZulu-Natal, North West, Limpopo, Mpumalanga and Eastern Cape (CLS 2015). Communal land according to Weinberg (2015: 7) was employed by the colonial and apartheid governments in a crude or simplistic way, to describe African customary land tenure systems as "group-based", that is, opposite to individual property ownership in Europe and elsewhere. Weinberg (2015: 6) adds that the post-1994 government refers to the former homelands as "communal areas" (Communal Land Tenure Policy 2013), where the rights to land of the people living in those areas are uncertain and vulnerable. Evans (1997) adds that the apartheid laws made it illegal for Africans to hold individual titles to property, on the premise that this would erode "communal land tenure". Citing the government's White Paper on the Tomlinson Report (1956), Houghton (1956: 187) notes that "individual tenure would undermine the whole tribal structure. The entire order and cohesion of the tribe…is bound up with the fact that the community is a communal unit…".

This chapter is not going to delve into the merits or otherwise of the government's position on communal land tenure, but it appears it formed the basis of the areas identified as such having their land put under the custody of chiefs and traditional areas. Communal land has thus been assumed to be used communally.

As the debate over land rights and the land tenure rages on, the community of Manyeledi based on their customs and the assumed communal ownership of the of the land in their community have been able to come together and made the communal land available for the benefit of the community members. The processes involved in agreeing to start the initiative were organised by the traditional authority through the *Kgotla* (community meetings). The traditional authority under the leadership of the Chief appears to apply the African philosophy of Ubuntu in this initiative.

Ubuntu is described by Khoza (2006: 103) as "the capacity in an African culture to express compassion, reciprocity, dignity, humanity and mutuality in the interests of building and maintaining communities with justice and mutual caring". The initiative to mobilise the community to address the challenges they face also addresses the issue of social justice. Each of the farmers in the project farms on communal land that is allocated to them through the local traditional authority. The initiative to mobilise the community to address the challenges they face also addresses the issue of social justice. Brody (2017: 31) points out that estimates put the number of communal farmers in South Africa at about three million. He adds that the former homelands in South Africa comprise about 15 million hectares, the greater percentage of it being communal land (or commonage). He is of the view that this asset base presents numerous opportunities, if the challenges regarding infrastructure and knowledge shortfalls that have bedevil the communal farming sector can be addressed. Similarly, Maseti (2017: 6) echoes some of the challenges confronting the farming sector in South Africa and the emerging and communal farming in particular which affects the land reform programme currently, as millions of hectares of unproductive land that have been given to their rightful owners as part of the land restitution process. The National Development Plan (2011) equally highlights the same problem, underutilised agricultural land in communal areas. To address some of the challenges confronting small-scale farmers most especially farming on com-

munal land, Erasmus (2018: 32) noted that there is the need to place emphasis on education in agriculture in Africa, because the lack of education does not only impede access to technology, but it also impedes productivity. She adds that technology must suit the local culture and market. The land on which the farmers produce their crops is not privately owned but belongs to the whole community where the members of the community who are interested in farming have been given the permission to use it for productive purposes.

Through the initiative, education and training and capacity building were offered by volunteer educators who were funded by Unisa, Unisa staff and BII. The incubation of the members of the community by BII and the NWPA has enabled the communal land to be used effectively for productive purposes, thereby creating employment, alleviating poverty and ensuring food security through partnerships and collaborations. As the debate on the land question rages on, this community applying Nkrumah's (1967) "communalism" or "communitarianism" and Nyerere's (1968) African Socialism (*Ujamaa*) which are theories of social organization which seek for the cooperation of human beings rather than conflict, and consensus in the making and implementation of decisions rather than dispute. Neoliberalism, globalisation and the free market policies most at times operate from the opposite angle of communalism. As has been discussed earlier on in this chapter, some of the principles on which neoliberal and market systems are based are in conflict to some African cultures and tradition leading to conflict situation. Some of such examples in South Africa include the minibus taxi wars and of late the metre-taxi operators and app-based Uber and Taxify operators as well as the alleged political killings that have been taking place on the South African political scene. One may not be far from the truth by stating that the winner-takes-it-all approach to economic opportunities in communities can be looked at also from the cultural perspective which accommodates the cultures and traditions of the people. When compared to the capitalist system that is mostly applied in the West which is turning out to be where most parts of the world is moving towards, most African cultural traditions are based on the communal and collectivists practices. This view is supported by Ikuenobe (2006: 329) who argues that African communalism as both an African conceptual framework and set of cultural practices prioritises the role and function of the collective group over the individual in a world view context.

Conclusion

The chapter examined how one rural community in South Africa has used its cultural traditions and value system of communitarianism to manage one of its main assets – the communal land – to empower the members of the community to address the challenges of poverty, unemployment, food security and landlessness. Although neoliberal policies including globalisation dominate the economies of countries across the world today, some of the developing countries have not been able to move with the pace of globalisation. They have abandoned some of their socioeconomic

systems that have kept and sustained them over the years such as Ubuntu and Ujamaa. This chapter thus advocates for the return to African cultural values and traditions which work for them well such as the communal ownership and use of land. It is suggested that what has made this workable is a network of actors who include a private sector organisation, a higher education institution, a traditional authority, a provincial administration and a community. The community under discussion tapped into what is workable in their cultural tradition on using communal asset in the form of land and by applying the Africa philosophy of Ubuntu to address some of the socioeconomic challenges in their community. The initiative is working, as many community members have been empowered to become commercial vegetable producers and created employment, reduces poverty and addresses the challenges of food insecurity in the community and the area.

References

Ajei, M. O. (2007). *Africa's development: The imperatives of indigenous knowledge and values*. Doctoral Thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria.

Alperovitz, G., & Truthout, M. A. (2014). *Gar Alperovitz and Michael Albert: A conversation on economic visions*. Retrieved March 20, 2018, from http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/22557-gar-alperovitz-and-michael-albert-a-conversation-on-economic-visions

Ashley, C., & Carney, D. (1999). *Sustainable livelihoods: Lessons from early experience*. London: DFID.

Awoonor, K. (2006). Humanities and globalization: An African perspective. In *Legon Journal of the Humanities: Special Edition* (p. 11). Legon: University of Ghana.

Ban, C. (2011). *Neoliberalism in translation. Economic ideas and reforms in Spain and Romania*. Doctoral thesis submitted at the University of Maryland, College Park.

Bland, M. S. (2014). Challenges and achievements in the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) for women and girls. A speech by the Director of UNAIDS at the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, 58th session, 17th March 2014, New York.

Brody, S. (2017). Communal farming: Let's start with the basics. *Farmer's Weekly*, 1 December 2017.

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society (the information age: Economy, society and culture)* (Vol. 1). Malden: Blackwell Publishers, Inc.

Centre for Law and Society. (2015). Communal land tenure policy and IPILRA.

Chambers, R., & Conway, G. (1992). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century. Rural development; Rural poor; Developing countries. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, England.

Clark, M., & Luwaya, N. (2017). Communal Land Tenure Act 1994–2017.

Communal Land Tenure Policy (CLTP). (2013). Available from http://www.uct.ac.za/sites/default/files/image_tool/images/347/FactSheets/CLS_CommunalLand_FactSheet_Sept303.pdf

Dreher, A., Gaston, N., & Martens, P. (2008). *Measuring globalisation. Gauging its consequences*. New York: Springer.

Erasmus, D. (2018). Agricultural development's education gap. *Farmers Weekly*, 16 March 2018.

Etta, E. E., Esowe, E. E., & Asukwo, O. O. (2016). African communalism and globalisation. *African Research Review, 10*(3), 302–315.

Evans, I. (1997). *Bureaucracy and race: Native administration in South Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fukuda-Parr, S. (2012). The right to development: Reframing a new discourse for the twenty-first century. *Social Research, 79*(4), 839–864.

Heilbroner, R., & Milberg, W. (1995). *The crisis of vision in modern economic thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Houghton, D. H. (1956). *The Tomlinson report*. Johannesburg: The South African Institute of Race Relations.

Hountoundji, P. (2004). Knowledge as a development issue. In K. Wiredu (Ed.), *A companion to African philosophy* (p. 532). Malden: Blackwell.

Ikuenobe, P. (2006). *Philosophical perspective on communalism and morality in African traditions*. Lanham: Lexington Books.

Iwara, I. E. (2015). Cultural hegemony and Africa's development process. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 9*(4), 120–130.

Khoza, R. (2006). *Let Africa lead: African Transformational leadership for 21st century business*. Johannesburg: Vesubuntu Publishing.

Labenstein, H. (1969). Underdevelopment in Spanish America.

Luke, A., & Luke, C. (2000). A situated perspective on cultural globalisation. In N. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalisation and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 275–298). New York: Routledge.

Maseti, Z. (2017). Driving transformation with 'old' legislation. *Farmer's Weekly*, 1 December 2017.

Mhlungu, Y. (2018). Loss of land damaged the structure of African families, The Star, 29 March 2018, p. 14.

Milana, M. (2012). Globalisation, transnational policies and adult education. *International Review of Education, 58*, 777–797.

Mudimbe, V. Y. (1988). *The invention of Africa: Gnosis, philosophy and the order of knowledge*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Nash, K. (2000). *Contemporary political sociology: Globalisation, politics, and power*. London: Blackwell.

National Planning Commission. (2011). The National Development Plan 2030.

Ndlovu, S. (2013). *Community Development Projects and Food Security: The case of Zanyokwe Irrigation Project Eastern Cape Province, South Africa*. Master's dissertation, University of Fort Hare.

Nkrumah, K. (1967). African socialism revisited. In *Africa: National and social revolution*. Prague: Peace and Socialism Publishers.

Nyerere, J. (1968). *Freedom and socialism*. Dar es Salaam and New York: Oxford University Press.

Otite, A. (2011). Theoretical framework towards understanding the economic development and underdevelopment of Nigeria. *African Journal of History and Culture, 3*(8), 123–127.

Quijano, A. (1990). Estetica de la Utopia. In *David y Goliath* (Vol. 57, p. 37); cited in Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world* (p. 221). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Quora. (n.d.). *What are some differences between the various African cultures?* Retrieved April 15, 2018, from https://www.quora.com/What-are-some-differences-between-the-various-African-cultures

Seers, D. (1964). The mechanism of an open petroleum economy. *Social and Economic Studies, 13*, 233–242.

Shorter, F. (1978). *African spirituality (Ed)*. New York: Cassell Ltd Macmillan Publishing Co. Inc.

Weinberg, T. (2015). *Contested status of communal land tenure in South Africa, Rural Status Report 3*.