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Abstract

The study investigates the effects and impact of the National Land Resettlement Programme (NLRP) using three selected resettlement farms – Lievenberg, Drimiopsis and Du Plessis – as case studies. Based on these three concrete examples, the problems and achievements of resettlement implementation, as can be verified on the ground, were compared with the goals of the NLRP. Although these three case studies do not provide a sufficiently representative sample to enable an analysis of the achievements and pitfalls of the NLRP as a whole, they provide some interesting insights into the resettlement process and its problems.

Executive summary

The issues of access to land and land tenure were among the most important concerns of the Namibian people in their struggle for independence. Since Independence, the democratically elected Government has committed itself to redressing the injustices of the past by promoting reconciliation and sustainable development. The slow pace of the land reform process, which is part of that drive, was one of the motivations for undertaking this study.

Land resettlement in Namibia aims to alleviate poverty, raise living standards, enhance agricultural output, provide new ways for earning livelihoods, and improve the existing socio-economic structure. Some key problems affect land resettlement in Namibia.

Several methods were used in this study to acquire information from relevant stakeholders. Questionnaires were formulated prior to fieldwork to address the objectives and research questions of the study. The fieldwork entailed visiting three resettlement farms, namely Lievenberg and Du Plessis, which are involved in livestock farming, and Drimiopsis, which focuses on crop farming. Interviews were also conducted with institutions involved in the land reform process, such as the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, the Namibia National Farmers’ Union, and the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry to complement the information gathered from the farms.

The main findings of the study were that the majority of the resettled farmers were former farm workers or had been farming in communal areas; therefore, they had farming skills. However, several key components that underpin successful resettlement were not in place. In terms of support services, most of these farmers had received either limited or no post-resettlement services. This absence of support placed constraints on the agricultural output of these farms. These farms are mostly being used for subsistence farming and do not contribute to the country’s economy.

Among the farms visited was one that was reserved for the San, who are one of the priority target groups for the land resettlement process.
1 Introduction

1.1 Aims of the study

Assessing agricultural land use on resettlement farms was chosen as a topic of study because it affects not only Namibia, but also other parts of Africa where land reform projects are underway. Land resettlement in Africa takes place in the context of past land inequalities and social, economic, and educational disadvantages faced by indigenous populations, often following a country’s independence from colonial occupation.

However, the transfer of land to the previously disadvantaged also raises serious questions. These questions include the following:

- Can the beneficiaries really contribute to the country’s economy?

- Are the beneficiaries sufficiently equipped to manage the land in such a way that they preserve or improve the production standards of the former owner?

- Is the Government willing and financially able to support its National Land Resettlement Programme (NLRP) through funding and by providing post-resettlement extension services?

The aim of this research is to find some answers to these questions. For this purpose, selected resettlement farms in Namibia were visited to see at first hand what some of the results of the Land Resettlement Policy (RoN 2001a) have been.

Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries use a combination of policy instruments to implement their land reform programmes. In the Study Guide supporting the Land Reform and Resettlement course offered by the Land Use Planning Programme at the Polytechnic of Namibia, Kasita and Mooya (2003) highlight these policies as follows: land redistribution, land tenure reform, land restitution, and land resettlement.

The NLRP is divided into two major parts: communal land reform, and commercial land resettlement. The latter is further divided into the Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS) and the Farm Unit Resettlement Scheme (FURS). This report will concentrate on the latter scheme as a tool to achieve land reform objectives on commercial agricultural land. By means of FURS, the Government facilitates the resettlement of people on farmland previously owned by whites, and provides incentives for settlers to grow crops or raise stock.

In Namibia, the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR), supported by professionals and technical expertise from other line ministries, coordinates resettlement activities. The Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry (MAWF) is also involved in this process. Its main role is to provide technical support and training through its Directorate of Extension Services. Resettlement schemes are implemented according to the guiding principles set out in the National Resettlement Policy, whose aim is to redress unequal land distribution, alleviate poverty, and improve the standards of living of formerly disadvantaged Namibians. This Policy targets the following categories of beneficiaries: San communities; ex-combatants; displaced, destitute and landless people; people with disabilities; and people in overcrowded communal areas.

The interest in this study was triggered by the fact that the process of land reform, and resettlement in particular, is reportedly very slow. Only 30,720 people out of an estimated 243,000 landless Namibians had been resettled by 2003. Critics claim that the NLRP has moved far too slowly since independence in 1990, and delivered too little by way of tangible benefits to its land-hungry citizens (IRIN News 2004a).
Figure 1 shows the number of people in different categories resettled from 1990 to 2001. The figure shows that the majority of beneficiaries were resettled on communal land, while others were either resettled collectively on commercial land, received resettlement assistance from the Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS), or were resettled as individuals.

It has been suggested (IRIN News 2004a) that many beneficiaries are unable to sustain themselves on their allocated land, leading to calls on Government to provide more long-term support to new small-scale farmers. However, the MLR has opposed this by saying that its hands were tied and that some of the land offered by the commercial agriculture sector was unsuitable for resettlement.

**Figure 1: Number of people resettled by the MLR (1990-2001)**

- 33,965 Collective resettlement in communal lands
- 642 Collective resettlement in commercial lands
- 2,625 Individual resettlement scheme
- 1,640 Affirmative Action Loan Scheme

Source: MLR (2002); Agribank of Namibia (2001)

The main focus of this report is to find out how agricultural land distributed through the resettlement process has been utilised in the last decade, i.e., 1996 to 2006. The second and directly related aim is to find out whether the NLRP is achieving the objectives of the National Resettlement Policy of 2001.²

The objectives of this study are as follows:

- To determine the constraints of the land resettlement process
- To determine whether resettled farmers are economically stable
- To understand the problems that beneficiaries experience after resettlement
- To determine how land resettlement can be used to improve the settlers' livelihoods
- To determine the state of agricultural land after resettlement, and
- To determine whether settlers are self-reliant in terms of food production and income generation.

In other words, the research questions that are to be addressed are as follows:

- Do resettlement beneficiaries manage their agricultural land efficiently and productively, and
- Can experiences from the past decade help to improve the land reform practice of future resettlement programmes?

### 1.2 Background to the study

Out of 82.4 million ha of land in Namibia, 15 per cent comprises nature reserves and protected diamond areas, while 41 per cent constitutes communal land (Harrington & Odendaal 2002). Commercial farms and proclaimed towns make up the remainder of the land surface area. Of the total land available for commercial and communal use, i.e., 85 per cent of the total land surface area, only 34 per cent is suitable for crop farming. Of this latter percentage, only 1.4 per cent is commercially utilised.

The largest part of Namibian agricultural land is utilised for livestock farming, with natural vegetation being used for grazing. Namibia's commercial farms are principally orientated towards red meat production for local and export markets. Cattle farming takes place mostly in the central and northern parts of the country, whereas goats and sheep are

² The Policy (RON 2001a) provides for the registration and resettlement of the landless and the allocation of land to them to enable them to start a new life and become self-reliant.
formed in the south. The average size of Namibian commercial farms is large – about 7,000 ha – with farms in the south being larger than farms in the north. Namibia’s low and unreliable rainfall pattern limits its potential for commercial, sustainable agricultural crop production. Therefore, Namibia is said to rely on South Africa for food and to be self-sufficient in only beef, goat meat and milk, and dairy products (Harring & Odendaal 2002).

As regards its share of Namibia’s gross domestic product (GDP), the agricultural sector is comparatively small. Between 1990 and 2000, it contributed an average of 19 per cent to GDP, of which the commercial sector contributed 6 per cent (Werner 2004). However, the agricultural sector contributes extensively to exports, with the contribution having ranged between 15 per cent and 18 per cent since independence. Werner (2001a:6) notes that, in the decade after independence, beef accounted for 70 per cent of agricultural exports on average. Nonetheless, while the agricultural sector may not be a major contributor to GDP, it is still the largest employer in the country. It provides livelihoods for the largest number of people, accounting for 37 per cent of all jobs (Werner 2001). As regards the period 1996–2006, the number of workers in commercial farming areas totalled 42,227 in 1997 (Werner 2001). Employment in agriculture, as a primary sector, rose from 160,389 jobs in 1999 to 202,676 jobs in 2006 (Angula & Sherbourne 2003).

Table 1 shows there is still much to be done in terms of redressing land inequalities. This can be achieved by better strategic planning of the land reform programme in Namibia. However, measuring progress in land redistribution is difficult; official targets exist, but the data on the respective achievements is sketchy at best.

It has been reported that the MLR managed to meet the targets and even exceeded them in terms of land redistribution. But these targets for redistribution are far too low considering the official estimates of people in need of land. The original 1997 National Resettlement Policy (RoN 1997:1) estimated that the number of people who were “unemployed, landless and homeless”, who thus “[qualified] for resettlement”, to be 80,000 at that time. This figure was adjusted upwards to 243,000 people (40,500 households) by 2001, with the revision of the Policy (RoN 2001a:2).

However, there are signs that Government intends to accelerate land acquisition and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Agricultural potential</th>
<th>Per cent freehold commercial land</th>
<th>Per cent non-freehold commercial land</th>
<th>Per cent non-agricultural land</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Crops with short maturation periods and large stock farming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4.5</td>
<td>Crops with short maturation periods or large stock farming</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>Mixed livestock farming</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.9.10</td>
<td>Small stock farming</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Unsuitable for farming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NAD (2001a:39)
redistribution. Following a SWAPO Party Congress resolution in 2002, Government increased the annual budget for land acquisition from N$20 million in 1995-2001 to the current N$50 million per year.

1.3 Structure of the report

The subsequent parts of this report are structured as follows:

- Chapter 2 gives the context of the research, reviews the existing literature, and summarises the laws and regulations that govern the land resettlement process
- Chapter 3 discusses how and where the data was collected, and how this data was processed
- Chapter 4 summarises the research outcomes, with results being given in the form of tables, figures, etc., and
- Chapter 5 summarises the methods, results, analysis and discussion; presents conclusions; and gives recommendations.
2 Land resettlement in Namibia

The land resettlement process in Namibia was adopted after independence to redress past land inequities. It requires the support of technical and social service systems. To achieve the aims of land resettlement, various institutions are involved in the NLRP stipulated in the 2001 National Resettlement Policy (White Paper) and the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, 1995 (No. 6 of 1995).

2.1 Reasons for land resettlement in Namibia

Between 1990 and 2005, the Government of Namibia redistributed some 4 million ha of freehold (commercial) land to formerly disadvantaged Namibians (RoN 2005:vii). Currently, two main land redistribution programmes are being implemented: FURS, which accommodates small-scale farmers; and AALS, which targets financially better-off Namibians who were previously disadvantaged.

The following FURS objectives are based on the National Resettlement Policy (RoN 2001:a:3):

- To redress past imbalances in the distribution of natural resources, particularly land
- To give an opportunity for the target groups to produce their own food with a view towards self-sufficiency
- To create employment through full-time farming and other income-generating activities
- To bring smallholder farmers into the mainstream of the economy by producing for the market
- To alleviate human and livestock pressure on communal areas, and
- To offer citizens an opportunity to be reintegrated into society after many years of displacement by the colonisation process, the war of liberation, and other diverse circumstances.

The NLRP has four main components:

- FURS
- AALS
- Development of unutilised communal land, and
- Land tenure reform in communal areas.

There are many reasons for promoting land resettlement in Namibia. Firstly, resettlement is supposed to contribute to the reduction of population pressure in heavily populated areas, especially in the north of the country. Secondly, it is believed to raise the standard of living for the rural population, because there are only very limited job opportunities in rural areas. Land reform should help to ensure that the rural population has its own means of making a living. Thirdly, land reform should increase the country's agricultural output, despite Namibia's limited agricultural potential due to its arid climate. Fourthly, land reform intends to provide new ways for specific target groups (refugees, war veterans, San communities) to make a living. And finally, land reform aims to improve the socio-economic structure of the existing agricultural areas by working hand-in-hand with other agrarian reform measures (RoN 2001:a).

According to Adams (2000), Namibia's land reform challenges can be summarised as follows:

- Finding harmonious solutions in the context of the political and ethnic divisions inherited from the colonial and apartheid past
Table 2: Responsibilities of relevant institutions in the NLRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Role in the resettlement process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Lands and Resettlement                    | • Planning and coordination of resettlement programmes  
                                                     | • Implementation of projects  
                                                     | • Supervision of projects  
                                                     | • Monitoring and evaluation of projects  
                                                     | • Registration of leases  
                                                     | • Resource surveys and planning of proposed resettlement areas  
                                                     | • Development of planning guidelines and training of planners  
                                                     | • Provision of mapping and photography at appropriate scales  
                                                     | • Registration of leases and other real rights  
                                                     | • Financial control  
                                                     | • Planning and evaluation                                                                 |
| Directorate of Resettlement                           |                                                                                                 |
| Directorate of Lands                                  |                                                                                                 |
| Office of the Surveyor-General                        |                                                                                                 |
| Registrar of Deeds                                    |                                                                                                 |
| Directorate of General Services                       |                                                                                                 |
| Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry           | • Provision of veterinary services  
                                                     | • Assistance in evaluation of farms  
                                                     | • Provision of agricultural extension and training  
                                                     | • Provision of credit facilities  
                                                     | • Provision of water  
                                                     | • Collection of grazing fees  
                                                     | • Survey, installation and maintenance of water points  
                                                     | • Support of cooperatives scheme  
                                                     | • Market development                                                                 |
| Ministry of Environment and Tourism                   |                                                                                                 |
| Directorate of Environmental Affairs                  |                                                                                                 |
| Ministry of Regional and Local Government, Housing and Rural Development | • Proclamation of resettlement areas when essential                                                |
| Ministry of Works, Transport and Communication        | • Provision of infrastructure in resettlement areas                                            |
| Ministry of Education                                  | • Provision of teachers and educational materials                                               |
| Ministry of Health and Social Services                 | • Provision of health services                                                                  |
| National Planning Commission                           | • Advice on project planning issues and funding                                                 |
| Namibia Development Corporation                        | • Provision of credit to aspiring small-scale farmers  
                                                     | • Assistance with planning of schemes and training of beneficiaries in relevant situations   |
| Agricultural Bank of Namibia                           | • Provision of loans  
                                                     | • Assistance with evaluation of application forms                                              |
| Land Tribunal (established by the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act) | • Recommendations to the Minister of Agriculture, Water and Forestry in terms of the Act         |
| Non-governmental organisations                         | • Planning, extension services, materials input and training, where relevant                   |

Source: Naring & Oostendaal (2002:41)
• Devising solutions to land-use problems posed by the need to achieve land reform in a semi-arid pastoral environment, and

• Deciding what the stakeholders’ (national and regional authorities, traditional leaders, local users, and occupiers) role should be, and deciding in whom land rights and decision-making should be vested, and who should enjoy the benefits of the land thus reformed.

2.2 Key problems relating to land resettlement

The main problem of the NLRP is land acquisition. The Government sometimes opts for expropriation with market-related compensation, but by mid-2007, only four farms had actually been expropriated. Hence, expropriation appears to have been a measure of last resort for Government to be taken only if all other land acquisition measures have failed.

So far, the NLRP has progressed at a fairy slow pace. The MLR claims that there are too few suitable farms offered to it. However, the MLR seems to be very selective: Harring and Odendaal (ibid.) reported that by 2002, about six out of every seven farms offered to the MLR are rejected as being unsuitable for resettlement.

This lack of suitable land poses a major constraint to the NLRP. In the same study, Harring and Odendaal (ibid.) recommended that the Government come up with a new farm selection policy. They further recommended that the MLR first should identify Regions with suitable farms for resettlement, and then should acquire such farms. Some progress has apparently been made on this matter since the study, as the MLR finally agreed to make use of a model developed by the Namibia Agricultural Union (NAU) and presented to the MLR Deputy Minister. The model proposes classifying all commercial farms in terms of their suitability for resettlement according to a consistent and transparent set of criteria (Weidlich 2007).

Another key problem is the high rate of land degradation in Namibia. The resettlement of black Namibians often leads to commercial failure, environmental degradation, and poverty (LAC 2005).

Harring and Odendaal’s (ibid.) study also identified the lack of a comprehensive policy for development of the agricultural sector as being an important problem. The study pointed out that Namibia’s agriculture sector was based on cattle farming, which damaged the environment and was vulnerable to fluctuations in international export markets. In their conclusion, the authors (ibid.) criticised Namibia’s dependency on cattle products being the mainstay of the agricultural sector, and recommended that Namibia concentrates on its more humid areas such as the Kavango and Caprivi Regions for crop farming in order to diversify its agriculture.

RIN News (2004b) reported that agricultural extension services were provided, including training and information on techniques and technologies, but such services were apparently focused on the needs of communal farmers, whereas resettled commercial farmers were poorly supported – if at all.

2.3 Legal perspective

For a clear understanding of the NLRP, a short overview of the relevant laws is required. Article 16 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of Namibia (RoN 1990) guarantees all persons the right to acquire, own and dispose of all forms of movable and immovable property in any part of Namibia. Article 16 (2) gives Parliament the power to provide laws that would enable the State to expropriate property in the public interest. This Article simultaneously states that just compensation should be paid to the owners of such expropriated property. Hence, Article 16 (2) provides a limitation or derogation on the right to ownership of land in Namibia (Mwilima 2004).

Numerous policies and acts govern the process of land reform in Namibia. Among others is the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act, which provides for the acquisition of agricultural land by the Government for redistribution to Namibians "who do not own, or otherwise have the use of agricultural land or adequate agricultural land and, foremost, to those Namibian citizens who have been socially, economically or educationally disadvantaged by past discriminatory laws or practices" (RoN 1995). The Act also makes provision for the Government to expropriate farmland "in the public interest with a payment of a fair compensation" (ibid.).

The National Land Policy (RoN 1997) sets the basic principles and guidelines along which legislation for land in both the commercial and subsistence agriculture sectors should be developed. The Policy also calls for the promotion of sustainable land utilisation to protect the land as a natural resource. Sensitive issues concerning land rights – such as multiple forms of land rights, land rights for women, equality before the law, a mixed economy, security and protection, land delivery, and urban and rural land – are briefly outlined in the Policy as well. And finally, the document states that "through the implementation of land reform, the Government will promote a more just and equitable distribution of agricultural land to the benefit of formerly disadvantaged Namibians" (ibid.:14).

2.4 The current controversies surrounding the NLRP

Land resettlement was implemented as a means of alleviating poverty in Namibia, given that most of the beneficiaries do not have the required skills to get work in other employment sectors. The main criticism against the NLRP, therefore, is that land reform is not alleviating poverty since most of the resettled farmers have not been successful. On the contrary, in his study Land reform and poverty alleviation: Experiences from Namibia, Werner (2001) stressed that little could be expected from land reform in terms of poverty alleviation. The author identified lack of skills, innovation, and financial and technical support as the main barriers to poverty alleviation through resettlement projects.

The study (ibid.) also identified the lack of a proper settler selection process as a major problem. In some of the resettlement projects, beneficiaries were resettled because they were evicted from commercial farms; in other cases they were resettled because they were landless ex-combatants or unemployed farm workers. Thus, in Werner’s opinion (ibid.), these projects focused more on the provision of social welfare, free accommodation, food, and other transfers. Consequently, many of these farmers were not very productive in terms of food production.

Recent disputes between farm employers and employees also drew attention to land resettlement. For example, in 2003, at the Ongombo West Farm in the Omaheke Region.
the farm owner and his workers had a dispute over the unfair dismissal of some farm labourers. The dispute highlighted the lack of secure land tenure rights for farm workers. Some newspaper articles claimed at the time that the NLRI later expropriated the farm to set an example and punish the farm owner for having treated his workers unfairly.

The Legal Assistance Centre, in its Land, Environment and Development (LEAD) Project of 2005 (LAC 2005), pointed out that Namibia lacked specific legislation through which farm workers' land tenure rights were addressed.

The Secretary-General of the Namibia Farm Workers' Union blamed the eviction of farm workers on the Agricultural (Commercial) Land Reform Act. He claimed that the Act missed an opportunity to safeguard tenure security for farm workers. Similar sentiments were expressed in an IRIN News (2004a), which claimed "nothing [had] changed" since the legislation's enactment in 1995 in terms of farm workers' rights to live on land they had worked on – in some cases for decades. However, the Agricultural Employers' Association Chairman warned that imposing tenure security for farm workers – as was done in South Africa, for example – would lead to greater unemployment and would make farming more difficult. The Government intervened in the matter by announcing in February 2004 that Cabinet had approved the introduction of a Temporary Intervention Policy of Eviction (IRIN News ibid.).
3 Research design and methodology

The first step in the research design process involved the compilation of questionnaires. Two types of questionnaire were designed, in order to cover different target groups and stakeholders involved in the NLRP.

The first questionnaire intended to collect data from the NLRP beneficiaries, or primary stakeholders. This so-called beneficiary questionnaire concentrated on post-resettlement services that beneficiaries had received from Government institutions, and on how beneficiaries’ lives had been impacted socio-economically by the resettlement process. The second questionnaire focused on gathering data from the secondary stakeholders, which included the MLR, MAWF and the NNHU. The questions for these institutions also focused on post-resettlement services which the respective ministries claimed to have offered to beneficiaries.

The second step in the process involved collecting data from the stakeholders via fieldwork. Three farms from two of Namibia’s 13 regions were visited in order to obtain the information needed. The questions were asked in the form of interviews. This method proved considerably effective because the authors could clarify respondents’ answers where necessary. Additionally, comprehensive observations were made on all the farms visited regarding land use, condition of the farm, and social problems.

The following sections will discuss the selection of the sample farms, the farm observations, the farmer interviews, and the expert interviews.

3.1 Selection of sample farms

Due to time constraints and limited transport resources, only three farms where selected for the farm visits. The farms chosen were resettled between 1997 and 2005. Figure 2 shows the three farms in question: Lievenberg in the Erongo Region, and Drimiopsis and Du Plessis in the Omaheke Region.

It should be noted that the Drimiopsis farm has a somewhat undefined status. Here, resettlement has in fact taken place; but from a formal and legal point of view, the property is not officially recognised as a resettlement farm. Instead, Drimiopsis belongs to a group of 56 farms with an unclear status. According to sketchy information, these 56 farms were already Government property at the time of independence. In the period of upheaval following Independence, the 56 farms were apparently used ad hoc for various purposes. This included their use to resettle people who urgently needed a home and some land to live on. However, this type of resettlement did not follow any formal process. Hence, officially, these farms are not considered as resettlement farms. Surprisingly, when interviewed, neither the MLR nor the MAWF staff mentioned the status of these farms, and the fact became only known by chance after the fieldwork had already been finalised.

Figure 2: The study area - Location of the three sample farms

Source: Own compilation, based on material retrieved from http://www.klassiker.com/namibia_map.htm
3.2 Limitations of the applied methodology

Several problems were encountered during the different stages of the research. One problem was the reluctance of institutions to provide information. Institutions such as the NNFWU and NAU hesitated to assist, claiming that they were not directly involved in the NLRP. The authors were referred to the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN), but the DRFN Director told us that they were also not directly involved in resettlement.

A request was then sent to the MLR to provide some information on the NLRP. Again, there was reluctance to provide us with documents such as a map of all resettlement farms. The MLR staff claimed that such documents were confidential. Another problem was the preparation of the farm visits because MLR officials said they had no contact numbers for the resettlement farmers. As a result, the last few interviews that had been planned for the Nautabis farm had to be cancelled. No contact numbers were available, and when we arrived at the farm gate, it was locked and the farmer was absent. As a result, Nautabis was dropped from the study.

3.3 Interviews

Apart from the resettlement farmers on the three farms visited, officials from the following institutions were interviewed: the Resettlement Project Management Section in the MLR; the Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services in MAWF; and the Namibia National Farmers’ Union. The officials concerned were asked to answer questionnaires dealing specifically with the farms visited.
4 Findings

4.1 Questionnaire results

4.1.1 Results from the farmer questionnaires

After the farm visits to Lievenberg, Drimiopsis and Du Plessis, the results were analysed. The dominant land uses on these three farms were crop cultivation and livestock husbandry. Animal husbandry is usually the main source of income for these farmers. Cattle yield the highest return, followed by goats, sheep and donkeys, respectively.

The nearest marketing points for Lievenberg are Ombinge (about 15 km from the farm), Karibib (80 km away) and Omaruru (120 km away). The farm had not received any financial assistance nor veterinary services during the post-resettlement phase. It is equipped with amenities that include a farmhouse, a swimming pool, and even a tennis court. However, during the authors’ field visit, these assets were observed to be in need of renovation.

The Drimiopsis farm has been resettled by a San community, and has been in existence for 17 years. The main farm activities are crop farming, with a few individuals involved in raising goats and sheep. Drimiopsis was formerly an abandoned farm with no facilities.

Table 3: Characteristics of the farms visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Farm A</th>
<th>Farm B</th>
<th>Farm C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm name</td>
<td>Lievenberg</td>
<td>Drimiopsis</td>
<td>Du Plessis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Brongo</td>
<td>Omaheke</td>
<td>Omaheke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Karibib</td>
<td>Steinhausen</td>
<td>Steinhausen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>13,040 ha (Unit A is 2,411 ha)</td>
<td>2,262 ha</td>
<td>4,102 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sub-farms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of households</td>
<td>Only 1 household</td>
<td>120 home units with 700 inhabitants occupy the farm</td>
<td>25 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of resettlement</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1997 and 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of farming</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of beneficiary</td>
<td>Civil servants</td>
<td>Displaced San</td>
<td>Displaced farm workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant land use</td>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>Crops and livestock</td>
<td>Crops and livestock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markets</td>
<td>Karibib, Omaruru</td>
<td>Gobabis</td>
<td>Gobabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to markets</td>
<td>Karibib 80 km, Omaruru 120 km, Ombinge 15 km</td>
<td>50 km</td>
<td>68 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLR and MAWF support</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One-week training course on the use of pesticides</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming performance</td>
<td>Reasonable</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Requires immediate intervention from the MLR and MAWF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own compilation
so the settlers had to build their own houses and kraals from scratch. The main source of income for the settlers is from crops sold at Gobabis, some 50 km away. However, the settlers cannot sustain themselves because there are too many households on the farm. And although the farm received some post-resettlement extension services, the settlers do not have access to financial support. Sometimes there are also one-week training programmes which demonstrate how to grow certain crops and how to implement past-management programmes.

The third farm analysed, Du Plessis, was resettled ten years ago. The residents have lived on the farm since they were evicted from another farm that had been converted into town land. The main farming activities are cultivating crops and rearing livestock. Cattle form the main source of income, while income from selling crops is very low. At the time of resettlement, the farm had no facilities and the community had to build their houses from scratch.

4.1.2 Results from the institutions involved

(a) Response from the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement

The main purpose of the interview with the MLR was to complement the information collected at the three farms. The interview was conducted with the MLR’s Resettlement Project Administration and Management Division. This Division is responsible for advertising resettlement projects, selecting settlers, and organising post-resettlement support. The staff member interviewed did not provide much detail on the farms concerned, apart from Drimiopsis. He claimed that various post-resettlement services had been rendered to the three sample farms, namely as regards general farming training, land management training, animal husbandry, financial management, and property management. According to his statements, the following post-resettlement services were given to Drimiopsis: training in crop farming, agronomy, brick-making, and sewing.

The MLR official interviewed also explained that no specific criteria were used to determine the type of crops settlers are permitted to grow on their farms. Instead, this was determined by the type and size of the land. He claimed that the settlers had obtained credit facilities in form of loans and grants, but no specific figures were available to substantiate this. The reason given was that the settlers used different institutions to obtain funding, which made it difficult for the MLR to obtain records of successful applications.

Part of the cost recovery of the land resettlement process meanwhile comes from the new land taxation. Asked about the general relationship between the MLR and the settlers, the MLR interviewee claimed there was good cooperation between the two parties. He also pointed out that the land resettlement process was on track, and that there were effective policies in place.

(b) Response from the Namibia National Farmers’ Union

According to the Director of the NNFU, it was involved in land resettlement in the following ways:

- Policy education and policy analyses: This aimed to ensure that beneficiaries’ wishes were implemented in accordance with all land reform-related legislation and policies.

- Representation on Resettlement Committees and Land Boards: The NNFU conducts some training, and organises exchange visits between members of different Land Boards.
- Advocacy and lobbying: This activity involved undertaking research, conducting consultations with farmers, raising concerns with the MLR through petitions, issuing press releases, holding radio interviews, and offering workshops and seminars. The NNFU also paid visits to resettlement farms, where they conducted interviews with beneficiaries in order to raise their issues with MLR staff. Other activities included consultations with the Minister and his staff for advice on land reform issues, and compiling position papers.

- Training beneficiaries in farming skills: This was geared specifically to the Emerging Commercial Farmers’ Support Project, which is a joint initiative with the NAU. The joint venture started in 2005, but is still awaiting funding from the European Union.

- Research: This was focused on the needs of AALS beneficiaries and resettlement farmers, and a mentorship programme for resettled farmers was organised. The NNFU is currently drafting manuals to be used for training resettled farmers.

From the above, it is apparent that the NNFU’s involvement in the actual resettlement process is fairly limited. It is mainly a lobbying organisation, not a direct support institution. With regard to the three sample farms in particular, the NNFU’s total involvement comprised conducting a one-day assessment workshop at Du Plessis, which included the surrounding resettlement farms. The NNFU also made it clear that they focussed on general issues that were relevant to all resettlement beneficiaries at policy and implementation strategy level.

(c) Response from the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry

The interview with MAWF was conducted with the Director of Extension and Engineering Services. The Director is a member of the Land Reform Advisory Committee and represents MAWF in land reform discussion forums in Namibia. His Directorate is responsible for the provision of technical advice and training to resettlement farmers.

According to the Director, the following services were specifically provided to Drimiopsis: rangeland management, the San Draught Animal Power Acceleration Programme (San DAPAP), and training in gardening. The other two farms, Lievenberg and Du Plessis, had not yet been provided with any services, according to the Director, but their provision was being planned.

MAWF only permits rain-fed crops that are grown seasonally, e.g. maize and groundnuts, due to Namibia’s low and highly variable rainfall. The Director explained that Agribank was responsible for credit facilities, but that beneficiaries did not qualify for such facilities because they could not provide collateral.

The title on the land given to resettlement beneficiaries constituted a 99-year leasehold. Hence, the land ultimately belongs to the Government and cannot be used as collateral.

The Director claimed that his Ministry had a continuous relationship with farmers after their resettlement.

Also according to the Director, the land reform process was on the right track. However, he explained that the process suffered from certain problems and shortcomings. In his opinion, the “willing buyer—willing seller” system was too slow because too few farms
were being offered to Government. Other problems were the lack of credit facilities for resettlement farmers, and the lack of provision of resources to them.

4.2 On-farm observations

4.2.1 Farm A (Lievenberg)

The Lievenberg farm is situated in the Erongo Region, about 180 km from Windhoek on the road towards Karibib. The farm originally comprised 13,040 ha, which has since been divided into six units. For reasons that were not entirely clear, only one unit [Unit A, measuring 2,411 ha] was currently being used, while the other five farmers had not yet moved onto their allocated units.

The farmer on the active unit came from the Omaruru area. He had been a farmer for many years before moving to his unit. He had applied for the farm in 2001, but only began farming in 2005. The farm was observed to be in a good condition although the farmer explained that he had found the farm in a poor state when he had taken over. The farmer also pointed out that all the infrastructure and amenities were in a poor state of repair and needed renovation. This included constructing new fences in all grazing camps and kraals, and establishing new drinking points for his livestock.

The main product of the farm is cattle, followed by goats, sheep and donkeys, respectively. Cattle bring in the highest income. The farmer explained that he was not yet fully in business, however. He only sold to sustain his family and to send his children to school. The nearest markets were Oltjambingwe, Karibib and Omaruru.

The land appears to be utilised sustainably, but the farmer explained that he had a veld fire in 2006, caused by lightning. The fire claimed most of the land near the farmhouse, but the grazing camps far from the building had not been affected.

The farmer practices rotational grazing to avoid land degradation. He seemed to be very optimistic about becoming commercially successful in agriculture. He described how difficult it was to practice farming in a communal environment. The preferred commercial farming over communal farming because the latter was notorious for disputes amongst neighbours, especially with regard to livestock theft, while this rarely happened in commercial farming.

With regard to post-resettlement services, the farmer explained that he had not received any assistance, but had been promised help in the near future. Though the farmer had experience in farming and had been a farmer all his life, he said he would highly appreciate additional training in cattle management. In particular, he did not know much about cattle vaccination, i.e., when to vaccinate, how to vaccinate, and how to treat other diseases.

4.2.2 Farm B (Drimiopsis)

This farm is located in the Steinhausen Constituency in the Omaheke Region, about 48 km from Gobabis. The property previously belonged to a German farmer. Since its resettlement, about 120 home units with 700 inhabitants occupy the farm, but only seven of these 120 households were officially regarded as resettlement beneficiaries; the others had just moved in without permission. Most of the settlers were San farm workers who had been evicted from the farm on which they had been employed. Many had lived at Drimiopsis since independence.

The farm measures 2,262 ha, but the area used for resettlement is quite small.

The interview was conducted with the project coordinator, who was appointed by the MLR.
in 2003 and is in charge of monitoring and running the farm. His responsibility is also to establish opportunities for the San community to sell their produce in local markets.

Livestock and crop farming take place, but the latter is not successful because of a lack of cooperation among the settlers. The coordinator explained that most community members did not participate in crop farming, which explained the low level of crop production. The MLR, in cooperation with the MAWF, had provided the settlers with some post-resettlement support in the form of a one-week training course. The course focused on controlling pests, which the community found very useful.

Initially, the Roman Catholic Church apparently supported this community by granting them nine head of cattle as a loan, with the condition to repay one head per annum. Unfortunately, the community sold the cattle before they were able to reproduce. Other assistance came by way of agricultural inputs, such as crop seedlings, that were provided by the Government. A gardening project started off well, but production quickly went down. The small amount of vegetables produced as a result of a Food-for-work Programme initiated by the MLR are sold at Gobabis and to schools in the vicinity.

Two days before the authors visited the farm, the Spanish Embassy had visited the community to offer assistance with the gardening project. In general, it became obvious that this community had severe social problems.

One of the interviewees pointed out that even though they appreciated what Government had done to rescue them when they had been homeless, they felt that they were better off on their former farms as poverty and hunger was not so persistent. Some of the problems they complained about were regular livestock deaths. This particularly affected their horses, but the interviewees were unable to describe the diseases clearly.

4.2.3 Farm C (Du Plessis)

This farm is also situated in the Steinhausen Constituency in the Omatheke Region, about 20 km from farm B (Drimiopsis). The farm comprises 4,102 ha and it cost the Government N$986,010 to purchase it (Harting & Odendaal 2002:47). It consists of 25 resettled households who practise crop and livestock farming, with the latter being the dominant land use. In 1997, the farm residents were resettled here because their farm of origin (Omanyara) had been converted into town land. Additionally, there are some people who were recently relocated from their original farm (Arcadia North) in 2005, because the owner had turned the farm into a lodge.

There was a clear arrangement with the Government that the people would be relocated to this place on a temporary basis only. The present residents were told that they were on the top of the waiting list for a permanent relocation to a resettlement farm. However, in the last ten years, nothing had happened to meet this promise. The community has since elected a committee which represents it in negotiations with the Government and, according to the interviewees, the committee is in contact with the MLR every three months through their constituency council. However, despite these regular contacts, the process was simply dragging on. The community had also not received post-resettlement support.

The only public resource available is a nearby primary school. The nearest secondary school is 40 km away, while the nearest clinic is 9 km away.
4.3 Discussion and analysis

"Land reform involves more than just buying or expropriating land from one group in order to give more land to another group: it also involves a complex human process that requires careful social and economic planning" (Haring & Odendaal 2002).

The present study and the results of the farm visits, in particular, fully support the above statement. It is clear that the resettlement beneficiaries need more than just the land to become productive and self-sufficient; they also need systematic, comprehensive and long-term support.¹

According to recommendations by United Nations (UN) experts, the management of land resources need to strengthen relevant local institutions to the point where they are fully capable of addressing and solving the country’s problems (UNEP & FAO 1999:14). This is especially true with regard to the farms visited for this study. The UN study further concludes that external expertise, such as the extension specialists from the MLR and MAIFW, may initially have to assume a leading role in problem identification and programme implementation. Very often, there is no sense of ownership. Giving people land is one thing, but the support after project implementation is at least as important as giving the land itself. This is exactly what could be observed in one of the study areas (Du Plessis), where people were resettled “temporarily” and, a decade later, had still not been given any serious support.

The main activities of the three farms visited are crop and livestock farming. The residents were resettled to become self-sufficient, but the opposite is true. The residents of Drimiopsis were displaced San farm labourers. The residents of Du Plessis are also relocated farm labourers which seem to have been forgotten by the MLR and MAIFW. Finally, Lievenberg had been allocated to six civil servants, only one of whom is actually farming his part of the resettlement farm.

Most of those interviewed were elderly people who had no formal education. However, they claimed to have sufficient farming experience and skills because farming had always been part of their lives. Notwithstanding these skills and experience, they stated that they would highly appreciate Government support as regards financial assistance, agricultural extension services, and other post-resettlement aid. Some of the farmers had not received any of these facilities, despite post-resettlement support being strongly emphasised in the National Resettlement Policy, which defines such support as the duty of the institutions involved – especially MAIFW and the MLR.

The beneficiaries did not reveal their income levels in any detail, but from observations in the field it was obvious that incomes were very low. It seems the beneficiaries make just about enough money to sustain themselves, but they obviously do not contribute anything beyond this to the country’s economy.

One striking finding is how different these three farms are. At Lievenberg, there are six units with individual owners, but only one farmer has moved in with his family. On Drimiopsis, 120 families or 700 inhabitants live on the farm, which is overcrowded and resembles a rural squatter camp. With 25 households, Du Plessis is somewhere in between the two other farms.

¹ In South Africa, the agricultural bureaucracy heavily supported while commercial farmers in both livestock and crop production for many years. Farmers were protected from foreign competition, received various subsidies, and had access to the latest technology through an impressive research and extension network (Van Zyl et al. 1996:206).
5 Conclusions and recommendations

The present study does not claim to be more than a snapshot of the reality of resettlement farms in Namibia. Due to time and organisational constraints, only three randomly selected resettlement farms were visited and investigated. This small sample does not even account for 0.5 per cent of the total number of such farms which, according to the Deputy Minister of Lands and Resettlement, had reached 209 by May 2007 (Allgemeine Zeitung 2007:1). Hence, this study can by no means claim to be representative from a statistical point of view, and one would therefore need to be careful about drawing generalised conclusions from its results.

Nevertheless, the results do raise some concerns regarding the resettlement practice in Namibia. A larger sample of about 10 per cent of all resettlement farms would be required to either verify or reject these concerns from a statistical point of view. In other words, a reliable overview of the general situation would require that at least another 18 resettlement farms be surveyed. The following conclusions and concerns are, thus, based on the assumption that the three investigated farms are at least approximately representative of the overall situation.

5.1 Selection of beneficiaries

In two of the three cases – Drimiopsis and Du Plessis, respectively – the farm residents belong to the most disadvantaged sections of the population, i.e. the prime target group for the NLRP. In the case of Lievenberg, the five parts of the original farm were allocated to civil servants who are part-time farmers. Although the latter might formally qualify as potential resettlement beneficiaries because they fit into category “011” – having no land, but earning an income and possessing livestock – it may be questioned if it is sensible, just and fair to allocate resettlement land of a considerable size (about 2,600 ha in this case) to civil servants with a secure income, while other target groups may need that land much more urgently. According to the results of the farm visit to Lievenberg, even years after the farm allocation, only one of the five sections of that farm had actually been put to use. The other four beneficiaries had not even moved onto their portions, never mind making the land productive. This renders the well-known tendency of land allocation to civil servants, who are already comparably privileged, all the more questionable.

On the other hand, at Drimiopsis, a much smaller area (2,262 ha) was originally allocated to seven San households. However, a total of 120 San families (about 700 people) have since come to live on this small farm. When the land was originally allocated to the first seven San families in 1991, their relocation was supposed to be as a temporary solution only. The families were promised they would be given priority for (permanent) resettlement when other land became available. The reality, however, is that 15 years on, they are still at the same place and the land has become even more pressured because 113 additional San families have meanwhile moved onto the small farm.

The situation at Du Plessis does not look much better. On Lievenberg, five civil servants who are part-time farmers were allocated an average of about 2,600 ha each, while on Du Plessis, 25 households – mainly relocated former farm labourers – have to share the total land surface area of 4,100 ha, i.e. about 164 ha per household: far too little to make a living in Namibia’s arid conditions.

Whatever the reasons that led to the resettlement history of these three farms, the results prompt one to consider that action should be taken to remedy the situation.
5.2 Post-resettlement support for farms

Regarding post-resettlement support, the findings of this study are not very promising either. The perception of what constitutes post-resettlement support on the part of the MLR and MAWF on the one hand, and the farm residents on the other, do not match up.

For example, the MLR claimed to have provided comprehensive support to all three farms. However, apart from some rudimentary information regarding the training provided to the Drimiopsis settlers, the lack of data and records at the MLR did not allow comprehensive details to be provided on such services.

MAWF admitted that it had given no post-resettlement support to Liebenberg and Du Plessis but claimed to have provided some training measures to the Drimiopsis residents. MAWF specified the type of support rendered, but did not give any further information on it.

In terms of potential support from the NNFU, its representative stated in the interview that the union was more of a "lobbying" organisation which focused on policy issues rather than on farm support, service or training.

From the point of view of the settlers on these three farms, the Liebenberg and Du Plessis farmers claimed that no support at all had been provided to them by the MLR or MAWF, while the settlers at Drimiopsis confirmed a one-week training course in pest control had been offered jointly by MLR and MAWF staff. Hence, according to the settlers on site, only one of the three farms had ever received any support from the MLR or MAWF.

From the impression the authors got during their investigations, there also seemed to be little coordination of farm support measures between the institutions involved. The MLR was not aware of what MAWF had done on a certain farm, and vice versa. Also, important support inputs like credits to the resettlement farmer were handled neither by the MLR nor by MAWF, but by Agribank. In general, the authors received the impression that neither the MLR nor MAWF had taken the initiative to provide a well-coordinated bundle of post-resettlement services.

5.3 Cooperation with key institutions and organisations

All three institutions contacted - the MLR, MAWF and the NNFU - made staff available for interviews and provided information for the study. The authors were very grateful for this cooperation. However, the provision of detailed information fell short of the authors' expectations (see section 3.2).

At the outset of the study, the authors had hoped to be provided with the following:

- A list of all resettlement farms, including basic farm data such as its location, size, year of resettlement, number of subdivisions after the resettlement process, name, postal address, and telephone of a contact person
- An overview map displaying the spatial distribution of all resettlement farms in Namibia
- A detailed farm map and a farm description for each of the selected sample farms
- A log file that documented the timeline of the resettlement implementation for each farm, i.e. details concerning
  - when the farm had been offered to the MLR
  - when and how the farm had been assessed by MLR staff
- when the farm had been procured by the MLR and for how much
- when the farm had been subdivided into smaller portions, and which criteria were used to plan the farm layout
- when the smaller portions had been allocated to the beneficiaries
- what had been the selection criteria, and
- when the ‘new’ farm had been taken over by the residents, and
- what support had been provided to each of the three farms studied in terms of financial support, training, agricultural inputs, and veterinary services.

Unfortunately, most of this information was not or could not be provided. It was also not always clear whether information was not available due to the poor data situation or whether it may have been held back for some reason. In some cases, it was claimed that the requested information was ‘confidential’ and could not be provided for a student project. For the sake of transparency and easier research, the authors would like to suggest that the respective ministries be more transparent in this respect.

Due to these unexpected data acquisition problems, the authors had to select their sample farms at random rather than through a systematic screening process based on objective selection criteria. Also, the preparation of the farm visits turned out to be very difficult. Neither of the two ministries could supply the authors with any contact data for the new farm owners.

The results of these case studies seem to confirm the public’s general impression that the NLRP was a good idea in principle, but – up to now – it has not met public or Government expectations and has to be improved. During a meeting in May 2006, the Minister of Lands and Resettlement discussed the achievements and pitfalls of the NLRP with the Governors of the various Regions (Allgemeine Zeitung 2006:1). According to this source, “none of the Governors or counsellors could report, aside from the pitfalls [of the NLRP] at least one single success story.”

The findings of the present study fit into this picture. Unfortunately, reports about negative results like those on the farms investigated could be misused to discredit the idea and the necessity of resettlement in general. However, it should be kept in mind that unsatisfactory implementation in the past does not necessarily prove that the idea itself is wrong.

5.4 Recommendations

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, one should be careful not to generalise the results of this study. However, at least two recommendations can be drawn from the research:

- The MLR should, as soon as possible, conduct similar on-farm studies and situation assessments, preferably with an interdisciplinary team that includes an independent consultant and one staff member from the MLR and one from MAWF. Provided that such a survey is well prepared, a farm assessment should not take more than a day of fieldwork per farm. Hence, a statistically representative survey of about 20-25 farms could be completed within no more than two to three months. A fully-fledged survey of all 200+ resettlement farms would probably take at least 9 to 12 months, depending on the number of survey teams used.
- The MLR and MAWF should optimise and coordinate their databases and reconsider their restrictive information policy. At the Deeds Office, any member of the public is able to access detailed property information on anyone in Namibia. If such data is available to the public, why should farm-specific resettlement data be kept confidential? At the very least, consultants, students, and researchers should be enabled to retrieve basic data on each resettlement farm quickly and easily. Technically, this merely requires the compilation of a standard data set and a brief profile on each resettlement farm. Such profiles could be compiled, used, and maintained jointly by the MLR and MAWF. The farm data should include basic data on the farm (its size, location, contact person’s details, etc.), the most important data on its resettlement history, a summary of post-resettlement support by the MLR and MAWF, and a location map of the farm as well as a detailed farm map, preferably using orthophotos as backdrop images.
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