

TOWARDS A MIXED ECONOMY IN SOUTH AFRICAN AGRICULTURE.

MASIPHULA MBONGWA AND KGOTOKI NHLAPO-LEWIS.

28 April - 2 May 1989

Harare, Zimbabwe

CONTENTS

1. <i>Introduction</i>	1
2. <i>Analytic Framework</i>	1
2.1 <i>Political Economy and National Liberation in South Africa.</i>	1
2.2 <i>Perspective of the African National Congress</i>	2
2.3 <i>De Janvrian Model</i>	5
3. <i>Agrarian Question in South Africa</i>	11
4. <i>Transforming Apartheid Agriculture</i>	18
5. <i>Conclusions and Recommendations</i>	22
6. <i>References</i>	25

1. Introduction.

The aim of this paper is: firstly, to present an analytical framework of the South African agrarian question from the perspective of the African National Congress (ANC). Secondly, to use this framework to examine capitalist development in agriculture and rural economy and consequences thereof. Lastly, to suggest measures of transforming apartheid agriculture and the rural economy within a mixed economy.

It only examines general socio-economic relations and trends of rural South Africa. The latter include white farmlands and rural areas designated for black people (i.e bantustans, freehold lands, church lands, trust lands, coloured reserves and resettlement areas) - white agriculture (organised agriculture), subsistence and petty-commodity production (peasant production). Analysis is confined to the post-1910 period.

The paper has four sections. The first part of section one outlines elements of CST, the land question, the agrarian question and national liberation. The second part examines the agrarian question. The analytic model of De Janvry is used in the second part to examine South African agriculture and the rural economy.

The second section applies the above analytic model to examine the development of capitalism in South Africa agriculture and the rural economy. Specific attention is devoted to the capitalist road of development in agriculture, especially the cheap labour system in agriculture; cheap food relations; and the agrarian crisis.

The third section examines issues of transforming apartheid agriculture within a mixed economy. Issues examined include articulated development; agricultural land redistribution and land ownership; access to agriculture and rural markets; and restructuring farm labour relations and rural social conditions.

The fourth section summarises and makes recommendations. Recommendations include theoretical issues; democratic alliances; mass organization and mobilization; and mass democratic participation.

2. ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK.

This section discusses some elements of political economy in South Africa from the perspective of the ANC. The connection between the ANC and modern political economy in South Africa is identified. This is followed by outlining the ANC perspective. And a perspective of the agrarian question is presented.

2.1 Political Economy and National Liberation in South Africa.

Political economy generally studies conditions which govern how people produce and exchange their means of livelihood. These conditions change from one country to another as well as within a country from time to time.

Precolonial indigenous societies in South Africa were generally pre-capitalist. They varied from hunting and gathering to arable

and pastoral societies. Most importantly, these societies were masters of their productive forces - the foremost determinant of their development process, history and personality.

The advent of Dutch colonial settlement in 1652 qualitatively changed the historical development processes of these societies. From 1806 Britain spread colonisation by force of arms throughout the country, imposing structures and relations which gradually destroyed the material basis of indigenous political economies.

At the turn of this century the 250 years wars of resistance by separate indigenous societies finally came to an end. A phase of African resistance also ended. A new phase begun with the drawing of indigenous people as subjects of into the Union of South Africa 1910 - the independent state of united settlers based on a colonial capitalist economy. Therefore black people entered the international political economy as a colonised people.

Their exclusion from participating and determining the political and economic process of their own country, brought them together to form the African National Congress - the premier modern anti-colonial nationalist liberation movement in 1912. The founding principles of unity, non-racialism/non-tribalism and democracy have today earned the ANC a central place which reaches well beyond its traditional boundaries of the black constituency. It has become the spearhead of democratic forces who together represent an alternative to the apartheid system.

Revolutionary African Nationalism to which the ANC belongs asserts that the basis of national liberation, regardless of "formulas adopted on the level of international law, is the inalienable right of every people to have its own history, and the objective of national liberation is to regain this right usurped by imperialism, that is to say, to free the process of development of the national productive forces" (Cabral, 1974:83).

Human labour force is the paramount national productive force. Hence the objective of national liberation is essentially the emancipation of the indigenous labour force. This is impossible without the liberation of black people - the majority population which embodies this labour force.

2.2 Perspective of the ANC.

Apartheid and what it has done to the political economy and black people is incomprehensible unless the special type of colonialism (CST) which underpin it as a social system is understood. This is the fundamental ANC point of departure. Much has been written elsewhere about CST to belabour it any further (see ANC, 1984; Work in Progress, 1987; Slovo, 1988?). It suffices to mention only principal elements of CST.

There are at least five central elements of CST (Jordan, 1989:29-30). The first one is that:

CST is a system of white minority rule in which the black majority are statutorily excluded from the political process. Political power, except for some marginal delegated powers, is explicitly the monopoly of the white minority which bases its claims on race as the primary legitimating factor.

The formation and evolution of a white state in 1910 was coupled with the systematic erosion of black people's rights. Only when white rule became untenable, due to pressure, did it change and is faltering towards the democratic perspective of the ANC - after an outpour of horrifying counter-revolutionary measures.

Secondly, it is based on the conquest and dispossession of the indigenous peoples of their land and its wealth. This dispossession has itself been institutionalised in formal legislation. Consequently, access to the decisive sectors of productive land is racially determined to the advantage of the white minority.

The black majority population has to conclude terms of peace and reconciliation with the white minority, since "land dispossession enabled the colonisers to suck the entire African population into the orbit of the colonizer's economy and state machinery. Not only was the African from then onwards unable to solve any of his problems without having to refer to the white colonizer, but more, he was unable to refer to the white as an equal. Rather, the white colonizer dictated his decisions to a people which had become a subject people" (ANC Speaks, 1978: 136-137).

Thirdly, it is a system of labour coercion, underpinned by a host of extra-economic measures that were specifically designed to compel the African people, 75% of the population, to make themselves available as cheap labour.

South African capitalism rests on the policy that 90 per cent of black people should "spend their lives in daily labour" (Trac, 1988:21) and that (almost 90% of) the land that is "outside special reserves" in the country should be owned by "the white race" (Hirsch, 1986:11).

Fourthly, it is a system in which access to productive capacity and property is racially apportioned to the benefit of the white minority at the expense of the black majority. This has resulted in a skewed racio-social structure in which the property-owning classes are drawn almost exclusively from the white minority.

White supremacy demands that power should reside in white hands for its interests, privilege and advantage. This in turn creates the need for more power to defend accumulated white power and privilege (Bromberger and Hughes, 1988:219).

Lastly, it is a system of repressive social control. The black majority are explicitly ruled as a conquered people who can claim no rights other than those the dominant white minority are willing to concede.

Bromberger and Hughes' conclusion was that "South Africa is not merely a capitalist state but, more important, it is a settler state created and established by conquest and settlement" (1988: 219). This is the kernel of CST. The experience of black people under South African capitalism has been "little or no freedom to sell their labour by bargaining on even terms with employers on open markets (and little) opportunities for their economic improvement and independence" (Hirsch, op.cit).

How capitalism exploited the labour of the indigenous population determined the land question in South Africa (Nzula, 1979:36,38). The third CST proposition above explains that the indigenous population has been exploited principally as wage labourers. The essence of the land question is therefore black labour.

The race on labour is the feature by which black workers share common oppression with other classes and strata of black people, albeit variably. Its basis is colonial conquest and land dispossession, which continues to be the abiding grievance for black people. Indeed, it is the national question.

Black workers, experience exploitation which is unknown to other black groups or any white class. This implies that the land question has a class relation in addition to the racial relation. The basis of this relation is capitalist relations of production and exchange. Class and race relations are foremost determinants of the land question.

Generally stated, the land question obtains from the domination and exploitation of especially African people. It (land question) "forms the core attribute of closure where race is the dominant mode of that enclosure. (It) cannot be limited to either the rural or the urban areas, nor should it be constrained to freehold tenure within the dispensation of the Land Acts. It is greater than both, and more central to the struggle for self-determination and self-realisation than the legal possession of title deeds by individuals within the context of the Group Areas Act. (It) challenges foundation-stones of apartheid" (Zulu, 1988:43-44).

It is distinct from the agrarian question. It embraces all social structures and relations of production and distribution: both in agriculture and the rural economy, and in industry and the urban economy. The former is the agrarian (land) question. The latter is the industrial (land) question. The agrarian question is thus a part of the land question. The two are not synonymous.

The process of national liberation under the conditions of CST involves essentially the resolution of black labour. This implies finding a solution to race and class relations. Conceptually, the solution of these relations entails two distinct historical processes. But under CST conditions "our movement for national liberation contains both a nationalist and a socialist tendency. Our national democratic revolution has both class and national tasks which influence one another" (Tambo, 1985:12).

National tasks of the democratic revolution seek to transform the apartheid system to reflect the central position of black workers as producers in the economy and as the main force in society. Politically, this means black workers must be invested with the:

Right to vote and to combine in trade unions, they should also have the power, as workers, to represent their point of view in the management of the state, the economy and other elements of social life ... The worker in a democratic South Africa (must) play a role as a decision-maker, the maker rather than the object of policy (ANC, 1987:4).

This involves creating a unitary state without bantustans; forming a government on the basis of all the people; establishing a non-racial one-person-one-vote system; and instituting multi-party parliamentary democracy. This is formal liberation.

Class tasks of the democratic revolution contain factual national liberation. Formal political democracy must be tied to economic emancipation, because "to allow the existing economic forces to retain their interests intact is to feed the root of racial supremacy and does not represent even the shadow of liberation (ANC Speaks, 1978:189).

Economic changes must correspond and support political changes to free the majority population from hunger, poverty, disease, ignorance and backwardness. This requires an increase in the production of wealth; its equitable distribution and; to de-racialise and democratise the ownership and control of the means of production and exchange (ANC, 1987:2).

2.3. De Janvrian Model.

The model studies contradictions of uneven capitalist development and the limits of the state in implementing policies to overcome these contradictions. These contradictions and state policies are used to analyse the agrarian question.

The analysis asserts that uneven capitalist development in the process of capital accumulation results in the creation of centre and periphery characterised by unequal domination of the latter by the former. Central to the process of capital accumulation is the contradictory nature of the relationship between production and circulation.

Articulated economies are characterised by a market for final consumption which is located in upper income earners, wage workers and peasants. This relationship leads to the contradiction which derives from the fact that the capacity of the system to consume must continuously be expanded in order for its production capacity to grow. The need to lower wage costs as a condition for capitalist profits implies that consumption tends to lag behind the production capacity.

This leads to a simultaneous rise in the organic composition of capital and the fall in the rate of profits which creates a barrier to capital accumulation. This barrier - the **crisis of capital accumulation** - is resolved by state intervention or an external solution by individual capitalists and the state. As the system is linked to democratic governments and broad although conflictive regimes the contradictions deriving from the crisis of accumulation do not lead to a crisis of accumulation. The latter solution created colonialism and sustains neo-colonialism.

Disarticulated economies are characterised by a market for final consumption which is situated in the upper income groups because the key growth sectors - which are based on cheap labour - produces goods which are beyond the reach of workers' wages. Market expansion in these economies require a subsistence sector which functions as the supplier of cheap labour to the key growth sectors.

The relationship between key growth sectors and the subsistence sector constitutes functional dualism. This relationship makes it possible to sustain a level of wages that is below the cost of the reproduction and the maintenance of the labour force. Wages in this case supplement the subsistence needs of the worker and his/her family and net production in the subsistence sector.

Capital accumulation under these economies entails the diversion of investments from basic foods and infrastructural needs as well as importing goods whose consumption is restricted to the elite. This contributes to the balance of payments problems and low rate of capital accumulation. To overcome this crisis of capital accumulation, which leads to the questioning of the existence of the state - that is, the crisis of legitimation - a growing need arises for foreign capital, import substitution and export promotion. To create favourable investment conditions for foreign capital, disarticulated economies usually resort to repression against rising workers' militancy.

They are thus characterised by undemocratic, militaristic and authoritarian regimes. The militaristic nature of the state also means the alliance in power is limited to landlords and capitalist classes, while peasants and workers have marginal access to the state and this alliance.

Consequences of disarticulated conditions create a crisis in the economy which, within the agrarian sector, is characterised by stagnation tendencies and uneven development in production. It also leads to rapid differentiation and massive poverty in the rural population.

There are three determinants of stagnation and uneven development which are in their order of importance: terms of trade, which are turned against agricultural food products and agriculture in general; control of the state by traditional or capitalist landed elites, who obtain institutional rents biased towards their hegemonic class positions; land tenure system, if the pre-capitalist sectors are prevalent or if large-scale absentist landlord estates are the principal types of enterprises.

The hierarchical importance of the determinants of stagnation and uneven development arises from the fact that in an attempt to resolve the agrarian crisis, land reforms are able to change the land tenure system and social classes who control the state, but are not able to change the major determinant of stagnation - terms of trade.

Land reforms, together with agricultural development programmes (ARDs) and rural development projects (RDPs), constitute agrarian reforms. Below a typology of land reforms is outlined to assess the impact of land reforms on the determinants of stagnation and uneven development within the context of the mode of agricultural production, social structure and the land tenure system.

Land reforms can either be redistributive, or integral; they can involve shifts within the same mode of production; or they can induce a transition from the pre-capitalist mode of production to junker or farmer road - depending on the effect they have on the determinants of stagnation and uneven development. They also produce a reform and a non-reform sector. The reform sector is

land seized from landlords to form family farms, cooperative and state farms. The non-reform sector is land retained or sold privately by their owners. It includes lands of the pre-capitalist elite, junker land elite or capitalist farmers.

Table 1. A typology of land reforms

Post-Land Reforms							
Mode of Production in Whole Society	Mode Production in Agriculture	Precapita- list	Capitalist			Socialist	
			Precapitalist Estates and Reform Sector	Capitalist Estates and Reform Sector	Capitalist Farms and Reform Sector		Peasant Farms
Pre land Re form	Capitalist	Land Tenure	1. Mexico 1917- Chile 1962-67	2. South Africa 1913-1950 Philippines 1963-72	3. Mexico 1934-40 Chile 1967-73 South Africa 1902-1913	4. Taiwan 1951-63	5. China 1949-56 Russia 1917-
	Capitalist	Precapitalist Estates	6.	7. ↓ South Africa 1950-1970	8. Philippines 1972-79	9.	10. Cuba 1959-63
		Capitalist Estates	11.	12. ↓ Chile 1973- South Africa 1970-	13. Mexico 1940- ?	14. ??	15. ???
		Capitalist Farms	16.	17. ↓ ?	18. ?	19. ??	20. ???
	Socialist	Peasant Farms	21.	22. ??	23. ??	24. ???	25. ???? Cuba 1962- China 1952-
Socialist Farms							

→ Development path of capitalist agriculture in South Africa

? = Objectively possible land reform types.

?? = Objectively unfeasible land reform types.

??? = Land reform types beyond mixed economy feasibility.

Source: i) De Janvry, A, 1981, *The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America*, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, p.205.

ii) De Janvry, A, 1981, "The Role of Land Reform in Economic Development: Policies and Politics", *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Volume 63, No.2, 385.

Redistributive reforms (1,7 & 13) are essentially quantitative because they change the distribution of land among different enterprises without changing the dominant mode of production and classes in control of the state. These reforms do not change any of the determinants of stagnation and uneven development.

Transformation reforms from pre-capitalist to junker road (2) affect the third determinant of stagnation (land tenure) by transforming the pre-capitalist estates to large-scale capitalist estate operating on wage labour. This is attained by liquidating feudal social relations or threatening expropriation of underutilized land. The landed elite continues to retain control of the state. This reform strengthens the landed elite through

price support subsidies and credits (institutional rents).

Transformation reforms from pre-capitalist estates to the farmer road (3) occurs when a ceiling on land ownership in addition to prohibition of semi-feudal social relations is imposed. These reforms affects two determinants of stagnation and uneven development: the second (state control) and the third (land tenure).

Land reforms types (8,9 and 14) are shifts which occur within the capitalist mode of production. They affect only one determinant of stagnation and uneven development - the control of the state - as the landlords are eliminated the bourgeoisie takes control of the state.

Integral reforms (4) transform pre-capitalist estates to peasant farms. They eliminate the non-reform sector. If the peasant sector is supported by institutional services it allows peasants to acquire control of the lands organized as family farms and allows them to realise their full production potential. This reform removes the primary determinant of stagnation (terms of trade). If the creation of the peasant sector is not followed by institutional support, then cheap food policies which constitute the primary determinant of stagnation and uneven development remain intact. Thus the main determinant of stagnation remains.

Counter reforms (6,11 & 12) restore determinants of stagnation and uneven development. The reform from either junker or farmer roads to pre-capitalist estates restore pre-capitalist land tenure and mode of production as well as the control of the state to the landed elite. The reform from the farmer to the junker road changes the land tenure system but remains within the capitalist mode of production.

Once agriculture is located in an advanced capitalist system, agrarian reform via land reforms reaches its limits, while the objective (economic) and subjective (political) basis of the agrarian crisis continues to exist. A need for an integrated rural development programmes (IRDPs) arises to address the agrarian crisis. The IRDPs is made of Agricultural Rural Development programmes (ARDs) and Rural Development programmes (RDPs). Below is a typology of agrarian reforms.

The target group of ARDs is situated in the commercial sector of agriculture which consists of capitalist estates, plantations and commercial farms. These enterprises have access to public institutions that service agriculture (research, extension services, credit, insurance and marketing). They are economically and political integrated into the institutions of the capitalist society.

The primary goal of ADPs is economic. Its purpose is to increase the delivery of agricultural goods to the market. Enterprises in the commercial sector strive to keep the level of wage foods low, because they want to avoid the profit squeeze which worsens their terms of trade. They do this by using direct and indirect pricing policies.

Direct prices controls include: farm price supports, consumer price ceilings, forced deliveries to governments at mandated

prices, export controls and taxes, import tariffs or subsidies and input price subsidies. Indirect price controls include: exchange rates and monetary policies in general.

Table 2. Types of Agrarian Reforms

Types of Reform Content of Reform	Agricultural Development Projects	Land Reform		Rural Development Projects	
		Non-Reform Sector	Reform Sector	Political	Economic
Target Group	Commercial sector	Precapitalist estates	Internal peasants	Family and upper sub-family peasants	Lower sub-family and landless peasants
Goals:					
	Primary	Economic:	Economic:	Political:	Economic:
	Increase agricultural surplus	Increase agricultural surplus	Create a petty bourgeoisie	Create a petty bourgeoisie	Stabilize wages
Secondary				Economic:	Political:
				increase wage food surplus	social status quo
Instruments	Extension International Capital	Threats of Expropriation Change control of State Extension	Redistribution of land Incorporation	Neo-extension Incorporation	Public Amenities Integration

Source: De Janvry, A, 1981, The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Given the pervasive nature of the state in the determination of food and agricultural prices "free market determination of food and agricultural prices is largely a myth" (De Janvry, 1983:185). The study of agricultural prices must be located in the economic and social class structure as well in the international division of labour.

Determinants of price policies within the social class structure are capitalist entrepreneurs and peasant producers. Numerically the former are a minority, but they control the bulk of the land and most of the marketed produce. They also have a monopoly of political representation. The latter form a majority but control little or no land at all and produce little or marketed produce. To a greater or lesser extent they engage in wage labour. They also have little or no political representation.

Where the cropping pattern is unimodal, capitalist entrepreneurs and peasant producers produce the same crop. Price policies under these conditions affect both equally. In the case of dual cropping patterns, production is organised such that peasants produce staple food products and capitalist entrepreneurs - luxury foods and agro-exports. Price policies in this case affect

peasants differentially.

Social alliances affect pricing policies. Where peasants and workers form part of the ruling bloc, they share in the productivity of agriculture and industry through terms of trade and wages. In this case income parity become a primary elements of pricing policy. Where they are excluded, they do not share in the productivity of industry and agriculture. But are exploited through cheap food policies.

Urban constituencies such as workers, employers and government employees also affect price policies. Workers want high real wages through lower food prices, especially where 50 per cent or more of their disposable income is spent on food. Employers want cheap wage foods to maintain low monetary wages so as to be able to raise their rate of profits. Government employees who are part of employers and urban consumers also want cheap food.

Insertion in the international division of labour affects both the degree of food dependency and the position of the balance of payments of the domestic economy. The degree of food dependency on international markets determines the sensitivity of domestic prices and exchange rate fluctuations. Balance of payments determines the possibility of making up for deficient domestic production via imports. It also defines the capacity of the state to allow a price gap to develop between consumer and production prices and to make up for the difference out of public revenues.

ADPs produce contradictions which affect wage foods more than exportable foods, inputs for industrial use and luxury foods. They ease the balance of payments only to worsen the deficit of wage foods production. The development of commercial agriculture is coupled by symptoms of uneven development: concentration of land expropriation of peasants, growing semi-proletarianisation and landlessness, mechanisation, unemployment and regional disparities. The crisis of peasant production endangers sustained accumulation in commercial agriculture as it undermines functional dualism.

Given limitation of land reforms and contradictions of ADPs, RDPs acquire central importance for agrarian reforms. RDPs have a political and an economic component.

The political component is aimed at the upper strata of the peasantry which is made of family farms, modernised upper sub-family farms, reform sector of the redistributive land reform and peasant farms created by the land settlement schemes. In these farms resources of the upper strata of the peasantry is meagre but is sufficient to provide a living. It also provides a marketable surplus which assures the availability of cash to supplement part of the consumption that cannot be provided by agricultural production. The use of these meagre resources (land and cash) can be potentially modernized through technology and access to credit - diffusion instruments of ADPs.

RDPs manage the integration of peasants into the institutions of capitalist society by tailored technical assistance, supervised credit, informal education, limited access to peasant organisation. Where the state is controlled by the landed elite who are resisting the transformation of pre-capitalist social

relations, RDPs are limited as they do not include peasants in the pre-capitalist estates. Thus the transformation of pre-capitalist estates by land reforms are an absolute prerequisite for RDP.

The target group of economic RDPs is the majority of subsistence producers who are not integrated in ARDs or political RDPs. RDPs are conditioned by two constraints which derive from the permanence of functional dualism and unfavourable terms of trade. This can be illustrated in the following equation:

$$S = A + W + P$$

where: S = Sources of subsistence,
 A = Agricultural production,
 W = Wages, and
 P = Public amenities.

Agricultural production (A) is constrained because terms of trade are an obstacle to the modernisation of peasant agriculture. This derives from the fact that peasant surplus is siphoned out rather than being re-invested. Thus attempts to increase the labour productivity of peasants is not possible. The wage level (W) is also kept constant, because functional dualism requires that the subsistence sector should supply cheap labour and wage food. The level of sources of subsistence (S) is determined by the rise or fall of public amenities (P).

Economic RDPs make public amenities such as sanitation, housing, water supply and education available to cover the basic needs of the targeted group. While it seems to fight poverty, the real purpose of economic RDPs is to ensure that the target group continues to supply cheap labour.

3. The agrarian question in South Africa.

Mining capital arose within a pre-industrial agrarian colonial society in the 1870s. Its demands for controlled, regular, plentiful and cheap labour, on the one hand, and cheap wage foods for its labour force, on the other - could not be met by the dominant modes of agrarian economies which it found in the colonial society. These modes were the settler landlord, absentee landlord and land companies, the missionary economy and the indigenous economy.

These modes of production formed part of separate colonies of the Cape, Natal, Transvaal and Orange River. The first two were English colonies and the last two belonged to settlers of Dutch descendants. Mining capital confronted the last two because it is in these colonies that the mining industry was developing.

Spawning the four colonies was metropolitan merchant capital which was based in coastal towns and London. All the modes were based on indigenous producers from whom land, labour and agricultural produce was appropriated by the settlers on the one hand, and the indigenous ruling class, on the other.

Absentee landlords and land companies were an alternative to the landlord economy as they offered peasant protection from the state and settler and settler community. Tenants paid rent and

taxes as well as provided labour to the the mines as terms of tenancy. At times companies provided institutional support as equipment, seeds and credit. By working the lands peasants added value which yielded high profits for the land speculation companies.

Missionary station economies helped to transform the indigenous modes of production and social relations. Missionary stations were inhabited largely by refugees from various communities. Tenants were protected from tax raids. In addition to taxes, inhabitants paid a tithe to build churches and schools. They produced poultry, wheat, maize and fruits and wool.

Peasants were required by missionaries to use ox-drawn ploughs, new seed varieties and build houses along European lines. Skills such as carpentry, blacksmith, wagon-building were promoted. Inhabitants of the mission stations also provided labour to the settler communities and mines. Missionaries encouraged production for the market. They thus became a centre of independent small peasant production. They also became intermediaries for land speculation and were themselves speculators (Trapido, 1978).

Indigenous economies consisted of land that remained as reserves after colonial conquest and annexation. A small number of Africans had titles to landownership (Platsky and Walker, 1985; Beinart, 1982). Cattle played a central role in subsistence and social relationships: for cultivation and lobolo. The mode of appropriating labour, land, livestock and agricultural produce between indigenous economies was via trade, raids and tribute; within an indigenous economy it was by communal labour and tribute; between the indigenous economies and colonial settlements, it was through taxes, raids and tribute.

It was a landlord economy as the nominal political power and the indigenous producers as the economic base in all the four modes of agricultural production who presented an obstacle of cheap labour and cheap food to the mining industry. This derived from relationships between the landlords and their indigenous tenants, which determined the nature of colonial capital accumulation. Labour was a scarce and expensive commodity which the landlord could not pay. The indigenous wanted to hold onto their lands which the settler state as a whole laid claim upon. The sharecropping, labour and rent tenancy system which arose from the conflicting demands between the landlord and indigenous tenants provided little room for the former to meet the demands of mining industry without threatening of capital accumulation. For the indigenous population, saddled with colonial relations, any form of intensifying surplus extraction provoked resistance.

Mining set about changing these economies. It started with the indigenous economies. It smashed their political structures and replaced them with ones more suitable to the procurement of labour. Having done that, British imperialism dragged the landlord economies into the Anglo-Boer War of 1899-1902.

With the two obstacles removed, mining attempted a radical land reform of a transition type to farmer road. Its result was to later determine the path of the nature of capitalist development in agriculture. This land reform, the Land Settlement Scheme, was undertaken soon after the Anglo-Boer War. Its purpose had

political and economic objectives. The major economic purpose was to control indigenous labour and to increase the much needed agricultural produce for urban markets at low prices. The political objective was to settle British soldiers in the rural areas, so as to neutralise the ideological control landlords had over the Afrikaner rural population.

The instruments which were used included expropriation, recalling mortgages, taking over land of people who died in the war, selling and taking over state property of overthrown Afrikaner regimes. Beneficiaries of this reform were British soldiers who participated in the Anglo-Boer War. The aim was to create out of them a class of capitalist farmers.

Land distribution under this reform resulted in British soldiers receiving most of fertile lands, Afrikaners received the remainder of the land, and African people received barren land which later formed part of the reserves. - To ensure that these soldiers, who were not skilled entrepreneurs in agricultural production, were not out-competed by African peasants, the latter were denied access to markets. Furthermore, subsidies which totalled £400 per year were given to each individual soldier-farmer to cover: the purchase of oxen, horses, saddle and bridle milk cows, agricultural implements, furniture, house, living expenses and wage funds (Sitai, 1979).

This land reform failed because, in the first place, soldiers who were the motive force of the farmer road of capitalist development were foreign to the farming community and the country. Secondly, the reform met with fierce resistance from the Afrikaners who, instigated by the leading sections of their community, saw it as an attack from imperial Britain. Thirdly, it was resisted by black people who were denied access to markets, because they saw it as an impediment to their development.

Another consequence of the reform was that a large portion of the Afrikaner population was thrown out of the rural areas. In part, this process led to the concentration of land to government and companies, on the one hand, and to Afrikaner landlords, on the other.

The failure of this land reform was a significant victory for Afrikaner landlords. They were later to use their dominance in the rural economy as a bargaining power base to shape the political and economic future of South Africa. Their relative strength was significant in so far as British monopoly capital shared common interests with Afrikaner landlords with respect to the African majority population.

On the basis of that position, the Afrikaner ruling bloc emerged as an ally in the process of the creation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 (Mbeki, 1985:40). Afrikaner landlords became the motive force of capitalist development in agriculture. Capitalism in South African agriculture, therefore, followed the settler landlord path.

This path is reflected in the 1913 Natives' Land Act, which became the framework that defined the role and position of Africans and black people in general - in the process of capital accumulation. It (Land Act) placed a seal of legislative

approval upon the intentions, means, justifications and consequences of the seizure of the land and the stock of the African people over more than 250 years of settler colonisation.

It defined the role and position of African people in the country as that of providing service to the white society: that is, to become civil servants, labour tenants, wage workers and domestic servants. Nearly 90 per cent of the land in the country was reserved as the exclusive property of white people, and the remain slightly more than 10 per cent was allocated as native reserves to Africans.

Commercial agriculture in the country became an economic activity that was to be undertaken by white entrepreneurs on the basis of cheap African labour. African entrepreneurs who were already involved in commercial agriculture, and those who intended to in the future, had their progress curtailed by a series of measures. Subsistence agriculture in white owned farmlands, reserves and African freehold lands was allowed to provide a part of the means of subsistence for families of African workers who were employed on the white farms and industries. Measures were later taken in the future to control and regulate the movement and settlement of Africans in the country and urban areas in particular.

As a reflection of differences which existed among the landlords, white landed interests were to be protected against some provisions of the Act in Transvaal, Natal, Cape Provinces and native reserves. These white interests were further strengthened against African tenants and workers.

The Land Act was a racially-based transformation land reform, because it aimed at the ultimate elimination of African commodity producers in all four modes of agricultural production mentioned here above. Missionaries, absentee landlords and land companies particularly in Natal and the Transvaal blunted the effect of the Act on rent and African freeholders. The protection of white interests which were linked to African tenants delayed the process of eliminating African commodity producers. It could not stop it.

By restricting the production of wage foods to white farmers and the supply of cheap labour to African people, the Act outlined the framework of resolving the problem of cheap labour and wage food. The manner in which African people were set to serve the white society as a whole, and the manner in which they (Africans) would procure their means of subsistence in carrying out their ascribed duties - created the foundations of disarticulated accumulation and functional dualism in South Africa. The implicit racial constitution of this disarticulation and dualism is the testimony of the dominant existence of CST conditions over these relations and structures.

The post-1913 period saw the simultaneous implementation of ADPs and RDPs-like agrarian reforms in commercial agriculture to reinforce the land reform effected by the Natives' Land Act. Commercial agriculture gradually assumed the task of producing wage foods and agricultural products. It also formed part of key sectors together with industry and mining. These key sectors and all strata of the white population, formed the final consumption market of the disarticulated economy in South Africa.

The target group of RDPs within commercial agriculture became the whole rural white population. Its political objective was to nurture the development of the white agrarian bourgeoisie. The secondary political objective was that this bourgeoisie should increase wage food surplus and agricultural products in general. Its primary economic objective was to stabilize the incomes of the whole white population, particularly the poorer strata. The second economic objective was political in that it sought to legitimise and consolidate white supremacy. The overall objective of the RDPs was to integrate all the white rural population into the evolving capitalist institutions of the CST society.

The target groups of the ADPs was the upper strata of the white population. The primary economic goal was the same as RDPs' objective. The state played an important role in creating economic and social infrastructures which were vital for the commercialisation of agriculture. These included research centres, credits, insurance, marketing boards, co-operative and agricultural unions. Its (state) monetary and fiscal policies included the granting of tax concessions, input price subsidies, low interest rates credit and subsidies on retail food prices.

The infrastructure included railway and road networks which were built largely to serve commercial agricultural regions. The overall result was an increased production in food crops, livestock and horticulture (Swardt, 1970:4). There was also an increase in inputs used by farmers such as fertilizers. The total number of farms increased constantly from 1918, but fell continuously after 1950. The average size per farm decreased and increased in the same period respectively in the same period. These policies maximised the number of farmers settled on the land. They also helped poor farmers to survive in commercial agriculture (Cooper, 1988).

African labour tenancy production in commercial agriculture and peasant production in the native reserves was already demonstrating the characteristics of subsistence production by 1918. The inhabitants of the reserves were unable to meet their subsistence requirements without engaging in wage labour, particularly migrant labour, because of declining productivity (Simkins, 1981:264). The same dependency on wage labour showed itself among labour tenants in commercial agriculture, because of worsening terms of tenancy.

An increasing number of labour tenants from the 1930s left white farms to engage in wage labour in towns and major cities, where the expanding secondary industry was offering better wages and working conditions. These developments were coupled with an increasing urbanisation process among African people, because the secondary industry required a permanent urban workforce. The migration of labour tended to be permanent (Nattrass, 1976).

In response to the forementioned, the white commercial sector put pressure on the state to adopt stricter measure to control and regulate the movement and supply of African labour within commercial agriculture and between this sector and other sectors. To this end laws such as the Native Service Contract of 1934, Native Laws Amendment Act of 1937, Native Consolidation Act of 1945 and Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act of 1951 were passed.

The state was also used to forcibly remove more than 3.5 million people between 1960 and 1983 from commercial agriculture and urban areas. More than a third of these were removed from the white countryside (Platsky and Walker, 1985:11). Most of the more than 3.5 million people were relocated into the bantustans.

By the 1940s natives reserves had reached a point which can be explained by the following sources of subsistence of income equation:

$$S = [A] + W + [P]$$

In the case of the subsistence in the native reserves, public amenities [P] which are here denoted as constant - are actually next to non-existent, because they are expropriated by white commercial agriculture as institutional rents. [P] has existed as repressive state apparatuses to African people under CST conditions. [A] is the constant level below which agricultural cannot decline without causing collapse in the subsistence economy. Decline in agricultural production [A] which had been observed since 1918, reached this level around the 1940s. As a result there was pressure on W to rise, to compensate for the decline in [A]. This was demonstrated by the wage increase demands and strikes in the metropolitan areas, as witnessed by the Miners Strike of 1946. Mine workers were mostly migrant workers from the natives reserves' subsistence sector.

The consequences of the decline in [A] within the subsistence sector is that an increasing number of households, particularly women and children, left to seek wage employment elsewhere so as to bridge the gap that was developing by a decline in [A]. It is by this period that the dependency in wage labour becomes inevitable. The result was that whereas wages, W, were secondary and agriculture, [A], was the primary source of subsistence income, S, with [A] subsidizing commercial agriculture, mining and secondary industry - W became primary and [A] secondary from the 1960s (Simkins, 1981:270).

These changes account for the paradoxical phenomenon where up to a third of arable land in the reserves has not been cultivated. In part, the reason is because land has become more of a security than an productive agricultural base, given the general worsening conditions such as soil deterioration. Under these conditions, agricultural carries risks of bad harvest which the majority of the poor population, with its meagre incomes, cannot afford to take (Lenta, 1981). To these households, an investment in agriculture in a bad season is now worse off than in withholding their meagre incomes (Operation Hunger, 1987). These conditions threatened the material basis of cheap labour and disarticulated accumulation in commercial agriculture, mining and secondary industry.

In response to these developments, RDP strategies were implemented, bringing about the existence of public amenities investment in the bantustans - as witnessed by betterment schemes (De Wit and Labbrandt, 1989), border industries and the Bantu Authorities Act in the 1950s. The political objective of these RDPs were chiefs, headmen and the upper strata in the subsistence sector. Their (RDPs) primary goal was to create a bureaucratic bourgeoisie. Their secondary goal was to control and

regulate the supply of cheap labour to the South African economy as a whole.

The economic target group of the RDPs was the lower strata of the subsistence sector. The primary goal was to stabilise incomes of this strata. The secondary political objective was to shift from Pretoria onto the bureaucratic bourgeoisie, the responsibility in the maintenance of apartheid control in the bantustans. The instruments employed to realise these objectives included the Bantu Investment Corporation, BIC, which was split along tribal construction of the bantustans; border industries which today form part of a broader industrial decentralisation strategy together with growth point centres within the bantustans such as Babalegi (Bophuthatswana) and Isithebe (Kwazulu); betterment schemes; the granting of self-government authority to bantustan bureaucratic bourgeoisies; and establishing labour bureaux in the bantustans through the Bantu Labour Regulation of 1968.

The overall objectives of these instruments has been to integrate African people in the subsistence sector into the institutions of the apartheid system, particularly the upper strata to become the extended arm of apartheid domination. The location of more than 3.5 million people in the bantustans frustrated the success which might have resulted from the RDPs. Instead, this resulted in the sharp deterioration of agricultural production and productivity in the bantustans: due to overpopulation, soil deterioration, and the increased involvement of women and children in wage labour. This was accompanied by growing unemployment, more dependence on wage labour, impoverishment and starvation. As always, this intensified the pressure on the demand for the increase in wages, W, to effectively substitute agricultural production, [A], as was witnessed in the 1973 and 1979-1985 strikes in the metropolitan areas.

Commercial agriculture in the early 1960s was in favourable conditions for further capital accumulation. The reason for this is that, firstly, there was an economic boom on the international economy due to the reconstruction of Europe following World War II. This stimulated the export sector in the country. The economy had a strong balance of payments position. Secondly, the outlawing of the liberation movement and the suppression of the trade union movement, restored the process of capital accumulation which was threatened by the legitimacy crisis during the 1950s, due to the collapse of the subsistence sector. Lastly, there a huge inflow of foreign capital which was attracted by favourable conditions of capital accumulation.

The combination of all these conditions placed immense resources at the disposal of commercial agriculture, which emerged from the 1950s still in problems of labour shortages and a low level of development of the productive forces. To government, white farmers and other sectors of the economy - mechanisation was an answer to address these problems. For these reasons, a different set of ARDs was implemented to avail these resources to commercial agriculture. Its target group was the upper strata of white farmers who, in the 1970s formed 40 per cent of the total number of farmers and accounted for 87 per cent of total production and in 1983 formed 30 per cent of farmers but produced 75 per cent of total output. This upper strata has been called the productive core by Cooper (1988), because it receives

differential rents over and above the institutional rents - due to better location relative markets, fertile soils and high capital investments.

The primary economic objective was that commercial agriculture, through the upper strata, would increase the supply of agricultural surplus on a cost effective basis relative to other sectors in the economy and international agricultural prices. This meant that the level of development of productive forces as a whole and in particular labour productivity, had to be significantly increased. Instruments of the ADP strategy was to make public institutions which service commercial agriculture such as research, extension services, credit, insurance and marketing more responsive to the needs of the upper strata. For instance tax concessions, freer access to Land Bank loans which were previously restricted to poor farmers were now made available to the upper strata of white farmers (Cooper, op.cit).

Mechanisation was the chief instrument through the primary economic objectives of increased agricultural surplus was to be achieved. As a result overproduction in commercial agriculture became a common feature. So did increasing indebtedness of white farmers, concentration and centralisation of landownership and production in a few hands; rising land prices and land speculation; an increasing surplus labour which led to the eviction of labour tenants and the casualisation of labour.

The overall result of these ADPs was a creation of a core sub-sector which contains the upper strata and a peripheral sub-sector which contains the remaining lower strata in commercial agriculture. In spite of the goals of the ADPs, the cost effectiveness of commercial agriculture in relation to other sectors and international agricultural prices, continued to be relatively low. Commercial agriculture cannot attract trained and skilled labour from other sectors because, relatively, labour conditions in the sector are inhuman: wages are low, farmworkers are not protected by labour legislation, white farmers resist the organisation of workers into trade unions and a series of archaic extra-economic relations of production continue to exist within the sector.

The implications are that commercial agriculture today constitutes the foremost obstacle to the general development of productive forces and labour productivity throughout the economy. No amount of capitalisation, subsidisation, elimination of labour tenant relations (which are today re-emerging) and repression of the national liberation and trade union movement will remove economic backwardness without releasing the process of development of productive forces, particularly black labour. Releasing the process of the development of productive forces means the removal of the five (5) CST conditions of capital accumulation.

4. Transforming apartheid agriculture.

The South African political economy is today in throes of legitimation and capital accumulation crises. Dominant white social classes who control the state and capital accumulation are desperately seeking changes in order to restore the latter.

The ANC, for its part, is determined to remove CST conditions which underpin these crises via: the liberation of national productive forces, particularly the black labour force; the increase in the production of wealth; its equitable distribution; deracialising and democratising land ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

Mixed economy is the coexistence of private ownership and enterprises, on the one hand, with public ownership and enterprises, on the other. Public ownership of an enterprise varies from complete ownership to 50:50, to 49:51 down to minority control. The development path of a mixed economy is determined by the alliance of social classes in control of the state, on the one hand, and the alliance of social classes in control of the process of capital accumulation. On the political level, a mixed economy is national democracy.

The South African economy is a disarticulated mixed economy. State intervention has been pervasive in commercial agriculture which is predominantly under private ownership. The principal task is to transform this disarticulated economy into an articulated economy. But South Africa has been a white country for close to a century. It is imperative that access to land - the foundation for human existence - should be guaranteed by the constitution of a democratic state to all South Africans for productive and reproductive purposes. Parliament must determine the degree of access to land and define what will constitute productive and reproductive purposes.

To this end, three types of agrarian reforms need to be taken: namely land reforms, agricultural rural development projects (ARDs) and rural development projects (RDPs).

The principal target of land reform must be commercial agriculture. Its particular focus must be landlord estates and some capitalist farms and agri-business with similar features of economic backwardness characteristic of landlord estates. The primary economic objective will be to increase wage foods and agricultural produce in general, as well as to create a reform sector from commercial agriculture.

To achieve this, the acquisition of land will be carried out. The present narrow alliance of the landlords, capitalist farmers and agri-business will be transformed to create a broader social base which will include farm and rural workers, black petty-bourgeoisie and peasants. State intervention will assist in the provision of housing, education and other services and amenities to especially farm and rural workers and peasants in the commercial sector. It (state) will also enforce and monitor laws concerning the interests of farm and rural, ^(workers) as well as peasants.

The same land reform will have as its target all black rural people in the subsistence sector, because black people have been discriminated against by every agrarian reform in CST conditions. The primary political objective of this land reform will be to encourage the development of black commodity producers in agriculture. This will contribute to undermining landlord estates that depend upon archaic forms of extra-economic production relations, which today constitutes the major obstacle to the development of productive forces in commercial agriculture and

labour productivity as a whole.

It will also contribute to deracialising and democratising land ownership and control of the means of production and distribution. Land acquired from commercial agriculture will be redistributed to black commodity producers to form family farms and co-operatives. State intervention will seek to incorporate these producers into commercial agriculture. There are three objectively available land reforms which can be implemented within the mixed economy where, as in the case of South Africa, capitalism is the dominant mode of production. In the typology of land reforms, these are movements from land reform type 12 to reform type 17, 13, and 18. All these land reform types occur within capitalism as the dominant mode of production. Reform type number 12 is the prevailing system of commercial and subsistence agriculture in the country, characterised by the dominance of landlords, capitalist farms and agro-industry.

The land reform type number 17 will result in no changes in the three determinants of backwardness, stagnation, and uneven development: namely the cheap labour system, social class alliance in control of the state, and land tenure. This land reform, if undertaken, will not release the process of the development of productive forces; nor will it result in the rise in labour productivity in agriculture.

On the contrary, it will consolidate the control of the landlords on the state. Capital accumulation which results will come under pressure from the crisis of legitimation because the majority of black people will not have benefitted from this land reform. This is, therefore, the least preferable of the three land reforms.

Land reform number 13 has actually been attempted in South Africa since the 1960s. It was to encourage the evolution of capitalist farms by eliminating labour tenancy and African freeholders. However, it failed because the state could not eliminate landlord estates and archaic extra-economic productive relations upon which landlord estates depend.

This land reform, if implemented, must involve the elimination of landlord estates, labour tenancy and other out-moded extra-economic production relations. Capitalist farmers will assume control of the state. Land acquired from this land reform may be distributed, as a reform sector, to the upper strata of black rural producers as a way of coopting them into the ruling bloc.

This land reform will contribute to the development of productive forces and labour productivity in commercial agriculture. It will also contribute to the cost effectiveness of the sector relative to other sectors in the country and international agricultural prices. Furthermore, it will remove the racial component of land ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

On the whole, this land reform type will remove the two determinants of backwardness, stagnation and uneven development: that is, land tenure and social alliance in control of the state. The Urban Foundation and the Development Bank of Southern Africa advocates the adoption of this land reform type.

However, this land reform type retains the primary determinant of backwardness, stagnation and uneven development because it excludes the majority of the black rural population. This group has always formed the basis of cheap labour and functional dualism. Thus the subsistence sector as the purveyor of cheap labour will continue to exist without the racial component of CST.

South Africa would have, through this land reform, entered the general disarticulated development path that characterises the Third World today. The process of capital accumulation which will result from this land reform type, will gradually be disturbed by the crisis of legitimacy that will develop from the discontent of the excluded black masses. This land reform type is, therefore, not ideal to address and redress the main problem raised in this paper - black labour.

Land reform type number 18 is similar to reform type number 13 in many respects. However, it is and does more. It removes all the three factors of backwardness, stagnation and underdevelopment because it includes all black groups in the subsistence sector. This is, therefore, the most ideal land reform type that is objectively possible in South Africa today.

Reform types number 14 and 19, which also occur under capitalism as the dominant mode of production, are also preferable because the peasantry will be the dominant social force. However, the reality of South African conditions is such that the peasantry, at the moment, does not possess the material basis to meet the demands and responsibilities that such a land reform type would place on its shoulders.

If the state was to intervene in support of such a peasant dominated agrarian economy, the cost of such an exercise would be very high and disruptive to food supply and capital accumulation in general. Let alone the possibility of added disruption that may result from reprisal measures which may be undertaken some countries supposedly in the defence of "democracy" and "free enterprise".

On its own, however, land reform type number 18 will not be adequate to release and meet the demands and responsibilities of: developing the productive forces; increasing wage foods and agricultural produce on a cost effective basis; equitably distributing income; deracialising and democratising land ownership and control of the means of production and distribution. The additional implementation of integrated rural development programmes such as ADPs and RDPs is, therefore, indispensable.

The target of ADPs, following land reform type 18, will be the black commodity producers, farm and rural workers. The primary economic goal would be to increase agricultural and wage foods on a cost effective basis; creation of employment; and income distribution. The secondary economic goal would be to enact legislation that will govern wage labour conditions in agriculture and the rural economy, and encourage the creation of trade unions for farm and rural workers. This measure will constitute part of affirmative action in agriculture and rural development. Instruments for realising ARD objectives will

include institutional support and services from both public and private sources as well as from international organisations.

The RDPs will have political and economic aspects. The target group of the political aspect will be those black commodity producers who have been left out of institutional structures of ADPs. The primary political objective will be to manage their incorporation of into commercial agriculture. The secondary political objective is to integrate these producers to control the state so as to democratise political power. The economic objective of the political aspect of the RDPs is similar to those of the ADPs.

The target group of the economic aspect of RDPs will be the poor and unemployed strata of the rural population. The primary economic objective will be to stabilise their incomes. The political objective will be to draw these groups into mass organisation where they will influence the political and economic processes which affect them and their families. Instruments of both aspects of the RDPs will include the creation of unemployment benefit funds for the rural unemployed; ensure a minimum living wage level for the employed; and the provision of social wages in the form of subsidised or free education, health housing and transport for the most impoverished groups.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations.

By way of concluding this paper, capital accumulation and the legitimacy of the South African state can be said to have had four major agrarian phases since the emergence of the mining industry in the 1870s. The first phase was, in so far as the sources of subsistence income equation ($S = A + W + P$) is concerned, characterised by the dominance of indigenous production, A.

The crisis of capital accumulation at this stage was that mining capital could not get indigenous labour at the wage rate, regularity and quantity it needed. Settler landlords, for their part, contented themselves by appropriating surplus from indigenous producers in the best possible means - sharecropping, labour and rent tenancy. This crisis was roughly from 1870s to the 1910s.

The second phase was the existence of parity between A and W. In other words A was declining while the importance of wage labour W was increasing. This was the ideal situation of capital accumulation within the framework of functional dualism. It was not without crises, however. The crisis of capital accumulation was located principally in the instability of agricultural markets - due to fluctuations in agricultural prices; the international economic crisis such as the depression of 1929-1932; workers' militancy; the general low level of productive forces in agriculture; and the narrow base of the domestic market (mining, agriculture and the white community). This phase covered the 1920 and the 1930s.

The third phase was marked by the collapse of the subsistence sector. The importance of wage labour is overwhelming, but it is not backed by the corresponding rise in wage levels, W. The crisis of capital accumulation becomes severe throughout the

economy, especially mining and commercial agriculture which directly depend on subsistence agricultural production A to underpay their workforce. The entry of secondary industry as a labour competitor exacerbated this by exerting pressure for the rise in wage levels, W, and the general development of productive forces in all sectors.

The crisis of legitimation that results from the crisis of accumulation calls to existence state intervention, P, especially repressive state apparatuses. This phase of the 1940s and 1950s ushered the next, fourth, phase. Here state repression becomes the key factor in capital accumulation, because it replaces subsistence agriculture, A, to keep wage levels, W, from rising. State intervention, P, which manifests itself via repressive institutions such as bantustans, betterments schemes and Bantu Education protects the continuation of functional dualism.

Capital accumulation is restored to the extent that state intervention, P, manages to control the crisis of legitimation. But the resulting economic boom soon plunges the country into its deepest general crisis. Consumption constraints lead to overproduction because the productive capacity outgrows the major narrow white final demand market; the critical shortage for skilled and trained workforce arises in the economy because the reproductive capacity of the traditional white sector where this labour force come from, is declining; sanctions adversely affect the balance of payments, foreign investors loose confidence in the economy and foreign capital is slowed down; the debt crisis mounts; and the resistance of the oppressed and state counter-revolution becomes too expensive to finance. Lastly, commercial agriculture which depends so much on state support plunges into a deep crisis of its own. This has been the phase since the 1960s to the present.

The general tendency of social development is towards a common, non-racial, democratic and articulated political economy. This trend cannot evolve spontaneously and in an unplanned fashion however. Conscious and deliberate measures must bring it about. For some time, the mode of production will still be capitalist. What is critical is which class alliance will control state power and the process of capital accumulation. A class alliance whose orientation is towards the elimination of disarticulated accumulation and functional dualism on the basis of 5 CST conditions - is bound to bring about a qualitatively different national democratic mixed economy and agriculture in particular.

Having this in mind, it is imperative for the ANC to quickly come to terms with the implications of a national democratic mixed economy in agriculture and the rural economy in general. The main implications of this evolving reality in South Africa have a bearing on: fundamental issues of the ANC perspective on the agrarian question; the importance of democratic alliances; mass organisations; and mass democratic participation.

The time is long overdue, the ANC should today be having a clear, definite and simple agrarian programmatic perspective that is not just understood and accepted by the majority of the population; but is also used by these masses as a weapon in struggles to fashion their democratic political and economic future around their daily material life. It is also via the analytical power of

this perspective that complex and complicated connections of agriculture with other sectors and the international economy will be extended and deepened.

On the basis of this agrarian programmatic perspective, the ANC will be able to seek and to win over to its perspective of a mixed economy, some elements of agrarian capitalist and petty-bourgeoisie farmers and agri-business. The evolving reality of a mixed economy suggests a necessary social, economic and political partnership with capitalist classes, particularly these elements. Secured onto the ANC perspective, they have a vital role to play in bringing about articulated capital accumulation in agriculture and the economy as a whole.

Particular attention should be paid to the black section of the forementioned agrarian social classes. They have, together with all black people, albeit variably, suffered national domination. They have also suffered social discrimination peculiar to the class and strata. It is necessary to convince this class of black people that their material interests and progress lies within the ambit of the general process of national liberation. Secured within the ANC perspective of mixed economy, it is actually via the black bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie that, among others, a contribution will be made to deracialising and democratising land ownership and control of the means of production and distribution.

Black farm and rural workers together with peasants are the principal objective of national liberation in the countryside. As such they are the cornerstone of the ANC policies and strategies. It is upon the power of notably these groups that the ANC should forge alliances with groups mentioned here above.

The mobilisation of especially farm and rural workers as well peasants as a conscious socially organized force is vital to articulated capital accumulation and national democracy. White supremacy under CST saw to it that national and democratic were always kept weak and isolated from one another.

On the contrary, the very survival and success of articulated accumulation and democracy depends on organized workers and peasants, on the one hand, and a democratic agrarian bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie. This is so because an articulated mixed economy and national democracy requires such a broadly based alliance of social classes, to avoid the crisis of legitimation and the crisis of capital accumulation.

When the broadest alliance of classes actually participates in both the political and economic processes - in pursuit of and around their vital material needs - then an articulated mixed economy and national democracy comes to life. An will open the possibility of developing productive forces to their potential.

References.

- ANC, 1978, "Strategy and Tactics of the ANC", in ANC: Speaks Documents and Statements of the ANC, 1955-1976, ANC D.I.P, Lusaka.
- ANC, 1984, South Africa: Colonialism of a Special Type, ANC D.I.P London.
- ANC, 1987, Background Paper of the Arusha Conference on The World United Against Apartheid for a Democratic South Africa, Reference No.BP-05/87.
- Beinart, W, 1982, The Political Economy of Pondoland, 1860-1930, Ravan Press, Johannesburg.
- Bromberger N, and Hughes, K, 1987, "Capitalism and underdevelopment in South Africa", in Butler, Elphick and Welsh (eds), Democratic Liberalism in South Africa: Its history and Prospect, David Philip, (Pty) Ltd, Johannesburg.
- Cabral, A, 1974, Revolution in Guinea: An African People's Struggle, Stage 1, London.
- Cooper, D, 1988, Working the Land: Review of Agriculture in South Africa, Enviromental and Developmental Agency, Johannesburg.
- De Janvry, A, 1981, The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- 1981, "The Role of Land Reform in Economic Development: Policies and Politics", American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Volume 63, No.2, 384-392.
- 1982, "Social Articulation as a Condition for Equitable Growth", Journal of development Economics, Volume 13, 275-303.
- 1983, "Why Do Governments Do What They Do ? The Case of Food Price Policy", in Johnson, G and Schun, E, (eds), The Role of Markets in the World Food Economy, Westview Special Studies in agriculture science and Policy, Westview Press, Boulder, Colarado, 185-212.
- De Swardt, S.J.J, 1970, "Subsistence and Commercial Farming", Agrekon, Volume 9, No.2, 3-8.
- De Wet, C and Leibbrandt, M, 1989, "Land Reform and Regional Economy: A Ciskeian Case-Study", Paper presented at the South africa Economic Research and Training Project Policy Workshop: Towards a New Economic Democratic Order, Wageningen, November, 1989.
- D'Souza, F, 1987, Operation Hunger, University of Oxford, Department of Biological Anthropology, Oxford, UK.
- Hirsch, E, 1986, Apartheid's Great Land Theft: The Struggle for the Right to Farm in South Africa, Pathfinder Press,