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St. Paul's, the 'settlement' village to be discussed here is situated in Latatiele district, Transkei which borders on both Lesotho and South Africa's Natal Province. The district covers an area of approximately 2136km$^2$ and according to the 1980 census of the Transkei has a population of 99 479 (Saluti Magistrate's Office).

The focus of this paper is the striking degree of differentiation in St. Paul's, for although an initial impression of the village at harvest-time was one of plenty, closer examination revealed that many families were only just keeping body and soul together. This is despite the fact that St. Paul's is a comparatively prosperous community in relation to its neighbours although villagers are not able to produce their own subsistence requirements through agricultural activities. I will try to demonstrate that differentiation is determined by access to cash as even the most successful agricultural activities play only a supplementary role in providing dietary requirements.

Even prior to the Transkei's 'independence' in 1976, Latatiele district has been the subject of numerous disputes over boundaries. A reason for this seems to be the fertility of the land and the situation of the sources of mountain springs. From the turn of the century onwards, the relevant government publications reveal wide differences of opinion as to who should be occupying the area. "The Latatiele district is eminently adapted for European settlement..." (Beaumont Commission Vol. II, 203-4) said Mr. R.A. Richardson to the Beaumont Commissioners, while a 'Native', Henry Ladapuna, appealed for land to be sold to Blacks: "We have got no land. In Latatiele there is no land." (Beaumont Commission Vol. II, 204)

The Native Land and Trust Act created the South African Native Trust, a corporate body which could buy land - in competition with Blacks and Whites - in released areas and lease out portions to Blacks (or Whites). The released areas were published in a schedule to the Act. The position in Latatiele at the end of 1936 was that there were 56 European owned farms and 19 Native owned farms or portions thereof. The demarcation of these farms dated back to the implementation
of the Report of the Griqualand East Commission 1884 (G.682E1) which allocated land in the aftermath of the Transkei Rebellion of 1880-81. The Cape Government's policy at the time was to create a white buffer zone in this area and also to keep the fertile land in the foothills of the Drakensberg in White hands (G682E1:5). The commission, however, recognised the impossibility of this demand and said as much several times in the course of their report.

The existence of a number of Black owned farms in Katatiele in 1936 lead to the ironical situation whereby the Trust was "buying from 'blacks' themselves rather than purchasing from 'white' for 'black'" (Bardsley, 1982:39). In 1939, the policy for the district was, in accordance with general Trust policy (cf. U.G. 54/1939), that all farms situated in the Drakensberg - 20 in all - be demarcated as forest reserve in order to protect and preserve springs and rivers. The next line of farms was to be reserved as grazing areas for location stock and the lower arable farms for settlement. The conditions for settlers were as follows: each man with no other landholdings was entitled to arable land varying in size from 6 to 8 acres (2.4 - 3.2 ha.), depending upon soil fertility; 1 acre (0.4 ha.) kraal site and the right to run 8 cattle and 1 horse; the rental to be 30 shillings per annum (District Record Book).

St. Paul's is situated on one such Trust farm and the history of changing land ownership is illustrative of the move away from early agricultural production discussed by Wilson (1971) and Bundy (1972). Since 1969, the village has been subjected to 'betterment' and is one of the rare cases where many individuals have benefited from the scheme. However, the main reason for this is the fortuitous siting of the village on an old river bed which has resulted in a strip of land of remarkable fertility. The village is thus in itself an example of differentiation with inhabitants relatively more prosperous than those in neighbouring villages; the 'prosperity' taking the form of good harvests and superior grazing. The richness of the soil is certainly reflected in the fact that of 25 families interviewed with access to land, all but one declared they did not use and did not need to use fertiliser on their fields or gardens. The one exception stated that
she had experimented with using fertiliser on her field the previous year with disastrous results and was never going to use it again. This information takes on greater meaning when compared to a village 16 km away - which has also been subjected to 'betterment' - where 20 landholders use fertiliser on their fields against 4 who do not (Spiegel, 1982).

**THE CHURCH'S INVOLVEMENT**

The land on which the village stands has changed hands a number of times in the past century. As the name implies, there has been Church activity in the area (Wallace Farm, the land the village is now situated upon, having belonged to the Anglican Church from 1912 to 1964). The following history was obtained from two churchmen - an oral account from the Reverend Richard Lantshongo, an elderly Anglican priest now living in the neighbouring village of Ramohlakoana; and the writings of Archdeacon Loutrie, in charge of St. Stephen's parish in the 1940's - as well as parish records and correspondence.

Lantshongo's history dates back to 1862 when Adam Kok and his Griquas trekked into 'Nomansland' (the area that today corresponds to the modern districts of Latatiele, Mount Currie and Uzinkulu cf. Ross, 1974), along with his Sotho allies under the leadership of Lepheana. In 1878, Lepheana's son Ramohlakoana, approached the magistrate at Latatiele, Martin Liefeldt, and requested that a Bishop be placed at the service of his community. As a result St. Paul's mission was built by the locals and the Reverend Tonkin installed in October of the same year. The mission station was apparently abandoned during or just after the Transkei Rebellion of 1880 and official Church activity was only resumed after 1883 when the Griqualand East Commission recommended that the Church be given quit-rent title to the ground on which the mission buildings were standing (CMK 5/13 Cape Archives). According to the recommendations of the Commission, Ramohlakoana, who had remained 'loyal' to the Cape Government during the conflict, was allocated the land adjoining St. Paul's that is present day Ramohlakoana.

In 1895, tender was made by a White landowner to purchase the
property - Wallace Farm - from the state, at that time the
Cape Colony. Ramohlakoana vociferously objected to the sale
on the grounds that 'his' church, to which he had contributed
over £100 (C.H. 5/13 Cape Archives), was situated on the land.
This prompted him to initiate a collection amongst his people
towards the purchase of Wallace Farm and later the same year
the deal was concluded. Ramohlakoana bought the land for
£1 000 of which £600 was on bond, later reduced to £600 (Loultrie;

In 1903, Ramohlakoana died and Wallace Farm was inherited by
his son, Lohlokoana, who had been a rebel during the 1880
war and was consequently living in Lesotho. So it was
Lohlokoana's son Elicel Lepheana who had the task of managing
the farm.

Elicel was not a faithful steward and used for
his own purposes such revenue as came into his
hands (Loultrie).

This, presumably, was the reason for Kohlakoana's sudden
desire to sell Wallace Farm to the Church in 1910. He was
apparently so keen to sell, and sell to the Church, that he
sent a letter to the Bishop offering him first option to
buy at a price of 22/6 an acre - well below the market value
of the land. The Church felt obliged not to turn down such
a good offer, and, as they were also anxious to "save St. Paul's",
sent 'home' an appeal to England for funds. Kohlakoana gave
the option to buy on September 10th, 1910 and this was accepted
on November 15th of the same year, a great part of the purchase
money coming from the U.K..

Loultrie comments that apart from "saving St. Paul's", the
purchase fulfilled another "shadowy hope" -

This was that the purchase of this farm might eventually
do far more than save the mission of St. Paul's. It
might develop into a revenue producing investment and
thereby form an endowment for the whole parish (Loultrie).

The parish at the time comprised St. Stephen's in Katatiele
town and two 'Native' churches - St. Paul's and St. Columbus.
Loultrie takes pains to point out that the revenue from
Wallace Farm was always distributed fairly in the interests
of both European and Native.
The farm turned out to be the lucrative investment that had been hoped for. The land was let out in plots of 1 morgen each at an initial rate of 20/- per annum, which by 1940 had risen to 25/- per annum. By the late 1950's, 295 people were hiring arable and grazing lands on the farm for approximately £2 per plot. Twenty six of these were classified as 'Big Owners' who paid £4 or more and 'owned' therefore three or more lands; 86 paid between £2 and £4 and therefore 'owned' more than one land but less than 3 lands; and the remaining 163 were referred to as 'Small Owners' who paid under £2 for the 'normal land' (Wallace Farm Correspondence no. 1. Hereafter referred to as WFC).

Informants in the village recalled that only three families were actually living on the farm at this time. They were employed as Rangers whose duties entailed looking after the farm fences, collecting the rent for the fields and liaising between Church and tenants. The majority of the lessees were resident in the neighbouring village of Ramohlaakoana while the remaining few lived more further afield. This picture is confirmed by the farm correspondence:

Hitherto S. Paul's Mission Station has been isolated by the very fact that it has been in the centre of a farm on which there are no African residents to speak of (WFC no. 7).

The situation began to change in 1958 when the South African Native Trust approached Archdeacon Knight, the current head of the parish, with an offer to buy Wallace Farm, which was situated in a released area. In terms of the 1936 Land and Trust Act, the South African Native Trust had been empowered to expropriate farms if owners were (or are) unwilling to negotiate. The Church was regarded as being a 'White' institution and thus Wallace Farm constituted a White spot in a Black area (WFC no. 5). A rather puzzling factor is that the correspondence from the Magistrate's office to Archdeacon Knight refers to the removal of 'Black' spots in the Ongeluksnek Valley, which was itself proclaimed a released area.

Negotiations between the South African Native Trust and the
Church were concluded in 1965 and from the correspondence appear to have been fraught with some difficulties. The major problems were that the Church was determined to retain ownership of the 50 acres of land comprising the mission and its grounds; and that the lessees were voicing strong opposition to the sale for fear of losing their fields when the Trust gained ownership.

There was strong feeling amongst landholders and people in Ramohlakoana that if the Trust did acquire the land it should do so for the use of the people in Ramohlakoana's location. Reverend Lantshongoa, who was also a participant in the debate, called the Church's attention to the overcrowded conditions in Ramohlakoana and to the role that Ramohlakoana himself had played in the establishment of the mission (WFC no. 11). Archdeacon Knight vigorously supported these claims and repeatedly sought assurances that Wallace Farm would become an extension of Ramohlakoana's location.

As a result of the Church's stalwart position, both of these problems were eventually resolved. In May 1960, at the public meeting of Wallace Farm landholders, Kr. S.J. Parsons, Magistrate of Matatiele, gave the assurance that:

The intention of my Department is that when the property has been acquired it should become again an integral part of the Ramohlakoana location and its occupation or settlement or use will be planned on that basis along with the location (WFC no. 17).

Just over a year later, in July 1961, the Bantu Affairs Commissioner guaranteed that the Church would retain ownership of the buildings at St. Paul's as well as permission to continue its activities at the mission. However, the Trust insisted on acquiring title to the land upon which the mission is sited. In 1965, the deal was finally concluded, Wallace Farm was sold to the Trust for R61 399 and St. Paul's site for R1 554 (WFC no. 44, 45).

ST. PAUL'S AND LETTERJERT

The majority of St. Paul's residents were moved from
Ramohlakoana in 1969-70, the area that they had been living in became a grazing camp. In June - July 1982, the village comprised a total of 174 households, and of these a question schedule was administered to a random sample of 28. This sample accounted for a de facto population of 164 and a de jure figure of 216. Included in the de jure category are migrant workers, children at boarding school and all absentees classified as household members by interviewees. (In so doing I have endeavoured to use the terms 'de jure' and de facto in the same sense as does Murray, 1981). On the basis of these figures the average de jure household size is 7.7 people and the estimated de jure village population is 1,386.

Naturally St. Paul's has been subjected to 'betterment', for in terms of a proclamation issued in 1944, 'betterment' is automatic and compulsory on all Trust farms (Yawitch, 1981: 14). 'Betterment' is the term used to refer to the 'rationalisation' policy aimed at halting and reversing the deterioration of land in the 'Bantustans'. One of the policy's major concerns is to restrict overstocking which is viewed by officialdom as being a result of African traditionalism; it also seeks to centralise and consolidate residential areas within the 'Bantustans'. The latter measure often involves moving people and apportioning them a standardised land block. Yawitch (1981) comments that 'betterment' almost invariably leads to stock loss and/or land loss and that: "...every part of the reserves experienced some kind of protest and resistance to dispossession of both land and cattle..." (1981: 18). She cites examples where people have been moved repeatedly, each move resulting in further land loss and impoverishment and the ineligibility of non-taxpayers to plots or fields. However, a point that needs to be stressed for its relevance to St. Paul's is that:

...in terms of the new dispensation created by betterment, it is the poor, or when speaking about the reserves, the poorest sections of the population, who fare worst (1981: 49)

It seems to have been the case in St. Paul's that only taxpayers were eligible for sites and fields and that those without material resources remained equally or more impoverished after their move to the village. Fortunately though, the
move to the village was not characterised by the misery
described in many of Yawitch's Examples. Everyone that I
spoke to said that they were happy to be in St. Paul's, the
most frequent reasons given being the good harvests and good
grazing. For those who had moved from Ramohlakoana (these
comprised the great majority of villagers) resettlement meant
an escape from damp and overcrowded conditions. Some informants
said that they had had the choice of moving to another part
of Ramohlakoana or of moving to St. Paul's and made it quite
clear that they had chosen the latter. One such woman referred
to the fighting and unrest in crowded Ramohlakoana and felt
that St. Paul's was a much healthier environment for bringing
up children; another recalled how her house had not only
been damp but used to be flooded nearly every year. These
were recurrent themes in the interviews.

It appears that the good harvests in the village attracted
some outsiders as well. Two families interviewed moved to
St. Paul's in the hope of getting a field: neither had
succeeded, although they had managed to get sites. They
were, however, of the firm opinion that the move had been
beneficial for them - one family was involved in sharecropping
while the other claimed that: "some people here have fields
and they can help us".

The fact that St. Paul's is a 'betterment' village is visibly
obvious in the way it is laid out - there are three distinct
portions - the cattle grazing areas, arable land divided into
fields and the residential area divided into square blocks;
As one informant put it:

The Trust ordered us to put our houses in lines,
the demonstrators came and put the streets in
lines and made sites back to back, this was so
that toilets could be far from houses.

Despite the supposed standardisation that the 'betterment'
scheme implies, many people in the village have got a better
deal than others. The size for residential sites is 46m X 46m
(Dept. of Agriculture and Forestry, Lalutie), but it appeared
that some people's sites were far larger than others. Also
sites situated at the end of the village furthest from the
road tended to be very rocky and of little use for cultivation
as gardens. According to land reclamation plans for the area (no. 4982/564) drawn up in 1966, the size of fields is 5 morgen (4.28 ha.). Here again there was reference made to some people's fields being larger and of better quality than others. In practical terms it is very difficult to prove or refute these claims, but the stories of how people came to be allocated fields and sites often amounted to tales of bribery and deceit.

The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951, is the legislation used to employ chiefs to implement 'betterment' strategy. As salaried civil servants they can be hired or fired by the government and so the security of their office depends on how well they are seen to be doing their job. In the local sphere they wield a considerable amount of influence - "Chiefs and headman have the power to allocate the most precious commodity in the average Transkeians life: land" (Streek & Wicksteed, 1984:18).

Koliko succeeded to the chiefship of Ramohlakoana's location in 1964 and it was he who, according to informants, allocated fields and favoured those who were able to pay bribes of liquor and cash. Many informants also recounted problems that they had had in securing a site in the village. It was claimed that some people who lacked fields had never managed to get sites and were currently living with friends and relatives, whilst recent arrivals had obtained sites by paying bribes of up to R80. According to villagers the best fields went to those who could afford the highest bribes, with Koliko letting aspirant landholders 'bid' for their fields but accepting all payments and eventually allocating the field to the person who had paid most. In 1965, a census had been taken in Ramohlakoana and the reason given to those who did not receive a field for want of a 'gift' was that their names had not appeared on the census. Deborah James refers most aptly to this sort of local government as being "subtly oppressive" (James, 1983: 32).

Koliko has since died and the Transkei was granted 'independence' by the South African government in 1976. However the existing
structures of government, salaried chiefs and tribal authorities have been maintained. St. Paul's now falls under the jurisdiction of the Magistrate's office at Maluti and the tribal authority at Ramohlaloana. The chieftainess at Ramohlaloana is assisted by two literate advisers who appear to handle all the administrative duties of the post including approving the appointment of a headman in St. Paul's. From the accounts of informants it would appear that officials on every rung of the administration from agricultural demonstrators up to those in the Magistrate's office are prepared to accept 'gifts' in return for services rendered. To what degree this has increased (if at all) since independence would be difficult to ascertain. It was apparent, however, that these practices are being carried out on a wide scale and constitute a major problem for villagers, especially those with limited resources (cf. Sharp, 1982). The following example illustrates the nature of the problem and highlights the general trend - that those with material resources often become more affluent with relative ease, while the 'have-nots' are the most vulnerable and the most likely to remain without material resources.

In 1979, a businessman in the village allegedly bribed the late chief Koliko and the demonstrators in order to get a residential site. As a result a woman was moved off her plot, which she was told was a business site. The businessman was also reputed to have been able to obtain a licence even though previous applicants had failed. In 1981, the same man is said to have 'persuaded' the St. Paul's headman and the demonstrators to dispossess an orphan of his site. This indeed occurred, but others in the official hierarchy who had not been consulted reported the matter to the Magistrate's offices. However, the businessman was said to have seen the Magistrate before the complainants, and the case has not been heard of since. My informant commented that the greatest part of the businessman's initial cash outlay had been spent on bribes. So although plots of land and fields are theoretically free to tax-paying villagers, people have to pay highly for land, often having to make several payments to officials ranging from the Headman to the Magistrate.
The Transkei is considered by some to be the least offensive of the 'homelands' in that historically it is the least fragmented and has not been subject to resettlement upheaval to the same extent as any of the other 'homelands'. Against this background we have village like St. Paul's which, it has been established, is exceptional in a number of ways, primarily in its land fertility. So could we justifiably suggest that this village is an example of a 'betterment' scheme that has been totally successful? If by success we assumed that the village community attains self-sufficiency through individual farming activities, the answer would have to be a definite 'no'. As mentioned earlier, a wide degree of differentiation was observed and although poverty of the level reported in, for example Qwa Qwa (cf. Sharp, 1982) was not evident, there were many families who were only just surviving. However, even the most prosperous families could not survive on their agricultural produce alone.

There appears to be one key factor that divides the 'haves' from the 'have-nots', and that is access to a cash income. Both Murray (1981) and Spiegel (1979) have discussed at length the importance of a cash income for the success of small scale cultivation at village level in Lesotho. Similar factors are evident in St. Paul's. However, I would like to stress that although land alone is not sufficient for securing a family's livelihood, a cash income is. For there are residents of St. Paul's who do have access to land but as a result of lack of other material resources are unable to cultivate their fields or gardens. Conversely, there are villagers without fields but with resources in the form of cash or invested cash (eg. a tractor or oxen) who are able to engage in fairly lucrative sharecropping arrangements. So those with both land and a cash income are clearly in the best relative position.

Table I below shows the amount of maize grain that each household in my sample acquired through agricultural activities. The measurements are in bags and one bag is equivalent to approximately 80kg; produce from the gardens is usually eaten when fresh and is thus very difficult to quantify. Cattle have been included because they are not only
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household number</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Yield from field in wagons of hemp</th>
<th>Garden</th>
<th>Garden cultivated</th>
<th>Sharecrop on own field</th>
<th>Sharecrop on others' field, yield paid-out</th>
<th>Grain paid out for services rendered</th>
<th>Grain acquired for services rendered</th>
<th>Total yield in household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1½</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1 bag = 80kg
an important source of food, but also good indicators of material wealth. Thus, households 6, 7, 27 have the largest cattle herds and it can be noted from the table that 6 and 7 also have the highest grain yields. Household 27 does not have a field but is one of the wealthiest in the village. Mr. Z. a South African Railways pensioner arrived in St. Paul's with his family in 1974 having previously lived on another Trust farm in the district. In 1978 he acquired his own site after allegedly having to pay koliko R200, 5 sheep and a bottle of brandy. In addition to his 50 cattle, he also owns 6 goats, 2 horses, another 7 goats that are out on loan for R40 each, as well as agricultural equipment like a cultivator and a thresher. The ploughing and harvesting seasons are therefore very lucrative periods for the Z. family, as oxen and equipment are hired out to fellow villagers. Mr. Z. spent all his working life with the railways and receives a "very good" pension (he would not reveal the amount) and his farm labour son has been instructed not to send money home but to put it in the bank as the family is doing well at home.

In contrast, households 13, 18, 22 each have a field, but little or no cash income means that subsistence itself is a constant struggle. For example, Mrs. J. in household 22 is a widow with 7 children of school-going age, fortunately 5 of her children are able to live with her sister-in-law in Ramohlakoana. In the 1980/1 season she had to pay out R35 for tractor hire as well as one bag of maize to the woman who helped her with weeding and harvesting. Her cash income is derived from the sale of her handwork - reed mats and brooms - and occasional piecework like washing and plastering floors. She is lucky, however, that relatives and friends in the village are in a position to help her with gifts of food and offers of piece jobs.

On the basis of the figures given in table I, the average de facto household size for the sample is 5,8 while the average grain total is 6,4 bags (although the average yield per field amongst those who cultivated is 11 bags). It is interesting to note the 1955 Tomlinson Commission recommendations for agricultural development in this area. The Commission
estimated the average grain yield per morgen to be 5 bags and proposed that for farming to be economically viable, a family should have 6 morgen of ploughland and 10 head of cattle (U.G. 61/1955: 115). This would provide a surplus over and above their calculated minimum dietary requirement of 15 bags per family of 6 per annum (U.G. 61/1955: 84, 114). Whilst acknowledging the dangers and shortcomings of attempting to quantify dietary requirements, these and the following figures provide interesting comparisons. Colin Murray (1981), in illustrating the variation in estimated grain consumption needs in Lesotho uses the following examples:

a) a Basutoland Government official estimate that a family of five persons requires 20 bags of grain per annum to meet subsistence requirements

b) a recent estimate by a project evaluation team that the average de facto household of 4,4 persons in Lesotho requires 14 bags of grain per annum to meet its energy requirements

c) my own estimate that the average de facto household of 4,4 persons in rural Lesotho requires 7 bags of grain per annum to meet that proportion of its calorie requirements that can properly be met by the consumption of maize meal, according to a localized FAO construction of the dietary requirements of the 'reference' man

(Murray, 1981: 200)

Adjusting these figures to St. Paul's averages and those collected by Spiegel in a neighbouring 'betterment' village, we can make the following comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>de facto household size</th>
<th>average no. of bags of grain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tomlinson estimate</td>
<td>(6) 5,8</td>
<td>(15) 14,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate a)</td>
<td>(5) 5,8</td>
<td>(20) 23,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate b)</td>
<td>(4,4) 5,8</td>
<td>(14) 18,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimate c)</td>
<td>(4,4) 5,8</td>
<td>(7) 9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Paul's *</td>
<td>5,3</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other 'betterment' village *</td>
<td>(5,6) 5,8</td>
<td>(4,1) 4,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1980/1 season

The figures in brackets are the actual household size and actual number of bags of grain.
In St. Paul's, therefore, rain production falls short of all three estimates but is slightly higher than that of the other "betterment" village. Only the exceptional few can meet the bulk of their dietary requirements through cultivation and even this accomplishment is usually contingent upon a cash income to meet the costs of ploughing, planting and harvesting as well as the purchase of consumer goods especially during the cut of season period. Despite the fact St. Paul's is situated on very fertile soil nobody in the sample could equal the Tomlinson Commission figure of 5 bags of grain per morgen.

Although the case material below and that discussed so far may appear to provide only extreme examples, the aim in focusing on differentiation is to stress that poverty in the South African rural periphery (or anywhere else) is not a uniform state. Pockets of wealth can exist in generally depressed and impoverished areas - St. Paul's is an example of that. In the village relative prosperity and deprivation are found side by side and the well worn maxim that the rich get richer while the poor become poorer certainly holds true.

Take for example the case of Mr. and Mrs. R., who are members of household 6. The couple have two unmarried daughters who between them have produced ten children, seven of whom have survived. The family lives in a homestead comprising two thatched mud houses and one brick tin-roofed house. Two family members are engaged in migrant labour and between them send home regular cash remittances of R50 per month.

The family's cash income of R50 per month seems to have been underestimated by Mrs. R. in view of the fact that she said she spends an average of R80 per month on food alone. Whatever their cash income really is, they do have a sizeable investment in the form of 18 head of cattle and two horses (besides raising a large number of chickens).

The R's have a field and site, the field in St. Paul's being much larger than the one they had in Kaahlenaana, from where they moved in 1970. Mrs. R. did not have to spend any cash.
during the 1960/1 season for cultivating her field. Both ploughing and planting operations were carried out with the R.'s own oxen, and seed saved from the previous year's crop was used. No fertiliser was used. The field was planted with maize, beans and pumpkin and produced a yield of 19 bags of maize, 3 bags of beans and scores of pumpkin. In the garden, potatoes, pumpkin, cabbage, beetroot, peas and carrots were planted. These provided a plentiful supply of green vegetables during summer. Like most families in St. Paul's, the R.'s also eat a selection of wild vegetables, some of which are seasonal, while others are available all year round. The children also catch fish and rabbits for themselves, the adults not being too partial to "wild things".

In winter the greatest part of the family's food intake is purchased at the store. Mrs. R. buys most of this food at a shop in a nearby village where she has an account. She also occasionally shops at supermarkets in Matatiele (South Africa) and is thus able to take advantage of the savings that this affords. For local shopping the grandchildren use horses for transport and Mrs. R. finds it worth her while to spend 90c on the return bus fare to shop in Matatiele (S.A.).

The R.'s were one of the families who chose to come to St. Paul's instead of staying in Ramohlakoana. They believe this was the right move as they now have a bigger and better field and reap an even better harvest than they did before. They feel that they have enough to eat and regard themselves as being amongst the most prosperous stratum of St. Paul's society. They have several significant factors in their favour - they came to St. Paul's with extensive resources in the form of cattle and a steady cash income and so had no difficulty in securing a large, fertile field and garden. Cattle are valuable, not only in cultivating one's own field, but like tractors may be hired out to make money for their owners; unlike tractors, however, cattle provide a self-renewing investment, they do not break-down or require expensive spare parts or fuel (grazing is freely available to villagers) and they reproduce themselves without expense to their owners, except for labour expended in herding.
This brings us back to Yawitch's point cited earlier - that in the course of resettlement it is usually those with least resources to start with who fare worst.

For in the process of restructuring the principle was firmly entrenched that while those who had access to some resources would end up with less, those who had nothing or minimal resources to begin with, would be plunged into a downward spiral of ever-increasing impoverishment (Yawitch, 1981: 50).

As a result of a combination of fortuitous circumstances that I have tried to outline above, the first part of Yawitch's assertion does not hold true in St. Paul's - those with access to resources, like the R.'s, have fared very well in the village.

However, the following case illustrates the striking relevance of the second assertion. Mrs. H.K. was separated from her husband "a long time ago", she is about 62 years old and lives with her two surviving children, a son of 32 years and a daughter of 28. She has born another seven children all of whom died in infancy. Her son suffers from T.B. and has been admitted to the Katatiele T.B. hospital (SANTA) at various times over the past years; he has never been fit enough to seek employment. Her daughter is mentally handicapped and spent some time in a hospital for the mentally disturbed in Umzimkulu; she, like her brother, has never been employed.

Mrs. H.K. was born in Lesotho but moved to Ramohlakoana's location when she married in the 1940's. She moved to St. Paul's in 1970 with her two children and said that she had been given a site and field by her sister-in-law. According to Mrs. H.K., her sister-in-law had rights to property in Hardenberg (a ward in Ramohlakoana's location) where she moved with her husband and family. In 1980, Chief Moliko reallocated the field to a resident of Ramohlakoana. The reason given was that the field did not officially belong to Mrs. H.K. and also that she was not utilising the field to its full potential. Mrs. H.K. asserts that Moliko was 'persuaded' with the aid of a bribe to expropriate her field. The family did retain the house and garden.

I was not allowed to go inside Mrs. H.K.'s house as she was
ashamed of the interior, instead we sat outside in her large unfenced garden. Upon enquiring why she did not grow anything in her garden, the response was that she had no money to build a fence, and to plant anything in an unfenced garden is a useless labour as any produce will be eaten by animals.

The M.K.'s existence appears to be one of 'hand-to-mouth' survival. All three have applied for pensions, the two children both qualifying for disability pensions. But although they re-applied in May 1982, they have still not received anything. (Problems in getting pensions are not unique but are a common feature of life in the 'Bantustans'.

The situation in the Transkei has been exacerbated by the creation of a separate bureaucracy since 'independence' (cf. Maré, 1981; James, 1983).

Mrs. M.K. says that she occasionally gets a 'piece-job' and then buys some mealie meal and potatoes from the local store. They also receive gifts of mealie meal from neighbours from time to time. There is a dam situated between the village and the fields from which they catch fish in summer. A large portion of their diet comprises a selection of wild vegetables, in addition they supplement their diet by catching fieldmice - an activity usually associated with young boys and regarded with disdain by adults.

According to neighbours, Mrs. M.K. has gradually sold off most of her possessions over the last two years (since the loss of her field). She and her son are reputed to have spent most of this cash on drink and they are often to be found in an inebriated state. The only valuable property that the family appears to possess is one cow, one calf, one piglet and three chickens. Mrs. M.K. is reluctant to sell the cattle as she says she will soon be dead and she wants to be able to leave her two 'helpless' children something of value. When asked why she did not sell the cow and use the money to build a fence and establish a food producing garden, she just repeated that she wanted to keep the cow for her children.
Mrs. H.H. believes that she and her family are the poorest in the village. Other people have food, she says, "because they are harvesting, we have nothing, we are starving". If she had money, she added, she would buy food - mealie meal, vegetables, tea and sugar. When asked again about spending money on a fence, Mrs. H.H. said her first priority would be to buy food. A neighbour later commented that she would probably buy drink and also observed that the H.H.'s spend most of their time sleeping and did not take advantage of work offers to assist with harvesting in return for maize (a common practice in the village). Mrs. H.H. said that she had not heard that work was available.

The family's lack of material resources (land, labour and cash), with the accompanying demoralisation, has brought them to a position where alcohol provides the only comfort. They regard themselves as being the poorest inhabitants in the village and are viewed with a mixture of pity and contempt by their neighbours.

The fact that they have a potential garden is meaningless because their access to even this small piece of land is blocked by what have become insurmountable problems for the family. They have no cash income to buy the necessary equipment, but more importantly, appear to be too depressed physically, mentally and emotionally to extricate themselves from their situation. The H.H.'s survival is largely contingent on the goodwill of others and also on the abundance of the environment which provides a range of 'free' foodstuffs, the acquisition of which requires only a desultory expenditure of labour.

However, as has been demonstrated time and again (Murray, 1981; Spiegel, 1979 et al) access to land is not the be all and end all; cash or good capital investments (eg, cattle, tractors), are of vital importance in attaining agricultural success. After all the H.H.'s did have a field for a time, and the allegations that they were not utilising it fully were probably well founded. With no cash input, and in this case very limited labour resources, the cultivation of a field is difficult to say the least.
Mrs. M.N.'s case (household 15) illustrates this point. She is a 58 year-old widow, mother of five surviving children (one child died in infancy) and grandmother of three. Her three sons and one of her daughters-in-law are engaged in wage labour in South African industrial centres. At the time of fieldwork there were six people residing in Mrs. M.N.'s homestead. Of the four family members in wage employment, two were sending home remittances, amounting to approximately R45 per month.

Mrs. M.N. was born in Lesotho and moved to Ramohlahoana when she married. There the family had one field, but no garden. When she moved to St. Paul's in 1970 she was allocated a site with ground large enough for a garden, but no field. Despite this Mrs. M.N. is able to engage in cultivating activities through a sharecropping arrangement. The field is in St. Paul's although the owner lives in another village in the district.

In the season 1960/1, Mrs. M.N. paid R45 in tractor hire for ploughing and supplied all the seed for planting. Her partner's oxen and planter were used for sowing the seed. Maize, beans and pumpkin were planted and produced a yield of 14 bags of maize, 2 tins of beans (6 tins = 1 bag) and "many pumpkins". This harvest was shared in equal proportions. In addition Mrs. M.N. planted maize, beans, pumpkins and turnips in her garden which she said produced a good crop and were all eaten fresh.

Mrs. M.N. indicated that a large part of her family's dietary intake is provided by her own agricultural activities. She has an ample egg supply from her 17 chickens (her only livestock) and she collects wild vegetables. However, a substantial part of the family's diet is purchased at the village store where she has an account and estimates her monthly expenditure at R25.

Although she moved from Ramohlahoana as part of the 'betterment' scheme, Mrs. M.N. had the choice of St. Paul's or another part of Ramohlahoana. She chose St. Paul's because of the "good harvest", but feels she was better off in Ramohlahoana where she had a field.
Mrs. J.N. is an example of someone who is utilising limited resources to the full. The fact that she has a reliable cash income enables her to engage in agriculture through a sharecropping arrangement and to make regular purchases at the local store. Her position is a very precarious one though; it is very probable that in a few years her sons will have established families and households of their own and will cease sending money home to their mother. This will place her in the position of those, who as she put it, "have no money and no harvest".

CONCLUSION

It is necessary to see the case material in its geographical context; St. Paul's village is situated in a relatively prosperous and extremely fertile area. Many families owe their survival to the fact that they live in a village where their neighbours can afford to help support them and where their environment supplies them with a range of 'free' goods. All residents of the village benefit from the fertility of the soil as well as the abundance of wild vegetables, wild animals (such as rabbits, small buck and fieldmice), fish and fuel that are free for the taking. In addition, the recent history of land allocation illustrates the important role that the Anglican Church played in insisting that Wallace Farm become an extension of Ramohlakoana's location thus preventing mass resettlement there of people removed from "Black spots".

This paper has attempted to show that poverty is not uniform condition affecting everyone in the same way in the South African rural periphery. St. Paul's is an example of such differentiation in providing relatively abundant resources to its inhabitants. However, participant observation in the village reveals a wide variation between those who are relatively prosperous and those who are barely surviving. Access to land is not the most crucial factor dividing the rich from the poor, but rather access to a reliable cash income. For money can buy access to land - be it through bribery or participation in sharecropping activities - and is also necessary in achieving success in any agricultural venture. It is
significant that even the most productive villagers cannot meet their subsistence requirements through farming alone and have to supplement their diet with purchases of consumer goods. This points to the fact that the size of fields, even in the fertile area, is not sufficiently large to support economically viable farming activities. With growing population pressure in Ranchlakoana it is unlikely that the size of fields will do anything other than decrease, making the need for cash and therefore wage employment more and more urgent. With economic depression and growing structural unemployment, the future, even for St. Paul's villagers, looks fairly bleak.
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