

African Renaissance

ISSN: 1744-2532 (Print) ISSN: 2516-5305 (Online)

Indexed by: SCOPUS, IBSS, EBSCO, COPERNICUS, ProQuest,
J-Gate and Sabinet

Vol. 19, (No. 1), March 2022
pp 311-331

Causal Linkages between Communal Tenure and Food Security: A Case of Vhembe District, South Africa

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31920/2516-5305/2022/19n1a15>

Mawere J* & Matshidze P

*Centre for African Studies, Human and Social Sciences
University of Venda, Private Bag
X5050, Thohoyandou
South Africa
Email: joshuamawerem@gmail.com*

Kugara S.L

*Department of Cultural Studies and Political Studies,
Human and Social Sciences,
University of Limpopo, Private Bag x1106, Sovenga, 0727
South Africa*

Madzivhandila T.S

*Developmental, Capable and Ethical State (DCES)
Human Sciences Research Council
South Africa
Email: TMadzivhandila@hsrc.ac.za*

Abstract

The need to establish the causal link between communal tenure and food security is progressively gaining currency as governments and development organisations refocus their exertion towards helping indigenous peoples to move away from subsistence farming to commercial farming. Many scholars contend that food security and poverty reduction cannot be accomplished except issues of access to land, security of tenure and the ability to use land

profitably and sustainably are tended to. This study was conducted in Vhembe district, where communal tenure and agrarian practices still prevail. The paper established how communal tenures can contribute to food security in the Vhembe district, South Africa. The paper employed the qualitative methodology, and data were collected through semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions. Despite the fact that the findings highlight a lack of security of tenure, it is astonishing that a majority of the participants felt secure and contended that communal tenure was effective in ensuring food security. The paper recommends secure customary tenure to improve food security.

Keywords: *Food Security, Communal Tenure, Indigenous Peoples, Tenure Security, Poverty, Land*

1. Introduction

During the precolonial epoch, land affairs were governed under customary tenure. Cousins (2008:111) described the customary tenure system as a “system of complimentary interest held together simultaneously”. He further averred that “the system of tenure was both communal and individual” (Cousins, 2008: 109). The concept of ‘ownership’ was limited. Customary law in property was more concerned with individuals’ commitments to one another in regard to property than with the rights of individuals to property. The system valued the relationships between people over a distinct individual’s entitlement to attest his right to property.

A good analysis of the colonial rule shows that it condemned indigenous knowledge systems (IKSs) and the customary law system. Colonial rulers replaced the customary tenure system with Roman-Dutch law, which is embedded in the concept of ownership (Cousins, 2008). The introduction of the Roman-Dutch law, termed common law, hindered the development of IKS and effectively replaced indigenous laws (Bennet, 2004). The vocabulary introduced by common law made it troublesome, if not difficult, to decipher customary law land tenure (Bennet, 2004). It is based on this misconception or intellectual error that customary tenure is judged. Consequently, from the Eurocentric perspective, customary tenure has and continues to be viewed as insecure and incompatible with sustainable development.

Despite the perceived view, majority of indigenous black South Africans still reside in former homelands and Bantustans, now termed communal areas. As a result of their experiences, these people continue to hold insecure tenure rights either individually or communally and

these rights are in most cases informal and unregistered. As is normally the case, these land rights hold a subordinate legal and economic status with the title vesting paternalistically in the state. Furthermore, most of these people continue to live in extreme poverty. Their living conditions have deteriorated, and they continue to struggle for survival with insufficient access to sanitation, health, education and food.

With the dawn of democracy, the government implemented an ambitious land reform programme. The programme included a land redistribution programme which was aimed at expanding access to land among the indigenous blacks a land compensation program to re-establish land or remuneration to those dispossessed because of the oppressive laws from 1913, and a tenure reform programme to protect the rights of people living under insecure tenure (Constitution, 1996), including people living on communal land owned by the state or farm workers or dwellers. Section 25 (6) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996 provides:

A person or community whose tenure of land is legally insecure as a result of past racially discriminatory laws or practices is entitled, to the extent provided by an Act of Parliament, either to tenure which is legally secure or to comparable redress.

Section 25 (9) subsequently mandates the government to legislate law(s) to provide for tenure security. It provides that “Parliament must enact the legislation referred to in subsection (6)”. During the colonial and apartheid era, communal people endured insecure tenure, and this negatively impacted their development. The government’s objective was and still is to secure previously insecure rights to land for black South Africans, in law and in practice. Furthermore, the government endeavours to offer viable tenure options to those occupying restored and redistributed land. However, progress in this regard remains sporadic and minimal. Rural people still endure insecure tenure up to this present day.

As a result, land-use regulations and planning frameworks inherited from the colonial past have served as ideological tools for preserving unequal land distribution and inequitable tenure security. Consequently, despite the fact that South Africa is viewed as a food secure country, most South Africans remain food insecure at the local level, particularly in rural areas (Labadarios et al. 2011: 891; Pereira, 2014: 339). Empirical investigations have affirmed that numerous South Africans are still food

insecure, tormented by poverty and unemployment despite the economic and political developments that have been made (Altman, Hart, Jacobs, 2009: 345; Labadarios et al, 2011: 891; Pereira, 2014).

Communal black resource-poor farmers' ability to meet daily household needs is determined by how well they manage and supplement a restricted and delicately balanced collection of resources: crops, pasture, and forest (Pereira, 2014). Without land and secure tenure, communal landholders cannot obtain credit, financing or membership in agricultural organizations, particularly those involved in processing and marketing (Mpandeli & Maponya, 2014). If communal landholders have secure tenure, they can invest in the land's productive potential, rather than exploit it. Furthermore, they are more likely to use environmentally sustainable farming practices. They can plan and adjust resource allocation decisions swiftly in response to changing climate or economic situations, and they can rely on the productive outcomes of their labor (Pereira, 2014). Security of tenure is frequently the key to having control over significant decisions like what crop to cultivate, what techniques to utilize, and what to consume and sell (Pereira, 2014). Given communal landholders' preference for growing food rather than cash crops and spending income on family food, tenure security must be considered a critical link in the chain connecting household food production to national food security (Groenmeyer, 2013). In that regard, this article aims to establish how the communal tenure system can contribute to a food-secure South Africa.

2. Literature review and theoretical framework

This section is divided into two: literature review and theoretical framework.

2.1 Critical appreciative approach

Griffin (2017:17) defines a theory as critical insofar as it seeks "to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them". According to Allen (2016:23):

The critical theory is a type of social theory oriented towards critiquing and changing society, in contrast to traditional theory oriented only to understanding or explaining a phenomenon.

A commonly held view is that communal tenure ceaselessly brings about stagnation of production, insufficiency of resource dispersion and oppression of the peasantry (Mothae, 2017 & Ngqulana, 2018). In this regard, this article intends to critically analyse the veracity of the commonly held view by gathering information from the people who live and practice customary tenure. By grounding the article under this theory, the authors contend that communal tenure, despite the onslaught, is a sufficient tool to bring about food security, production and economic emancipation.

2.2 Literature Review

This section will review literature on the following:

2.2.1 Communal Tenure Landholding Rights

In South Africa, various interested parties have expansively discussed the significance and place of communal tenure as an apparatus for food security in a democracy (Thamaga-Chitja, Kolanisi & Murugani, 2010). At the centre of the discussion of the significance and place of communal tenure is the idea predicated on the speculation that communal tenure is insufficient a tool to realise any meaningful rural development, consequently a danger to food security (Kepe & Tessaro, 2014). The danger is the insufficient support received by inhabitants occupying communal land, which consequently affects food security. South Africa, like most countries topographically situated in the African landmass, has scars and wounds from the long periods of oppression, colonisation and apartheid.

South Africa, as a section of the greater African territory, used to rely on its own Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) during the precolonial age (Kugara, 2017). IKSs in South Africa were used to build up a crucial device to regulate tranquillity, order and concordance for the people and their spiritual and physical being. Europeans censured IKSs and marked Africa, South Africa included as a “dark continent” which requires civilisation (Kugara, 2017 & Mawere, 2020). Communal tenure, as a product of Indigenous Knowledge Systems endured a similar destiny. Communal tenure was vulnerable to outside intervention, as a result of the way that it was imbedded in uncoded value systems and established in religious, social cultural and political antecedents. In most

cases, traditional leaders' systems were reconfigured through indirect rule.

As a result, selected leaders are bound to implement the suzerain laws which discombobulated the set tenure systems and rendered it inferior (Kepe & Tessaro, 2014). Europeans held to inaccurate knowledge of communal tenure. Delius (2014) and Cousins (2008: 111) contend that these supposed misrepresentations were, to some extent, deliberate undertakings by the Europeans to embrace a variant of 'communal tenure' that complemented their interest. The systematic undermining of IKSs, in this context communal tenure, by the Europeans manipulated most people into buying into the viewpoint that indigenous knowledge is irrelevant and evil (Altieri, 2015). Crawl & Paleczny (2018) contended that:

The advent of colonialism resulted in a cultural imperialism that has resulted in IKS suffering for decades from heavy propaganda which elevates Western cultural systems at the expense of local ones, thereby tearing into the social, economic and cultural fabric of local communities.

In that regard, the European system of governance succeeded in labelling communal tenure as insecure (Kynoch, 2016). This misplaced misconception continues to exist in contemporary South Africa (Nevhutanda, 2018), despite the fact that in contemporary South Africa, majority of black South Africans dwell in former homelands and Bantustans now named communal areas. Shackleton and Luckert (2015) stated that around 2.4 million rural households with 12.7 million black people or 32 percent of the populace dwell in communal areas in South Africa. As a result of the historical experiences, black people keep on holding insecure tenure rights either independently or communally and these rights are mostly informal and unregistered (Kugara, 2017).

As is usually the case, these land rights have a lower lawful and societal position with the title vesting paternalistically in the state. In this case, customary tenure is left in the hands of local traditional leaders and those allocated pass it to their descendants through inheritance. However, most people live in extreme poverty. Their everyday environments have disintegrated, and they keep on battling for survival with insufficient access to quality sanitation, health, education and food. We contend that tenure insecurity brings with it both psycho-social and financial dimensions. It elevates the vulnerability of rural people

(Obeng-Odoom & Stilwell, 2013) and hampers gainful investment that can help poor people to improve substantially.

Nonetheless, other scholars contend that tenure security is not fundamental for empowering investment (Asaaga, Hirons & Malhi, 2020; Fenske, 2011). This is because, in spite of the summed-up presumption, building up the connection between tenure security and productivity is impossible. Other scholars further contend that tenure security is just about a person's certainty of the right they hold. This implies that tenure security is all about land administration. De Souza (1993) stated that:

In every human society, challenges or disputes are bound to occur over landownership, but with security, these rights should be protected and enforced. Security is thus about the exercise of one's rights without the fear of unnecessary interference or fear of forceful eviction.

Therefore, it is the core duty of land administration to protect people's legitimate tenure rights and to mediate disputes. Subsequently, a land administration framework that neglects to execute these duties fairly or does this ineffectively, will engender insecure tenures (Aliber et al, 2004). This is whether or not the tenure framework is freehold or communal or whether the administration system is traditional or modern. In that regard, it is pertinent to ascertain how communal tenure can contribute towards food security.

2.2.2 The Status of Food Security in South Africa

Food security has consistently been the core of the South African government's agenda and it was declared a priority in national strategies and projects (Hendriks 2014: 3). Food security is among the key role players in strategies and policies that have helped shape the new South Africa. Nonetheless, Hendriks (2014: 1) averred that the food security issue has been seen and is open to different understanding by various governments throughout the years. The national policy for food and nutrition security in South Africa reiterates the need for policy development. In 2002, the South African cabinet presented the Integrated Food Security Strategy (IFSS) to oversee and organise food security programmes.

These projects face various challenges that need a multidimensional methodology. Several factors, such as globalisation, climate change,

trading agreements, and food storage and distribution represent a risk or challenge to food security. The government accepts that by building up a food security policy will help characterise and measure food security, provide a structure for various methodologies and programmes, and make a platform to comprehend global commitment towards restrictions and parameters (Department of Social Development (DOSD) 2013: 3; Department of Agriculture (DOA) 2011: 1-4).

South Africa is among the 49 sub-Saharan nations tormented by hunger and poverty. Hendriks (2014) pointed out that South Africa is nationally food secure but most rural communities experience food insecurity. One of the reasons for this is the insecure land tenure. According to Jacobs (2009), using 2005 food prices, 80% of households cannot consume a nutritional basket of food amounting to R262 per person in one month.

However, the report indicated that provinces that are mainly rural and with high levels of poverty such as Limpopo (25%), Eastern Cape (20%) and KwaZulu-Natal (20%) had the highest numbers of households that relied on agriculture to supply their own food (Food Security in South Africa, 2017). As per the South African government statistics report (2011), the degree of poverty varies marginally across different provinces. Limpopo province has the most noteworthy occurrence of hunger and poverty at around 63.8%, the Eastern Cape is second with 60.8%, trailed by KwaZulu-Natal with 56.6%. The South African national general family overview (2014) demonstrated that 11.4% of families are vulnerable to hunger.

The significant challenge in South Africa with respect to food security is the absence of formalised structures to assess its impact on government programmes. Hendriks (2014: 3); Labadarios et al. (2011: 891) and Pereira et al. 2014: 339) explained that policy dysfunction in South Africa and an absence of coordination compound the food instability issue. According to Hendriks (2014), 30-50% of the population has inadequate food and consumes an unbalanced diet. As of today, to the extent of the authors' knowledge, South Africa has no concrete and satisfactory measure for food security and no regularised approach to monitor progress or deficiency in that department. As such, there is a need for government palliative programmes saddled with the responsibility to tackle food security.

For a middle-income country with elevated levels of poverty and food insecurity, this ought to be a critical concern. Therefore, to achieve food security, austere policy monitoring and appropriate reporting

frameworks should be developed. According to Hendriks (2014: 4), there are various components that should be thought of, including source of income, access to land, developments in rural areas, retail markets, changing family unit structures, education, health, and nutrition information, water and inputs, to annihilate food security. Besides, for most South Africans, the absence of land to develop food implies that food must be paid for. As much as economic growth is critical to move forward as a nation, household income to guarantee food security is fundamental.

The proportion between taxpayers, unemployment and grant beneficiaries is lopsided. The number of social grant beneficiaries rises each year. There are a lot of people on social grants, thus burdening taxpayers (Chakona & Shackleton, 2019). Grants are inadequate as an exclusive household income, accordingly many families principally reliant on grants will have insufficient money to buy food (Hendriks, 2014: 19; Labadarios et al. 2011: 896; SASSA 2013). South African rural communities are far less developed than its urban areas (Du Toit, 2018). Be that as it may, hunger is pervasive in the two areas albeit on an alternate scale. Hendriks (2014: 4) and Nawrotzki et al. (2014: 290) stated that households with a high percentage of working members have a more grounded food security status. It is estimated that less fortunate households have somewhere in the range of six and seven members, and the food items found in the basic food item pantries are beneath the normal or least prerequisite to achieve or maintain a balanced healthy diet (Labadarios et al. 2011: 891).

Confronted with hunger, families frequently have to embrace drastic changes, reducing their consumption of quality foods. Hendriks (2014: 4) posited that supporting rural farming builds food accessibility as well as the nutritional content of their food. Difficult times compel households to apply for credits to survive. These leave households devastated, impoverished and indebted for a long period of time. In addition, basic essentials, for example, education and health are compromised and become expensive extravagances (Dewbre 2010: 2223). New interventions are fundamental to creating a healthier, food-secure country to guarantee a bright future. A few investigations affirm that families with better family food security status have members with higher levels of education, highlighting the significance of education and its role as a solid defensive factor (Nawrotzki et al. 2014: 290).

A considerable amount of money is invested yearly to ease hunger and poverty by means of food assistance programmes. However, there is

no proof to demonstrate the effect and the viability of such social relief aids (Hendriks, 2014). Most often, these projects are mainly run by non-governmental organisations and are uncoordinated and unoriginal. Moreover, agricultural projects actualised by various government sectors focus on backyard production, which despite everything has no huge and quantifiable global confirmation as far as its effect on nutrition. For any food aid programme to be effective, household food insecurity must be identified (Dewbre 2010: 22-23). Food aid projects might be an ephemeral answer for food security, hunger and poverty, but they are not a long-term answer for improving the lives of food insecure households (Hendriks, 2014: 19). The critical issue is that South African food security is under risk and immersed by a wide scope of difficulties that require huge interventions with different policies and strategies. In that regard, it is pertinent to determine how communal tenure can help mitigate food insecurity at the household level.

3. Methodology

The article used the explorative qualitative approach. Data was gathered through focus group discussions and semi-structured questions. This study was conducted in the Vhembe district of the Limpopo Province, South Africa. The Vhembe district municipality is constituted of four local municipalities—Makhado, Musina, Thulamela and Collins Chavani. This study was conducted in Thulamela municipality. The authors chose Thulamela because this area depicts what the researcher sought to uncover. Participants (2 rural women, 2 rural men, 2 traditional leaders, 2 elderly people, 2 people from the department of rural development and 2 land law experts) were chosen using purposive and snowball sampling. Thematic data analysis was favoured to analyse the data gathered. The themes used were drawn from the conspicuous issues discussed during data collection stage.

4. Findings

The article findings are discussed thematically below;

4.1 Livelihoods and Communal Tenure

The first part of the findings looked at the implications of communal tenure on the livelihoods of rural people in Vhembe district. The

participants who made the case for communal tenure based on economic efficiency and poverty reduction and food security, contended that small holder farming in the rural areas is both proficient and gainful, and this is satisfactory to limit urban and industrialisation biases. The participants' contended that because of the low transaction costs, particularly in acquiring communal land and supervision of subsistence farm work in communal areas, small scale farming brings about more significant yields than large scale capitalist farming on corporate farms. Others introduced an increasingly political case, contending that communal land designation to communal black people is not just proficient, it is also socially just.

The interviewed participants emphasised that communal tenure furnishes communal people with access to land, increment in financial benefit and new surges in income. Besides, the participants indicated that communal land managed by poor individuals will in general utilise more locally sourced input supply and services, thus non-farm income rises. They also opined that the communal tenure system diminishes the profound land disparity in the nation, an angle that hampers development but improves rural livelihoods by giving destitute individuals access to land.

According to participants, the administration ought not be convinced to force the freehold tenure system on communal people since it is not customised to suit African issues and lifestyle. Rather, the government should uphold indigenous ways of land administration. This was said to be significant to improve the livelihoods of rural people, since they are familiar with these systems. Furthermore, the systems respond to their social standing as a previously disadvantaged group. It was contended that a well-modelled and developed communal tenure system would reverse the marginalisation of rural people and place them at the centre in agricultural and development policies.

The interviewed participants further stated that communal tenure urges a delinking from off-farm work, improving the welfare and livelihoods of rural people. They argued that majority of the rural people come from humble beginnings and are generally compelled to offer cheap labour on farms for survival. In any case, with access to communal land, same are in a situation to produce harvest for subsistence and selling. This offers them self-reliance status, thus they become developed and food secure in their own right. The study established that most of the participants expressed positive effects of communal tenure on their personal development and food security,

though there were some who argued to the contrary. These participants indicated that across Africa, a long-term process of development out of agriculture is trending and that investment in subsistence farming installed in communal tenure has less rhyme or reason than supporting exits from agriculture and the growth of alternative livelihoods, including those in rural areas.

These participants opined that communal tenure dependent on the smallholder model of farming makes little sense beyond impermanent welfare relief alleviation, except if joined with an exceptionally generous interest in off-farm enterprise development. The interviewed participants in such manner expressed that foreseeing development and food security under communal tenure is simply a populist dream, that yields no profits, and constantly renders Africans interminably poor. Others contended that emphasis on communal tenure, local markets and the development of community-based agri-food systems presents an alternative, fixated on peasant systems of agribusiness, a framework which never really counter the land and monetary historical injustices. Hence, Africans will ceaselessly and deliberately stay poor and on the outskirts of the economy.

4.2 Investing in Customary Land

The key finding was that there is no established nexus between investment and land tenure. In spite of the considerable claims that communal tenure limits or prevents investment, and poses a danger to food security, the study observed that communal land holders and different investors were putting resources into the said land. Participants reiterated that investment has been huge in their communal areas. This is regardless of the alleged poor tenure security. In such asserted environments, the participants indicated that investment is expected to be disregarded.

It is important to note that investments have been made in clearing the land, in livestock, in farming hardware, in transport and in housing. Issues of tenure security, as opposed to conventional wisdom, do not appear to have sabotaged investment. The authors observed that the investment made by people, and without help from the government or organisations, is considerable, and gives firm establishments for the future. There is in any case, a rare sort of participants who aver that the insecurity that is implanted in communal tenure rights impedes access to

formal credit and investments thus, exacerbates poverty and intensifies food insecurity.

4.3 Challenges Limiting Communal Land Investments and Use

Participants were asked to outline challenges limiting communal land investments and use. This section was pertinent to understand why some community remain underdeveloped and food insecure, if the communal tenure system is not the cause of the lack of investment as stated by the participants. The participants raised several issues, issues they argued hindered effective communal land use and investment. They indicated that fields stay unused in light of the fact that people are too apathetic to even consider going to cultivate the land. The participants blamed the government for creating a dependency syndrome in people. They narrated that people now feel entitled and rely on social grants and demands rather than working their land.

Some participants said that it is not really a matter of being sluggish but instead with people no longer having a similar measure of livestock they once did to do the physical work required and they lack other equipment and tractors to have the option to use the land to its fullest potential. As a result of the colonial trust system, the participants detailed that they cannot sell or lease it to people who may effectively use it. It was reported that communal land is under a trust wherein occupants can just get the right to occupy the land yet have no rights over its disposal. A certain participant said:

Everything that we have counted here in terms of pieces of land that we share as the community, are owned by the state through traditional leaders. We only enjoy rights to use. However, we cannot even lease the property or sell. Therefore, we do not feel incentivised to develop the land.

Extrapolating from the response above, one is tempted to contend that for any development to be effective, there is a need for a more extensive consultation and participation by those communities for whom the development is proposed. Development ought to be people-driven. However, communities are playing an active role in setting their own development agenda as opposed to looking for solutions from the state. In that regard, traditional authorities must play an active role as a sector of local governance to promote development in their areas. That

being said, there is a need to uphold, preserve and develop indigenous knowledge systems that are relevant, applicable and known to the people to attain food security.

Participants detailed the difficulties they had concerning cattle and farming equipment. Notwithstanding the monetary difficulties, a few participants reported that the reason some of the fields were not being fully utilised was because they are located far away from the village. A few participants proposed that another reason behind why land was not being utilised is because *Ubuntu*—sharecropping in this instance—has ceased to exist.

I would prefer not to state that the times are different however I should state that the spirit of Ubuntu does not exist with people any longer.

Nonetheless, another participant pointed out that the practice of share cropping rested on offering something to receive something consequently. He was supportive of a progressively sacrificial method of sharing, including giving and not expecting consequently. He detailed that one way where land could be put to use is in the event that it is given to the people who have the capacity to use it without anticipating payment. Some participants revealed that tending fields and garden plots required physical strength that numerous people did not have anymore. Elderly participants reported that they had gotten increasingly dependent on the assistance of others since they can no longer till the land themselves. They added that money is required to employ additional help with working the land in light of the fact that the youth in the family are not prepared and/or willing to work in the fields.

When solicited to clarify the young person's lack of enthusiasm for farming, the participants revealed that there has been a change in the value that is put in land and its potential for food. They reported further that the young are languid and generally look down on farming activities. They said the youth would like to get jobs in urban areas and purchase food as opposed to producing it, and that even the people who are at home and jobless do not want any part in tending the land. The proposition that youth consider working the land an indication of destitution and something of which one ought to be embarrassed was affirmed by the contribution of one of the more youthful participants, when he was asked some information about his lack of enthusiasm for working in the fields or garden. The young gentleman said:

You get humiliated. For example, you may see your girlfriend strolling past and you won't need her to see you going into the field and getting filthy.

Be that as it may, at other times in the focus group discussions, it appeared that women bore disproportionate responsibility regarding working the land. Notwithstanding the challenges announced, a few participants said that there are individuals who were basically too lazy to even think about cultivating their land and that even with equipment and help, these individuals would not look into working the land. Therefore, laziness, lack of money and resources, lack of interest in farming the land by the youth, desire for formal white-collar jobs and lack of land title were among the major reasons cited that contribute to lack of investment in and use of customary land.

5 Recommendations

Based on the revelations and conclusions made above, we recommend policy propositions to improve the adequacy of communal tenure as a means for food security in Vhembe district, South Africa. The article recommends the following:

5.1.1 The Legal Recognition of Communal Tenure

The article recommends the legal recognition of the communal tenure system. Communal land holders ought to be given communal land allocation certificates. These certificates should serve to demonstrate possession and use rights on the land and should convey similar status with title deeds issued in the deeds registry office. To guarantee accountability and transparency, all allotments ought to be registered and a registry that is accessible nationwide is principal. This will expand their food security, as landholders may lease, mortgage and additionally unreservedly develop and invest in the land without fear of state appropriation.

5.1.2 Communal Land Committee

The article recommends replacing traditional leaders with an impartial and independent committee to administer and allocate land. The committee guarantees transparency, accountability, due diligence and

democracy. All communal land applications ought to be submitted to this committee. The recommendation endeavours to curb corruption and abuse of power by traditional leaders for personal gain. Also, the committee would bring a perceived leverage and aptitude to guarantee that each land allocation yields positive outcomes to develop the community concerned, in this way ensuring food security.

5.1.3 Promoting Co-Existence and Partnership between Traditional Authorities and Government Structures

The article recommends coordinated effort and concurrence between traditional authorities, community members and government structures. This implies governance must be moulded by humanism. It must be people centred. Traditional leaders as custodians of communal land have a sacred and lawful command to create and protect customary law practices and customs. In a similar vein, government structures have an established duty to support and build up the communities. The two organisations have distinctive but interconnected and mutually dependent functions. Governance should be transformed to incorporate and integrate both institutions at a local level to promote rural development and food security.

5.1.4 Actualising Small Holder-Oriented Farming

The article recommends the actualising of small holder-oriented farming because solutions to communal tenure must be framed by their impact on South Africa's food security. Small holder-oriented farming must be actualised as it is monetarily conceivable and can develop the indigenous aptitudes and knowledge that smallholder landowners as of now have. Long-term planning is essential to keep up a strategic distance from disrupted and disorganised settlement, which subverts the presence of natural and environmental resources. Taking everything into account, there is a need for an adjustment in context that is shaped by the rebuilding of non-capitalist forms of peasant production and which does not give up to the necessities of globalised capitalism.

5.1.5 Financial Support and Workshops

The article recommends preparing workshops on both commercial and subsistence farming at all levels for rural development structures,

particularly for government officials who are directly involved in the design, application and development of rural development projects. The government ought to introduce financial and educational projects to capacitate communal people who intend to venture into commercial farming. In any case, in regards to the financial aid, it is recommended that the government buys the necessary items under an agricultural command program then forward them to the aspiring commercial farmers. This is to guarantee that the subsidising is not mishandled. The farmers would then go into contracts with the government to guarantee that the propelled help is reimbursed to the government.

5.1.6 Communal Land Classification

The article recommends the zoning and classification of communal land. Land must be divided between land for subsistence use and land for commercial purposes. All community members must possess a legal right to apply for communal land for subsistence use. In any case, land parcelled out for commercial use must be open even to outside investors. The recipients must be issued with lease rights. The commercial enterprises will benefit the local people through creation of employment, infrastructure development, business opportunities and rentals. This has capacity to make the local people food secure.

5.1.7 Capacity to Use Land

The article recommends that communal commercial land must be assigned according to capacity. The land committee is recommended to investigate the budgetary status of imminent applicants. The applicants must show that they can partake in the business venture. Business agribusiness and endeavour, for instance, mining and industry to mention a few, assumes a significant role in the economy. It guarantees food security, financial soundness and investor confidence. All business land redistributions must guarantee against future unused or underutilised land.

6. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to explore the causal linkages between communal tenure and food security in South Africa. The paper unveiled that for rural communities to achieve development and attain food

security, there is a need to redress the issue of access to secure land tenure. It is contended that it improves household food security, encourage economic freedom and the accumulation of wealth. Where people have land title, such tenure security can encourage investment in and development on and off the land. Amidst difficulty, when secure land title is held, the land can be leased or sold to others, as can domesticated animals to offer insurance against shocks.

Communal landowners can raise credit by utilising land as insurance against credits, while this sustainable resource can be transferred to the next generation, permitting them to benefit from the security it gives (Hanstad, Prosterman & Mitchell, 2009). From the foregoing analysis, the paper concludes that a secure communal land tenure is adequate to redress the food (in)securities. Thus, there is an urgent need to reformulate and adjust laws, policies and customs to ensure that communal tenure realises this pertinent objective.

Reference List

- Aliber, M. and Cousins, B., 2013. Livelihoods after Land Reform in South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 13(1), pp.140-165.
- Allen, A., 2016. *The end of progress: Decolonizing the normative foundations of critical theory*. Columbia University Press.
- Altieri, M.A., Nicholls, C.I., Henao, A. and Lana, M.A., 2015. Agroecology and the design of climate change-resilient farming systems. *Agronomy for sustainable development*, 35(3), pp.869-890.
- Altman, M., Hart, T. G. and Jacobs, P. T. 2009. Household food security status in South Africa. *Agrekon* 48(4): 345-361. Available: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03031853.2009.9523831> (Accessed 10 March 2020).
- Asaaga, F.A., Hirons, M.A. and Malhi, Y., 2020. Questioning the link between tenure security and sustainable land management in cocoa landscapes in Ghana. *World Development*, 130, p.104913.
- Bennet, T. W. 2004. Customary Law in South Africa. *Revue internationale de droit comparé*, 58(3), pp.992-994.
- Candel, J.J. and Biesbroek, R., 2018. Policy integration in the EU governance of global food security. *Food security*, 10(1), pp.195-209.
- Chakona, G. and Shackleton, C.M., 2019. Food insecurity in South Africa: To what extent can social grants and consumption of wild foods eradicate hunger? *World Development Perspectives*, 13, pp.87-94.

- Cousins, B., 2008. Characterising 'communal' tenure: nested systems and flexible boundaries. *Land, Power and Custom: Controversies Generated by South Africa's Communal Land Rights Act*, pp.109-137.
- Cousins, B., 2008. Characterising "communal tenure: nested. *Land, Power & Custom: Controversies Generated by South Africa's Communal Land Rights Act*, p.109.
- Department of Agriculture, F. a. F. 2011. Food security <http://www.nda.agric.za/docs/genreports/foodsecurity.pdf> (Accessed 14 October 2020).
- Department of Social Development. 2013. National policy on food and nutrition security <http://www.daff.gov.za/docs/media/NATIONAL%20POLICYon%20food%20and%20nutrition%20security.pdf> (Accessed 04 July 20120).
- Devereux, S. and Sussex, I., 2000. *Food insecurity in Ethiopia* (p. 7). Institute for Development Studies.
- Dewbre, J. 2010. Food security. *OECD Observer* (278): 22. <http://dut.summon.serialssolutions.com> (Accessed 01 May 2020).
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). 2010. High food prices and food security: threats, opportunities and budgetary implications for sustainable agriculture.
- FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation). 2010. The state of food insecurity in the world: addressing food insecurity in protracted crisis. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/013.pdf> (accessed 13 May 2020).
- Fenske, J., 2011. Land tenure and investment incentives: Evidence from West Africa. *Journal of Development Economics*, 95(2), pp.137-156.
- Goodall, K. 2009. Food security: what is it all about? <http://www.agrifood.info/connections/2009/goodall.pdf> (accessed 22 June 2020).
- Griffin, S., 2017. Key Concept: Critical Theory. In *Education Studies* (pp. 104-108). Routledge.
- Groenmeyer, S., 2013. The right to food sovereignty for small scale farmers: Case study of farming cooperatives in Limpopo province, South Africa. *Int'l J. Soc. Sci. Stud.*, 1, p.168.
- Hanstad, T., Mitchell, R. and L Prosterman, R., 2009. *One Billion Rising. Law, Land and the Alleviation of Global Poverty*. Leiden University Press.
- Hendricks, S. 2014. Food security in South Africa: status quo and policy imperatives. *Agrekon* 53(2): 1-24. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03031853.2014.915468> (Accessed 07 July 2020).

- Ingutia, R., Rezitis, A.N. and Sumelius, J., 2020. Child poverty, status of rural women and education in sub Saharan Africa. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 111, p.104869.
- Kepe, T. and Tessaro, D., 2014. Trading-off: Rural food security and land rights in South Africa. *Land Use Policy*, 36, pp.267-274.
- Kugara, S.L. 2017. Witchcraft Belief and Criminal Responsibility: A Case Study of Selected Areas in South Africa and Zimbabwe (Doctoral dissertation, University of Venda).
- Kynoch, G., 2016. Apartheid's afterlives: violence, policing and the South African State. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 42(1), pp.65-78.
- Kynoch, G., 2016. Apartheid's afterlives: violence, policing and the South African State. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 42(1), pp.65-78.
- Labadarios, D., Steyn, N. P. and Nel, J. 2011. How diverse is the diet of adult South Africans? *Nutrition journal* 10(3): 33-43. Available: <http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=de6d12e9-4f81-4256-82c5428f786fda0f%40sessionmgr4004&vid=2&hid=4204> (Accessed 18 February 2020).
- Mawere, J., 2020. Decolonising legal education in south Africa: A review of African indigenous law in the curriculum. *Pretoria Student Law Review Journal*, 14 (1), pp 31-63.
- Mohapatra, B.S., Koundal, K.R. & Pal, S. 2010. *Journal of food security*. Gurgoun, Haryan: Institute of Food Security.
- Mothae, T., 2017. *Assessment of communal land rights for smallholder farmers access to markets in South Africa: implications on gender* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Mpandeli, S. and Maponya, P., 2014. Constraints and challenges facing the small scale farmers in Limpopo Province, South Africa. *Journal of agricultural Science*, 6(4), p.135.
- Muzhinji, N. and Ntuli, V., 2020. Genetically modified organisms and food security in Southern Africa: conundrum and discourse. *GM Crops & Food*, pp.1-11.
- Mwaniki, A. 2011. Achieving food security in Africa: challenges and issues. <http://www.un.org/Africa/osaa/reports/achieving%20%foodsecurity.pdf> (accessed 20 July 2020).
- Nawrotzki, R. J., Robson, K., Gutilla, M. J., Hunter, L. M., Twine, W. and Norlund, P. 2014. Exploring the impact of the 2008 global food crisis on food security among vulnerable households in rural South Africa. *Food Security* 6(2): 283-297. Available: <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12571-014-0336-6> (Accessed 07 November 2015).

- Nevhutanda, G.V., 2018. *Insecure land tenure and the impact of the national Credit Act 34 of 2005* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Ngqulana, T.C., 2018. *Constraints hindering the development of communal livestock production and opportunities which exist in Nyandeni Local Municipality Eastern Cape Province South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria).
- Obeng-Odoom, F. and Stilwell, F., 2013. Security of tenure in international development discourse. *International Development planning review*, 35(4), p.315.
- Pereira, L.M., 2014. The future of South Africa's food system: What is research telling us. *SA Food Lab South Africa*.
- Richardson, R.B., 2010. Ecosystem services and food security: Economic perspectives on environmental sustainability. *Sustainability*, 2(11), pp.3520-3548.
- Roth, A.S. and Becker, P., 2011. Challenges to disaster risk reduction: a study of stakeholders' perspectives in Imizamo Yethu, South Africa. *Jàmá: Journal of disaster risk studies*, 3(2), pp.443-452.
- Shackleton, S. and Luckert, M., 2015. Changing livelihoods and landscapes in the rural Eastern Cape, South Africa: Past influences and future trajectories. *Land*, 4(4), pp.1060-1089.
- STATS, S., 2019. The extent of food security in South Africa.
- Thamaga-Chitja, J.M., Kolanisi, U. and Murugani, V.G., 2010. Is the South African land reform programme gender sensitive to women's food security and livelihood efforts? *Agenda*, 24(86), pp.121-134.
- Tounukari, N.J. & Omotor, D.G. 2010. Biotechnology and food security in developing countries. <http://academicjournals.org/bmbr/PDF/Pdf2010/Feb/Tonukari%20and%20Omotor.pdf> (accessed 22 June 2020).
- World Bank. 2011. *Agriculture and Development: A Brief Review of the Literature*. Washington: World Bank Printers.