

Power and Politics in Stakeholder Engagement: Farm Dweller (In-)Visibility and Conversions to Game Farming in South Africa

Authors

Femke Brandt femkebrandt@gmail.com

Jenny Josefsson josefsson.jenny@gmail.com

Marja Spierenburg M.Spierenburg@maw.ru.nl (corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

In this contribution we discuss tensions inherent in multi-stakeholder approaches addressing conflicts over natural resources as well as the involvement of stakeholders in research. The article is built on knowledge generated by extensive research on the impacts of conversions of private farms to game farms in South Africa, where significant increases in farm conversions have been observed since the 1990s. The studies had a particular focus on the consequences for farm dwellers, one of the most marginalised groups in the South African countryside. The research findings challenge the dominant narrative that game farming offers a ‘win-win’ situation for nature conservation as well as rural development. Based on data from the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal provinces, we extended the narrow technical and economic framing of the narrative to include the socio-political meanings of the conversions.

In this article we reflect on a series of multi-stakeholder workshops that we organized, partly as a requirement of the funding agency. The aims of the workshops were to disseminate our research findings amongst the stakeholder groups and explore ways to mitigate negative impacts of the conversions. We discuss how we organized the engagement process in ways that sought to address the power differences between game farmers, the State and farm dwellers. The main challenge appeared to be that farm dwellers were not recognized as stakeholders. This ‘invisibility’ has multiple reasons; in particular the historical and current trajectories of land dispossession. It is also linked to the specific institutional and personal relations in the two provinces, resulting in different uses of the workshop spaces. By considering the complexities of stakeholder relations in the farm conversion context, we gained a deeper understanding of the politics of land and belonging in the still unequal post-apartheid rural landscape. Based on the experiences from the research as well as the workshops, we take a critical stance regarding mainstream notions of stakeholder engagement and resilience building. We argue that if we fail to consider power relations and politics explicitly in these processes, we risk neglecting important conflicts and reproducing the invisibility of marginalized stakeholders.

KEY WORDS

Conflict, farm dwellers, game farming, multi-stakeholder approaches, power relations, stakeholder engagement, South Africa, violence

INTRODUCTION

In this contribution we discuss the tensions inherent in multi-stakeholder approaches to address conflicts over natural resources as well as the involvement of stakeholders in research. Such approaches frequently aim for the development of a common understanding of the problem at hand, as well as conflict resolution or mitigation, and thereby mainly focus on outcomes rather than process (Parkins and Mitchell 2005). A common risk is that power relations and inequalities, often developed over long periods of time, are ignored. As the editors of this special issue remark, in situations of strong power asymmetries, conflict may be a healthy expression of resistance, and cooperation may actually be the result of subjugation (Fisher, Bavinck and Amsalu, forthcoming). They therefore argue for a need to move away from seeing conflicts as undesirable, and instead considering them as an important step in the transformation of natural resource management.

In relation to this, we signal somewhat conflicting tendencies in sustainability science. On the one hand, the recognition that social and ecological systems are interconnected (Fisher et al. 2015; Cundill et al. 2005), has resulted in a strong emphasis on the need to involve stakeholders in research on social-ecological change, and finding ways to integrate their needs and knowledge in research (Deppisch et al. 2013; Mauser et al. 2013). Research funding organizations have absorbed these ideas, and often demand that researchers form consortia that include societal partners – both from the public and private sector. The idea is to involve stakeholders from the start in the process of defining research problems and questions, as well as in developing the research design, and ultimately work towards co-production of knowledge. It is assumed that this will facilitate the emergence of a common understanding of social-ecological problems, as well as the smooth uptake and implementation of both new knowledge and proposed solutions (Mauser et al. 2013; Cundill et al. 2013). Stakeholder involvement therefore is believed to contribute to resilience – which is also increasingly defined in a social-ecological manner – in a positive way (Deppisch et al. 2013).

On the other hand, there is a growing body of literature that recognizes the importance of power dynamics in collaborative governance for sustainability (Voss and Bornemann 2011; Barnaud and van Paassen 2013) as well as in transdisciplinarity and global environmental change research (Cundill et al. 2013, Tengo et al. 2017). This literature builds on critical perspectives, which emerged in community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) studies on multi-stakeholder approaches (Dressler et al. 2010; Larson and Ribot 2004; Edmunds and Wollenberg 2001). The critique is that these approaches tend to revolve around an assumed ‘neutrality’ of research as a space for engagement where everyone’s voice can be (equally) heard, and focus on

consensus-building in contexts where this might not be desirable for all parties (Barnaud and Van Paassen 2013). In reality, multi-stakeholder dynamics often serve the powerful stakeholders and silence or exclude marginalized peoples even further (see e.g. Balvenera et al. 2017; Voss and Bornemann 2011; Spierenburg et al. 2009; Ramutsindela 2007; Edmund and Wollenberg 2001). As a result, studies of collaborative governance for sustainability increasingly focus on strategies to deliberately foreground the needs and knowledges of marginalized stakeholders (Voss and Bornemann 2011; Tengo et al. 2017; Cundill et al. 2013).

Our contribution aims to connect insights from this literature, and builds on the more critical perspectives, but it also calls attention to the importance of the historical social-ecological context in which resource conflicts develop. As Fisher, Bavinck and Amsalu (forthcoming) write, the everyday contestations over land, power and belonging are embedded “within social and power relations that are framed by local histories and connected to wider processes of capital accumulation and political dynamics” (ibid page X). To increase our understanding of these relations, we embrace the proposed practice of ‘conceptual convergence’ (Ibid page X) by treating environmental developments as political projects with layers of conflict and issues.

This article is based on findings from and reflections on a research programme aimed at studying the impacts of conversions of commercial farms to wildlife-based production – more commonly known as game farming – on farm dwellers in two provinces of South Africa. The conversions take place in local contexts of longstanding conflicts over land and other natural resources, which shape relations between stakeholders. Structural violence and processes of marginalization are entrenched in these landscapes; in essence as a result of South Africa’s colonial and apartheid regimes. The relationships reflect largely unchallenged patterns of paternalistic and patriarchal relationships that perpetuate the oppression of black people, and of black women in particular (Devereux 2017; Eriksson 2017; Waldman 1996; AFRA 2004). One could argue that the social resilience of these relationships is strong, but in a negative way, as it hampers positive transformation and power re-distribution. These dynamics had important impacts on our research as well as on the multi-stakeholder workshops.

An important outcome of our reflections is that although the researchers considered farm dwellers to be legitimate stakeholders, this stance was – and still is - not supported in the broader political context, meaning that for example landowners and government officials to a large extent did not consider the impacts of farm conversions on this group, nor ascribed them stakeholder status (cf. Bologna 2008). In this article we analyse the relations with and between the various stakeholder groups in our research and workshops, and demonstrate how different historical and socio-

political contexts in the two provinces resulted in differences in how the workshop spaces were used.

SITUATING THE RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The conceptualisation of the programme was a collaborative effort by a group of South African and Dutch anthropologists, geographers and political economists, alerted by the visible changes occurring in their familiar landscapes in South Africa's countryside, resulting from farm conversions. From the outset, the positionalities of the research team were influenced by the decision to focus on the impacts of the farm conversions on farm dwellers. Farm dwellers are people who consider the commercial farms on which they live, but do not own, their home. Many of them are farm workers, ex-farm workers, or former labour or rent-paying tenants (*Daily Maverick* 2018; Del Grande 2006). Much of the literature on game farming that had appeared by 2007 focused either on species and conservation issues, or on revenues generated by what was in general referred to as 'the wildlife industry' (see Nell 2003, Langholz and Kerley 2006, Cousins et al. 2008). Commissioned studies suggested that the shifts to game farming were addressing both environmental problems – such as soil erosion resulting from overgrazing – as well as the problem of increasing unemployment in the South African country-side (Langholz and Kerley 2006, Snowball and Anthrobus 2008). Little research looked critically at the distribution of benefits of game farming among the various stakeholders, with the exception of a study by Kelly Luck (2003), and reports issued by the Association for Rural Advancement (AFRA) (2004) and the Eastern Cape Agricultural Research Project (ECARP) (2006).

At the time of the development of the research programme (2007) there was a clear gap in the academic literature and knowledge concerning the socio-political impacts of game farming. Inspired by the exploratory reports by AFRA and ECARP, the team decided to focus the research on the consequences for farm dwellers. Farm conversions tend to be presented as a 'win-win' strategy, contributing both to nature conservation and local economic development, mainly through job creation in tourism. Without rejecting these 'trickle down' assumptions upfront, the programme set out to critically analyse these discourses and knowledge claims by departing from the experiences of the most marginalized and 'invisible' stakeholders.

The main funding agency, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research – Science for Development (NWO-WOTRO), influenced the development of the research by placing a lot of emphasis on both stakeholder involvements as well as on strategies for conflict mitigation and policy change. In concrete terms, NWO-WOTRO required the organization of multi-stakeholder workshops to further develop the research questions and design presented in the research

proposal. NWO-WOTRO also requested a dissemination plan and a ‘log frame’ (an analytical tool designed to plan outcomes and indicators to measure outcomes). This meant that the methodological approach was influenced by expectations of desirable outcomes, and the idea that certain steps and actions had to be implemented during the course of the research project to arrive at positive policy impacts. However, based on research experiences in South African rural and ‘wilderness’ contexts, as well as an examination of relevant literature, the researchers were well aware of existing power contestations and potential challenges with the funder’s model of stakeholder engagement.

First, we provide a brief overview of the knowledge base informing the reflection process. The research team involved five senior researchers, six PhD-students, six masters students and two honours students. The team consisted of both Southern African, and European researchers and students. In-depth ethnographic case studies were conducted on four ‘hunting farms’ in the Eastern Cape, and seven game farms (both for hunting and non-consumptive tourism) in KwaZulu-Natal, which included the mapping of conversion histories and farm dweller settlements, and studies of every-day life at the farms. In addition, in-depth interviews were conducted with twelve game farm owners/managers in KwaZulu-Natal, and twenty-three game farm owners/managers in the Eastern Cape (representing various forms of game farming) on conversion histories and motives, employment on the farms, farm dweller histories and management practices. One PhD-student conducted an ethnographic case study of the Wildlife Forum in which stakeholders (except farm dwellers) at the national level meet to discuss legislation, while another PhD-student analysed the institutional context of game farming in KwaZulu-Natal. In KwaZulu-Natal, five farm dweller communities participated in the research, including three who were involved in land reform processes. In the Eastern Cape, (former) farm dwellers from game farms were interviewed in three townships/informal settlements. In total, more than 250 interviews were conducted with different stakeholders, including national and local government officials, NGO-staff, ‘conventional’ farmers, owners of game farming or farming service industries, tourism entrepreneurs, and nature conservation organisations. Numerous informal conversations and (participant) observations were conducted during wildlife auctions, meetings, hunting and wildlife tracking courses, on farms, and in townships and informal settlements. The series of multi-stakeholder workshops discussed here contributed further to the findings.

The findings of the research are discussed below. These findings, however, need to be analysed in the different historical contexts of agrarian changes in the two provinces, which will be presented first.

MAKING FARM DWELLERS VISIBLE AS STAKEHOLDERS IN GAME FARMING

Both in the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal provinces, the creation of the social category of farm dwellers resulted from centuries of land dispossession, the enclosure of land as private property, and the development of capitalist farming under colonialism and apartheid (Wels 2015; Van Sittert 2005; 2002). In this section we provide a brief overview of these trajectories and how they differ in the two provinces. Moreover, we underscore the structural violence entrenched in everyday power relationships in the South African countryside (AFRA 2004; Manby 2002), as well as the resistance to the inequalities characteristic of the natural resource distribution in farming areas. We consider the emergence of game farming as a process with multiple layers, meaning that we include dynamics of contestations of belonging in addition to conservation issues and economic development. It is against this background that we interpret the invisibility of farm dwellers as stakeholders in farm conversion processes.

Over centuries, white landowners and dispossessed Africans developed unequal relations and institutions on commercial farms (Eriksson 2017; Connor 2014; Mkhize 2012; Waldman 1996; Du Toit 1993). In the Eastern Cape, the semi-arid Karoo was transformed into a sheep-farming area producing wool as major export product for the British colony. The private property system introduced by the British transformed colonial society, but also generated resistance from the African population (Van Sittert 2005, 2002; Peires 1981). The search for better wages and working conditions produced a constantly available and mobile labour force for whom access to land for cultivation and livestock became increasingly difficult (Evans 2010). In absence of State support or services for black people on farms and in response to the persistent challenge to keep people on the farm, farmers were forced to supplement wages with agricultural produce, education and healthcare. This constant negotiation and resistance to power by dispossessed black people in turn shaped paternalistic relations on farms in the Eastern Cape (Connor 2014: 177).

Farm dwellers in KwaZulu-Natal have experienced a relatively high degree of autonomy compared to the Eastern Cape, as they often lived on land that was not occupied by the owner (Brooks et al. 2011). Many livestock farmers in the Midlands of Natal acquired additional farms in the *thornveld* area, which served as so-called 'labour farms'. At certain times of the year, tenants living on labour farms were summoned to the associated farm to work; thereafter they would return to the labour farm or seek work in the Transvaal mines, McClendon (2002) refers to them as 'off-site labour tenants'. In effect, the north-eastern region of the province served as a source of cheap labour for Midland farmers. The evolving system of labour tenancy became an entrenched feature of the social history of the region (McClendon 2000, 1995) despite various

attempts by apartheid governments to destroy this set-up through legislative and policy measures, as well as through forced removals during the 1960s (SPP vol. 4 1985). As a result, black people and households are present on most privately-owned farms (Platzky and Walker 1985).

The different trajectories of land dispossession in KwaZulu-Natal and the Eastern Cape have shaped the relationships and dependencies between white landowners and black workers and tenants on the farms. In her thesis, Mkhize (2012: 71-85) addresses the puzzle of why contestation and conflict around land tenure are much more visible in KwaZulu-Natal compared to the Eastern Cape. She argues that the much earlier dispossessions in the Cape Provinces created a dependent, servile labour class on the farms as people lost all access to land and independent farming during the 19th century (Mkhize 2014; 2012). Due to the early dispossession, black people have had little opportunity to claim land back under the ANC's post-apartheid land reform programme, which targets people who lost land as result of the 1913 Natives Land Act and subsequent discriminatory legislation. In KwaZulu-Natal on the other hand, the system of labour tenancy persisted during colonialism and apartheid. This enabled black people's access to land and grazing fields, which allowed a greater degree of autonomy (SPP 1985) compared to the dispossessed proletariat in the Eastern Cape. It further means that their rights to land and tenure are to some extent acknowledged in post-apartheid legislation. In KwaZulu-Natal many farm dwellers and landowners are currently engaging with the State in land reform processes (see Brandt and Mkodzongi 2018). Mkhize (2012: 71) noted the striking difference in labour-tenant claims submitted in both provinces by 2002 - 79 in the Eastern Cape and 7 713 in KwaZulu-Natal. Furthermore, in KwaZulu-Natal land rights organisations are active in multiple social spheres, and there are several restitution farms in the area where we conducted research.

Throughout the country, conversions to game farming predominately take place in commercial farming areas, where most landowners are white, and where working conditions and tenure security for farm dwellers have always been precarious (Brandt and Ncapayi 2016; Mkhize 2012). Under the post-apartheid democratic dispensation various attempts have been made to address this through the adoption of tenure security acts and labour legislation, which however are at odds with the deregulation of the agrarian sector (Spiereburg and Brooks 2014). Nonetheless, everyday power struggles on farms still result in evictions of farm dwellers, shaping labour regimes and deeply entrenched violent relations (Hall 2007; Manby 2002).

The political rhetoric of transformation and land reform adopted since the first ANC-led democratic government came into power in 1994 has generated anxiety amongst white farmers in both provinces (Fraser 2008). Statements in the press by Ministers and MPs about the need to

speed up land reform (Reuters 2016), require white farmers to legitimise and assert their position on the land. However, subsequent ANC governments have also promoted neoliberal policies, which have resulted in further deregulation and land consolidation (Williams et al. 1998; Van Zyl et al. 1996; 2001) rather than redistribution of land, resulting in a decline in the number of jobs on commercial farms (Vink and Van Rooyen 2009). In addition, there is a notable tendency to replace permanent workers by casual labour (Spierenburg and Brooks 2014; Aliber et al. 2009; Hall 2007). Thus, there is a general trend of larger farms with fewer owners that absorb less labour in the countryside.

Conversions to game farming have been observed since the 1960s (Wels 2015; Nell 2003). From the perspective of landowners, it was perceived to be an economically sound response to declining agricultural markets and profits that set in during the 1980s (AFRA 2004). With the end of apartheid dawning, the Game Theft Act 105 of 1991 strengthened ownership of land and natural resources by changing the status of wildlife from public to private good (Snijders 2015). Since then, farm conversion rates have increased significantly, but how much land and how many farms have been converted is difficult to estimate, as not all changes of land use and ownership are registered with government – or only with certain departments. Nevertheless, in 2006 the NAMC estimated that wildlife is produced on nearly 10 000 commercial farms, covering about 14.9 million hectares (NAMC 2006). More recent estimates cite 9 000 wildlife ranches, but with an expanded area of 17.04 million hectares (Taylor, Lindsey and Davies-Mostert 2016), amounting to more than a quarter of all land available in South Africa for grazing. The conversions are often gradual processes that consist of consolidation of farm properties over a period of several years, repeated investments in wildlife species, the fencing or unfencing of areas and demolishing farm houses and existing infrastructure (Brandt and Spierenburg 2014). During this process, farm dwellers are often forced to leave the farm in search for livelihoods and homes elsewhere (see e.g. Mkhize 2014; Brooks and Kjelstrup 2014).

Contestations over land ownership and access to natural resources is an on-going reality in South Africa's rural areas (see also Brandt and Mkodzongi 2018). On the one hand they are expressed through formalized land reform procedures as well as policy and legislative frameworks; on the other hand through informal or extra-legal methods, such as land occupations, 'illegal' cattle grazing, cutting of fences, protests and sometimes through direct violence. A relatively recent example is the 'unprecedented' uprising of farm workers that occurred on Western Cape wine farms in 2012 and 2013 (Eriksson 2017; Wilderman 2015; Ntsebeza 2013). The terms 'unprecedented' and 'historic' were used here, because of the extreme power differences on farms. The extremely low wages and poor living conditions for workers and farm dwellers are

other aspects of the structural violence that persists in the countryside. Popular rhetoric of rural violence in the countryside disproportionately favours the concerns of farm owners backed up by their powerful lobbies and organizations. Manby (2002: 89) states that crimes against farm owners are highly visible compared to the ‘near invisibility of violent crime against farm residents’ (see *Daily Maverick* 25 August 2015: Online; *Mail and Guardian* 10 October 2013: Online). Because ‘violence has been built into the fabric of white control of the land in South Africa from the start’ (ibid p. 90), extreme inequalities are normalized and therefore no longer perceived as violent.

In terms of the findings of the research programme, we discovered that the win-win narrative of farm conversions is quite hollow. Even scholars who are adamant about the positive impacts of farm conversions on employment creation, cite reduced labour demands as an important motive for farmers to shift to wildlife-based production (Langholz and Kerley 2006), a finding confirmed by researchers in our research project (see e.g. Brandt 2013; Mkhize 2012). Labour demands, however, vary across different modes of game farming. The high-end ‘eco-tourism’ lodges do generate more employment than ‘conventional’ farming, especially for women. However, this is a rather fickle industry; during the first years after the financial crisis, many of the high-end lodges witnessed a drastic reduction in the number of bookings, and many employees – especially in the lower ranks – lost their jobs or saw their working hours and pay significantly reduced. Most of the jobs created are seasonal and temporary, and former farm workers and dwellers often only have access to these insecure jobs in the lower ranks (Andrew et al. 2013). Other forms of game farming result mainly in the shedding, casualization, and outsourcing of labour (Spienburg and Brooks 2014). Especially hunting and breeding farms require far less labour. Only a few labourers are kept on to maintain water points or as trackers, and on hunting farms some of the women manage to obtain jobs looking after the guests in the hunting lodges (Brandt 2013).

Positive statistics provided by other researchers (e.g. Langholz and Kerley 2006, Snowball and Anthrobus) are often skewed towards one mode of game farming and fail to take into account the effects of the amalgamation of properties accompanying most conversions. While the owner or manager interviewed may have hired more staff, he – in most cases – does not take into account the fact that most of the farm dwellers on the farms acquired to expand the game farm (on average about 5, see also Langholz and Kerley (2006)), lost their jobs as well as access to land. It must be noted, however, that shedding and casualization of labour are strategies also deployed by the remaining commercial farmers in South Africa (see e.g. Du Toit 2004; 2005; Ewert et al. 2005).

We found that the wildlife industry’s claims of job creation, rural development and conservation efforts are a political strategy, enabled through the commodification of nature, to justify and assert

control over land, animals and people. Game farmers' self-proclaimed identities as custodians of nature is instrumental in the context of post-apartheid rhetoric of land reform and transformation, in which white landowners feel the need to legitimise their position on the land (Brandt and Josefsson 2017; Josefsson 2014). The conversions, however, also lead to tensions within the white farmers' community about, for instance, livestock diseases and predator control (Brandt and Spierenburg 2014). Furthermore, trophy-hunting businesses clash with conservationist ideals due to selective stocking, breeding and killing practices in the sector (Snijders 2014).

For farm dwellers, conversions tend to perpetuate dispossession from natural resources, and further displacement from land (Mkhize 2014; Spierenburg and Brooks 2014). In several instances this has resulted in contestations over land, belonging and notions of 'rights', sometimes with dire material and emotional consequences for farm dwellers (Brooks and Kjelstrup 2014). In the Eastern Cape, farm dweller life trajectories are characterised by constant mobility in order to evade farmers' control over their lives, as well as attempts to establish secure homes or places of belonging, if needed off-farm (Brandt 2013). Similarly for KwaZulu-Natal, Josefsson (2014) argues that farm conversions work against rural transformation. Ngubane and Brooks (2014) show examples of the interplay between land restitution and wildlife production on private land in a so-called community game farm set-up. In relation to the state, research shows that wildlife policy-making processes enabled a strategic arena for land and wildlife owners to promote their interests over those of farm dwellers (Kamuti 2014).

ANALYZING THE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENTS IN THE RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The table outlines the timeline and stakeholder engagements of the research programme. It indicates the period over which relationships were built with stakeholders, from the programme's inception until the completion of the last workshops. Note that the fieldwork took place within this timeline, but that research has since continued in some areas.

Insert Table 1 here

For this and the following sections we rely on meeting records, field notes, reflections and discussions, workshop reports, and our presentations to reconstruct the research processes and the events in the two provinces.

Starting stakeholder engagements as part of the research process

As required by the funding agency and the research programme's implementation plan, we organized a project inception workshop in the spring of 2007 with a number of stakeholders attending, mainly from – what we then thought were relevant – government departments (agriculture and environmental affairs) and civil society organizations. Two groups of stakeholders were conspicuously absent from these workshops; game farmers and farm dwellers. Members of the first group indicated they were too busy, and the farm dwellers turned out to be difficult to mobilize within our short turnaround time and this early on in the project. We therefore relied on civil society organizations to represent the farm dwellers' interests, and notably, some government officials took it upon themselves to represent the game farmers.

Together with these groups we refined our research questions. Some participants, including some government officials, objected to the focus on farm dwellers and thought we should look at impacts more broadly (translated mainly as revenues generated), but we maintained that focus, while at the same time emphasizing our independence. We explained that we would critically examine whether game farming was a win-win strategy for conservation and development or not and indicated that we would not beforehand exclude either possibility. This stance proved vital in obtaining access to the field, and especially to farm dwellers residing on farms. In addition to the workshop, we tried to contact some of the 'missing' stakeholders during exploring field visits, and managed to contact conventional farmers, game farmers and staff members of their official organizations such as the Eastern Cape Game Management Association. The farm dwellers, however, remained invisible.

We were aware of the sensitivity of the research issues, and the strong emotions these elicited. Nevertheless, our research was welcomed, but stakeholders had contradictory expectations; game farmers were convinced we would prove that farm conversions are the ultimate solution to the social and environmental problems of the countryside, civil society organizations were convinced that we would prove the conversions would result in nothing but misery for farm dwellers, and conventional farmers predicted that our outcomes would demonstrate that game farming destroys the farming sector.

Once the funding was granted, we organized a follow-up workshop in the provincial capital of KwaZulu-Natal, where some participating students presented their individual research projects. During this workshop some tensions rose, as some of the civil society organizations, which had endorsed the project, demanded that in return they would be given access to the raw data, including names of landowners, so they could use this for legal actions. We refused mainly for

two reasons. Firstly, it would be a serious violation of the general ethic codes of academia and research. Secondly, as we were dependant on farmers and landowners for access to both places and people, we could not risk compromising their willingness to participate (this still turned out to be a problematic negotiation, see Brandt and Josefsson 2017).

Implementing the research project required continuous engagement with the stakeholders, especially by the master and PhD-students conducting most of the research. While our contacts with game farmers and their organizations somewhat facilitated access to game farms and farmers, there were different experiences among the team members regarding negotiating access. This was in essence related to the researchers' different positionalities, shaped by race, gender, nationality and seniority (Kamuti 2016; Mkhize 2012). In general, it was harder for black South-African students to access or establish rapport with white farmers, as they were less welcoming to them than to white European students and researchers. The female researchers' experiences revealed the gendered nature of the game farming landscape (Brandt and Josefsson 2017).

When access was granted, this was often by farm owners who believed they were decent employers. Nevertheless, it proved to be very difficult - sometimes even impossible - to speak to farm dwellers on farms without owners or managers being present. The team tried other strategies to make contact with farm dwellers, for example when they visited relatives and friends outside the farms. Especially in KwaZulu-Natal, where conflicts over land in some areas have taken a violent turn, this was not without risk. While violence is also part of everyday life on Eastern Cape farms, as a continuous undercurrent of structural violence, open confrontations were much rarer.

The team's relationships with civil society organizations varied over time. With some we remained in contact, exchanging ideas and experiences, and some of the research participants organized workshops with and/or for them. Other organizations either moved on to other issues, or lost interest when our research did not result in data they could immediately use in campaigns or lawsuits. Our initial plans to identify conflict mitigation strategies in cooperation with these organizations turned out to be impossible. This was also related to the tensions we encountered in the field. For example, relations with the game farmers' organizations soured when our results did not confirm the positive image they were trying to promote. One incident was sparked by a presentation given by two PhD-students at Rhodes University (Eastern Cape) on their preliminary findings, during which members of the national and local game farming organization were present. After a fierce debate, in which the students were accused of conducting sloppy research, a representative of the national game farmers' organization sent out an email to all members

warning them not to cooperate with our group and advised them to deny us access to the farms. This sparked a new round of access negotiations for the researchers already in the field, as well as for researchers entering the field at later stages, as this influenced the attitude of some of the game farmers negatively.

It was in this volatile context that, towards the end of the project, we organized a series of workshops to disseminate our research findings to the stakeholders. While the funding agency mentioned multi-stakeholder approaches as an important (dissemination) tool, we adapted this approach somewhat as we will discuss below, in response to the power configurations we encountered in the field. In line with some of the critiques of this approach (Voss and Bornemann 2011; Barnaud and Van Paassen 2013), we decided to first focus on the most vulnerable stakeholder group we identified, namely the farm dwellers.

Eastern Cape stakeholder workshops: struggles with access and participation

We opted for a sequence of two workshops in the rural town where two of the PhD researchers had been based during their field research; the first in the township and the second in town itself. After this, a third workshop was organized in Port Elizabeth. The main aim was to report back what knowledge the research had generated and discuss how this could be relevant to the different stakeholder groups; notably farm dwellers, NGOs and relevant government officials. The biggest challenge was organizing the workshops one year after two PhD students completed their fieldwork in that region. In the context of limited phone and computer-based communication, relationships had been based on face-to-face interactions and physical presence of researchers. The available two weeks were too short to re-connect and trace farm dwellers who had moved in the time gone by.

The first workshop organized in the township was to enable a platform exclusively for farm dwellers and representatives of organizations that support farm dwellers. The aims were to discuss the research findings with farm dwellers and prepare willing participants to come along to the second workshop in town that would involve a discussion with a broader array of stakeholders; including local game farmers. Though the research focus was on the consequences of farm conversions for farm dwellers, we framed it as follows: 'From Merino to Rhino: the socio-economic impacts of wildlife ranching in the Eastern Cape'. This was an attempt to be inclusive, a balancing act in a context of extremely antagonistic participants. In the end this performed 'neutrality' made no difference to how the research team was perceived. On the way to farm dwellers on a trophy-hunting farm, one team-member met a farmer who asked why she was back

in the area. When she explained the workshops, a discussion about labour and land issues ensued, and the encounter ended tensely. She later found out that the farmer had phoned a game farmer participating in the research to ask why he let that “socialist” onto the farm “stirring up trouble among the workers”. The game farmer emphasized that she must understand that “farmers feel threatened” by the political shifts in post-apartheid society. Neither the game farmers nor any of the farm dwellers from the case study farms attended the workshops.

The fifteen participants of the first workshop in the township were members from the local Legal Advice Office, from the Southern Cape Land Committee (SCLC) and a few community members who had learned of the meeting through the Advice Office pamphlets distributed during the week before. This was despite transport arrangements made for workers who had indicated they would be able to come on a Saturday. Farm dwellers’ decisions not to participate could be explained by fear to jeopardize their relationships with farmers, the heavy rains that made farm roads inaccessible, or the realistic assumption that it would be unlikely that the researchers would be able to address their issues effectively.

The presentations and conversations were conducted in Afrikaans as few participants spoke English, and occasionally isiXhosa translations were provided by the participants. Farm dwellers who came with SCLC responded to the researchers’ presentations with keen interest. In affiliation with SCLC they have formed farm committees through which they negotiate with farmers about their working and living conditions. They spoke about the way they lost their fear for farmers once they were organized in committees. One of SCLC organizers indicated that it had taken them two years to build enough trust to establish the committees. They hoped the workshop would offer an opportunity to work with farm dwellers in this region where they had always struggled to organize farm dwellers due to the extreme inequalities and violence on farms. She pointed out that labour laws, land reform policies and the constitutional protection of private property pose significant problems for rural transformation.

Although the meeting facilitated relationships between the NGOs, it did not achieve what we envisioned, namely to report back our research findings to the participants of the research, and mobilize farm dweller participants for the next workshop. Moreover, we do not know what impact it had or what happened with the information shared and exchanged. To a large degree this is beyond the control of researchers, especially since the research programme was coming to an end, and we were leaving ‘the field’ as researchers often do.

A couple of days later the follow-up workshop took place in one of the town’s museums. Again,

the participants were interested parties with no direct relation to the farms that were part of the research. A staff member of SCLC was the only participant who had attended the previous workshop as well. With the exception of some of the researchers and some local government officials, the majority of participants were white. When participants were invited to introduce themselves, the latter emphasized they had come in their private capacity. They explicitly disassociated themselves from any stakeholder label and refused to represent any specific group. Nevertheless, they were present and adopted discourses that protected white farmers' interests. Some stressed the need to reduce labour costs while at the same time calling for more skilled labourers. Some argued for the separation of employment from 'home' and land rights, promoting the idea of the establishment of agro-villages for workers in the region, suggesting the research group should formulate policy recommendations in support of this. Other voices challenged these views by talking about their experiences with power dynamics on the farms, for example inspectors from the labour department, who struggle to speak to workers alone, without presence of the farmers. Towards the end, the workshop facilitator pointed out that we had talked about farm dwellers as 'farm workers' throughout the evening, as if they will remain that forever. He asked what participants thought about their need for land, and their futures as farmers. In the days after the workshop, several participants told one of the team members that they felt discriminated against as white South Africans: "Certainly we don't want to 'reverse apartheid'" they said. For them, redistribution of land and rural transformation would mean an oppressive system dominated by black people. To consider giving up of privilege and property for the sake of a more egalitarian and democratic society seemed unimaginable, undesirable and frightening.

The last and third workshop took place at a university in Port Elizabeth. Again, people we had engaged with during other phases of the project were absent, except for the SCLC representative. At this workshop, the representative from Wildlife Ranching South Africa (WRSA) was very vocal about his dissatisfaction with the research findings. He accused the researchers of working with 'the wrong data' and made it very difficult to create space for other voices to be heard. In the discussions, government officials, including black people appointed after 1994, supported his claims that game farming generates employment, and that small-scale farming does not lead to development. During the tea break however, in private conversations with one of the researchers, some of the officials expressed different views which were much more supportive of farm dwellers and small-scale farmers. However, none of them aired these views in public, and interviews held after the workshop revealed that provincial authorities are very reluctant to consider land claims on game farms.

All three workshops faced issues with the representation of both farm dwellers and game farmers.

Those representing these groups - including the NGO staff - were not the people from the game farms who had participated during the research process. This raises questions about accountability, and the value and meaning of sharing research findings and engaging with 'conflict'. Whether these conflicts can be solved locally is a moot point. Provincial and district authorities could play a role by engaging with local stakeholders and taking land claims seriously, however, they lack resources and capacity, and – in this province – seemed to buy into the claim that game farming is a win-win strategy discourse.

The KwaZulu-Natal workshops; confrontation and repentance

For the KwaZulu-Natal workshops the team had the benefit of learning from the dynamics and experiences in the Eastern Cape, which certainly helped with conceptualising and implementing the workshops. However, our suggestion to start with a separate workshop for farm dwellers was rejected by the farm dwellers, as they wanted to engage directly with the game farmers. This was already an indication of the different dynamics in the area compared to the Eastern Cape. To facilitate farm dweller and land reform beneficiary participation, we organised transport for participants to and from the workshops. We also employed one of the researchers' field assistants 'Khanda' who interpreted and facilitated the workshops in isiZulu, to address the power dynamics of language.

We held three workshops in the province, one in the Provincial capital Pietermaritzburg, because several key government departments and NGOs are located there, and two in a small town near the case study sites. We decided on two workshops, hoping that this would facilitate attendance for as many stakeholders as possible, and each workshop had indeed about 20 participants. We invited stakeholders who had either been interviewed or otherwise participated in the research, as well as those whom the research participants recommended that we invite. All stakeholders were given the option to participate in all three workshops, and as expected, most farm dwellers, farmers and land beneficiaries took part in the town workshops, probably due to the proximity to the farms.

Just like in the Eastern Cape, the process of inviting participants relied heavily on being present in the area and our personal relationships with stakeholders. For the town workshops in particular, communication via email or phone calls was an option due to limited access for many stakeholders. An important difference was that in KwaZulu-Natal, the fieldwork was still ongoing. The team therefore saw the workshops as an opportunity to expand and elaborate on the fieldwork, and to explore new or additional aspects in collaboration with the stakeholders. We

made this clear in the workshop preparations as well as in the workshops and tried to open up for interpretations and trajectories that we had overlooked, or which were important to the participants.

In the town workshops, the participants consisted of white game farmers or farm managers, and black so-called land beneficiaries. The land beneficiaries were also game farmers, as they had been ‘encouraged’ to continue with game farming when on the land returned to them (Ngubane and Brooks 2013). However, the historical and political context of land dispossessions and land reform has generated a certain terminology that perpetuates the invisibility of black farm dwellers in other positions than recipients of decisions (Eriksson 2017; Ramutsindela 2012). In addition, there were farm workers and farm dwellers, land claimants and an *inkosi* (local chief) whose constituency includes one of the team members’ case study farms. Representatives of the provincial nature conservation agency Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife (Ezemvelo) and local tourism operators were also present. The participation of two land rights activists, both with long-standing experience in private property debates, land reform, and fighting dispossessions, functioned as both experts and stakeholders. Their experience was evident in how they claimed space and questioned mainstream discourse, in comparison to many other participants. This brings attention to how the format of multi-stakeholder workshops is something to be learned, and not a ‘given’ mode of communication or conflict resolution.

Despite our efforts to facilitate participation by farm dwellers, this was restricted. In one case the game farmer told one of the researchers that “his people” were not allowed to participate in the workshop because they had too much work to do. He did not participate himself either. Another game farmer phoned the same researcher and was very angry that she had spoken to “his staff” about the workshops and said that she was not supposed to invite anyone but him. In the end, very few white-owned farms had representation from workers or farm dwellers. In one case however, the farmer brought the man he considered to be the representative of his workers. All of this shows that participation was neither apolitical, nor considered an individual choice. The farmers still decided, directly or indirectly, who from ‘their farm’ that was allowed to participate. This resonates with the Eastern Cape experience of game farmers and game farmer representatives trying to control the research process as well as the workshops.

During fieldwork the team became aware of some very violent and traumatising events that farm dwellers had been through. Many had experienced farm evictions, either carried out by the State during apartheid, or enforced by farmers post-1994. There were farmers in the workshops who had been involved in conducting illegal evictions, and some of the people they had evicted were

present. The team had also come across several instances where farm dwellers had retaliated with various forms of violence against evictions and oppression. Nevertheless, despite these dynamics, the experiences in the two town workshops challenged our expectations. Once we were in the actual workshops, the narratives were far less dominated by those (we perceived as) being in positions of power than we had presumed. Based on the Eastern Cape experience, as well the antagonism that some farmers expressed during the workshop preparations, we had expected the game farmers to try to dominate the process. However, the discussions turned out to be far more equal in terms of sharing the space and allowing different voices than we had anticipated. At times there were open contestations, especially regarding land redistribution and land use; these debates got tense but never ended in open (aggressive) conflict.

During fieldwork, the team had observed that the farmers often spoke about their wrongdoings against 'people' (Africans) in the past and it was clear from the context that they were referring to the evictions. They confessed to having mistreated farm labour, as well as their own families (referring to alcohol abuse and abusive behaviour). These confessions appeared to be influenced by the Mighty Men movement (see Daily Maverick 2017: Online; Dube 2015; Nadar 2009), and the call from its leader Angus Buchan to white farmers to find their way back to God and become a kind of benevolent, but firm Christian patriarch (see www.mightymenconference.co.za). Many farmers mentioned the Mighty Men movement as a source of inspiration and guidance for their changed lives. This somewhat reflective and pious attitude revealed itself during the workshops as well, and, we believe, influenced participants' behaviour. On a couple of occasions farmers approached the researchers to explain how they are listening to 'the people' now, and how they have changed compared to how they used to behave in the past. It is possible that this contributed to farm dwellers' relative visibility in the workshops. Nonetheless, this 'new' identity does not challenge the existing power hierarchies. In fact, it allows farmers and landowners to maintain their positions as (this time 'benevolent') patriarchs and entrench their belonging in the farming landscape.

The participation of land activists, and the strong presence of advocacy and activist organisations in the province, also contributed to the more equal use of space in the workshops compared to the Eastern Cape. The fact that open contestations are common between the stakeholders most likely influenced the workshop dynamics as well. Farm dwellers are much more visible in the KwaZulu-Natal rural political landscapes, than farm dwellers in the Eastern Cape. Lastly, the stakeholders also found common ground in terms of their frustration with the State and their struggles with big capital ventures. The participating farmers owned fairly small-scale family farms. They felt that the state only focused on and invested in large-scale farming, which in general strengthened the

position of those who already possess significant capital and assets. Another shared frustration was the State's lack of clarity, action and support regarding land reform and labour rights, which was experienced as disempowering and fostering uncertainty. In many cases stakeholders have been waiting for years for resolution to claims and disputes, or for promised financial or material support. While the frustrations with the state and capital appeared genuine, and as suggested by one activist offered an opportunity for collaboration between the different stakeholders, the focus on a 'common enemy' could also serve to detract attention from conflicts and power imbalances between the stakeholders present.

Apart from representatives of the provincial conservation agency no other government departments participated, hence no responses to these frustrations were provided. In fact, most government representatives did not reply to the invitations, which makes it difficult to analyse their absence. However, at the workshop in the provincial capital, where the department of agriculture was represented, government officials publicly expressed more diverse views than those at the provincial workshop in Eastern Cape. While some supported game farming, others did question its validity in relation to land claims and land rights.

DISCUSSION

The main insight generated by the multi-stakeholder workshops and the engagement process was that the farm dwellers were not considered as active stakeholders in game farm conversion processes (cf. Bologna 2008), either by farmers or the state; though there were some notable differences between the two workshops series. Due to participation in on-going land reform procedures and experience with institutional processes, farm dwellers in KwaZulu-Natal were more visible in contestations over land and belonging. At the same time, patriarchal relations remained firmly in place, and were difficult to challenge. In the Eastern Cape contestations were entrenched in more 'hidden forms of resistance' (cf. Scott 1985) farm dwellers as well as game farmers who had participated in the research opted to not participate in the workshops at all.

Meaningful inclusion and participation (see Parkins and Mitchell 2005) of stakeholders proved very difficult and complex. In hindsight we have realised that we focused mainly on content, reporting back on our findings, and challenging the win-win discourse. Although we aimed to address the power disparities and include farm dwellers by organizing stepwise series of workshops, participation did not necessarily lead to meaningful engagements or transformation of power relations (cf. Cooke and Kothari 2001). In addition, the limited resources available to us for planning and preparations also had an impact on the engagement process. A clear example of this

is that we could not do follow-ups or assessments of the impacts of the research and the workshops.

An unexpected dynamic that emerged in one of the KwaZulu-Natal workshops was that the stakeholders found common ground in their frustration with the State and large-scale commercial farming. To some extent this fostered a discussion around shared experiences. However, the impacts of farm conversion as well as of land consolidation and market deregulation have significantly different impacts on farmers and landowners as compared to farm dwellers, who undoubtedly have suffered far worse adverse effects (Devereaux et al 2017; Brandt and Ncapayi 2016; Mkhize 2014; Connor 2014). In this regard, the discussion still did not address issues of power inequalities or the disparities in access to land and resources.

Positionality and the levels of trust and networks of research relationships shaped the workshop dynamics in both provinces. As researchers, we are often perceived or expected to possess some sort of unique or pivotal knowledge that could solve the problems at hand. This does not mean that we always enjoyed trust from the participants. On the contrary, we found that the academic position also brought about distrust in many cases, especially in the relationship with farmers and landowners once they felt the research findings might jeopardize their win-win narrative. At the same time, had it not been for inter-personal relationships it would have been near impossible to organise any workshops at all. Other stakeholders also held the privilege of being ‘experts’ in their specific fields, for example those representing the wildlife industry, nature conservation organisations, and the land activists. There was a bias towards those with formalized education and experience in the powerful sectors (see Derkzen and Bock 2007; Parkins and Mitchell 2005), in terms of who claimed to advocate ‘truths’ and best practices. This perpetuated the invisibility of farm dwellers and their chances to meaningfully participate.

This raises concerns as to who was allowed or felt comfortable to claim space in the workshops, and furthermore, who was considered to have the skills or knowledge to take decisions or come up with workable solutions. The question of which kind of knowledge or expertise takes preference is important here. In South Africa this is linked to a long-standing tradition of paternalism (Ewert and Du Toit 2005) and stereotypical ideas about ‘farm workers’ (Bolt 2017; Eriksson 2017; Waldman 1996). Farm dwellers’ invisibility means that they are often not considered being legitimate decision- or claim-makers. This is reflected in the problem of identifying the conflicts. Both the State and game farmers tend to claim that they know what is best for ‘their people’. But what about the farm dwellers themselves, and their knowledge? If trust is placed in experts who are also empowered to take decisions for others, the process of exclusion

deepens, as the control over the outcome is moved further away from those who depend most directly on the resource (Parkins and Mitchell 2005). Regarding farm dwellers in particular, policy-makers tend to have a limited understanding of their livelihood structures, which means that they are poorly recognized or represented in rural transformation programmes (Del Grande 2006).

Those in positions of power tend to be (more) visible in both process and outcomes (Faysse 2006; Edmunds and Wollenberg 2001). This brings us to issues of complicity and responsibilities for the impacts of our research, since we decided whom to invite and not to invite, how the workshops were conceptualised and conducted, and to some extent what was being discussed. In this regard we became stakeholders too, and potential drivers of change. Our findings and interpretations, as well as the knowledge we generated, shaped the stakeholder engagement and the workshop dynamics, dispelling the myth of researchers as neutral or objective (Edmunds and Wollenberg 2001). Yet, as far as we could tell, in sharing and engaging with participants in the research findings, we were not able to influence power disparities during the workshops, or convince participants of the problems with the dominant discourse on game farming as a win-win strategy for conservation and development.

CONCLUSION: WHOSE RESILIENCE?

While the call for more stakeholder involvement in sustainability sciences is laudable, our experiences show that this is a far from a straightforward process. Our reflections have revealed that the question of who is considered a stakeholder or legitimate claimant shapes both conflicts and resilience. Similarly, the question should be asked: whose resilience is strengthened or enhanced, on the basis of what kind of politics that are reflected in multi-stakeholder engagements? The rationale behind the call is partly related to a desire to be inclusive, and partly pragmatic in the hope that this will result in more support for and smoother implementation of solutions (Mauser et al. 2013). The latter suggests a focus on outcome, rather than process, which can be quite problematic, as already suggested (cf. Parker and Mitchell 2005). Instead, meaningful and inclusive stakeholder engagement requires significant attention to process (Barnaud and Van Paassen 2013; Parker and Mitchell 2005). Insights into contexts and power configurations are crucial, especially if one wants to avoid domination by the group who is already better positioned to assert their ideas and needs. As Barnaud and Van Paassen (2013) indicate, developing these insights takes time, and hence renders the call for immediate co-creation of research problematic if there are not sufficient resources to address power inequalities and local dynamics. In our

research programme, these insights were developed over time, and may have served as a starting point for multi-stakeholder engagements.

The structural inequalities between the various stakeholders, as well as the scale of the problems we studied, limited our abilities to explore possible solutions. We were in no position to take decisions or offer solutions that could change or shift power relations or policies, and this may have resulted in farm dwellers withdrawing from the process. It also made it difficult to develop clear directives for the workshops, as well as (realistic) outcomes and objectives. To explore the value and impacts of the workshops and our research more in-depth, in ways that would have any crucial outcome for the farm dwellers, we would need an extension of the project far beyond the period and scope for which funding was obtained (see also Faysse 2006). In KwaZulu-Natal, the workshops contributed to generating new insights and findings to a greater extent than the workshops in the Eastern Cape, due to the fact that the workshops took place during on-going fieldwork. Some follow-up research and stakeholder engagement did take place after the research came to an end, but from different institutions and with different sources of funding, through post-doctoral fellowships and researchers pursuing careers in academia beyond the life of the NWO-WOTRO programme. These, over time, may help to generate further insights in the impacts of the project.

From the funder's perspective, the workshops were meant to contribute to conflict resolution, based on an implicit notion of consensus being a desirable outcome. However, in our case this turned out to be problematic. As many natural resource conflicts are about the distribution of costs and benefits, win-win solutions may not always be an option. The redistribution of costs, benefits and risks is inherently a political issue, and addressing the needs of marginal stakeholders means that more powerful ones need to give up some of their privileges. In our case, the conflicts are related to the land question in South Africa, which is a conflict rooted in more than 100 years of systematic dispossession. The negotiated settlement and the colonial and apartheid legacies in terms of governance structures and politics are actually part of the 'problem' (see also Voß and Bornemann 2011). In the context of game farming, land issues intersect with wildlife politics and post-apartheid land reform, as well as claims to belonging and continued violent dispossessions (Brandt 2016; Spierenburg and Brooks 2014; Josefsson 2014). In the light of this, it was not possible to resolve cases of land-based conflicts through a limited number of multi-stakeholder engagements, as enabling inclusion and agency for farm dwellers requires a long-term and committed process. Furthermore, game farming is not a technical or economic issue, but it is political, and therefore requires a political solution.

In our research, participants had different assumptions about reality and their futures, although this was not always made explicit. Farm dwellers were still positioned as eternal labourers, and not as potential landowners or farmers. Conservation politics in South Africa are enabled by the protection of private property, the increasing commodification of nature, and the assumption these are suitable arrangements to enhance both ecological resilience and social transformation without one compromising the other. In light of this, the (in-)visibility of farm dwellers is not just a matter of their presence in multi-stakeholder workshops; it involves understanding and acknowledging that nature conservation, game farming and socio-ecological resilience are political issues. The underlying violent and oppressive power structures in which farm conversions take place shaped the workshops perhaps more than we were aware of at the time. This realisation reinforces our conclusion that if we fail to consider power and politics explicitly as researchers, we risk neglecting important conflicts and reproducing the invisibility of marginalized stakeholders.

LITERATURE CITED

- AFRA (Association for Rural Advancement). 2004. Investigation of the Effects of Conservation and Tourism on Land Tenure and Ownership Patterns in KwaZulu-Natal. (Unpublished report phase 1, September 15.) McIntosh Xaba & Associates, Pietermaritzburg.
- Aliber, M., Baiphethi, M., de Satge, R., Denison, J., Hart, T., Jacobs, P. and van Averbek, W. 2009. Strategies to Support South African Smallholders as a Contribution to Government's Second Economy Strategy. Volume 1: Situation Analysis, Fieldwork Findings and Main Conclusions.
- Barnaud, C. and Van Paassen, A. 2013. Equity, Power Games, and Legitimacy: Dilemmas of Participatory Natural Resource Management. *Ecology and Society*, 18(2).
- Balvanera, P., T. M. Daw, T. Gardner, B. Martín-López, A. Norström, C. Ifejika Speranza, M. Spierenburg, E. M. Bennett, M. Farfan, M. Hamann, J. N. Kittinger, T. Luthe, M. Maass, G. D. Peterson, and G. Pérez-Verdin. 2017. Key Features for More Successful Place-based Sustainability Research on Social-ecological Systems: a Programme on Ecosystem Change and Society (PECS) perspective. *Ecology and Society* 22(1): 14. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08826-220114>
- Bolt, M. 2017. Becoming and Unbecoming Farm Workers in Southern Africa, *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 40:4, 241-247, DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2017.1406313.
- Bologna, SA. 2008. Stakeholders and Stickholders. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 31(3&4): 123-130.
- Brandt, F. 2013. Tracking an Invisible Great Trek. An Ethnography on the Re-configuration of Power and Belonging on Trophy-hunting Farms in the Karoo. (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.)

VU University.

- Brandt, F. and Josefsson, J. 2017. Sexuality and Power on South African Game Farms; Reflections on Positionality and Emotions in Ethnographic Research. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 23: 26-32.
- Brandt, F. 2016. Power Battles on South African trophy-hunting farms: Farm Workers, Resistance and mobility in the Karoo. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02589001.2016.1200244>
- Brandt, F. and Mkodzongi, G. (Eds.) 2018. *Land Reform Revisited: Democracy, State Making and Agrarian Transformation in Post-apartheid South Africa*. Leiden: Brill Publishers.
- Brandt, F. and Ncapayi, F. 2016. The Meaning of Compliance with Land and Labour Legislation: Understanding Justice Through Farm Workers' Experiences in the Eastern Cape. *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 39(3): 215-231.
- Brandt, F. and Spierenburg, M. 2014. Game Fences in the Karoo: Reconfiguring Spatial and Social Relations. *Journal of contemporary African Studies*, 32: 220-237.
- Brooks, S., Spierenburg, M., Van Brakel, L., Kolk, A. and Lukhozi, K.B. 2011. Creating a Commodified Wilderness: Tourism, Game Farming, and 'Third Nature' Landscapes in KwaZulu-Natal. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 102 (3):260-274. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9663.2011.00662.x
- Connor, T. 2014. *Conserved Spaces, Ancestral Places: Conservation, History and Identity among Farm Labourers in the Sundays River Valley, South Africa*. Pietermaritzburg: UKZN Press.
- Cooke, B., and U. Kothari. (Eds.) 2001. *Participation: The New Tyranny?* London: Zed books.
- Cundill, G., Roux, D. J., and Parker, J. N. 2015. Nurturing Communities of Practice for Transdisciplinary Research. *Ecology and Society*, 20(2), 22.
- Daily Maverick 2018. 'Is Government Going to Consult Us on Expropriation?' – Farm Dwellers. 7 March 2018. <<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2018-03-07-op-ed-is-government-going-to-consult-us-on-expropriation-farm-dwellers/#.WqqDYmrFLIU>> Downloaded 15 March 2017.
- Daily Maverick 2017. 'Analysis: The Gospel According to Angus Buchan'. 24 April 2017. <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2017-04-24-analysis-the-gospel-according-to-angus-buchan/#.WTBY1OvyjIU> Downloaded 30 May 2017.
- Daily Maverick 2015. Farm Attacks: If Only the Issue Were Just Black and White. 25 August: Online. <<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2015-08-25-farm-attacks-if-only-the-issue-were-just-black-and-white/>> Downloaded 20 September 2017.

- Deppisch, S., & Hasibovic, S. 2013. Social-ecological Resilience Thinking as a Bridging Concept in Transdisciplinary Research on Climate-change Adaptation. *Natural hazards*, 67(1), 117-127.
- Del Grande, L. 2006. The Transformation of Farming in South Africa and Africa: The Case of Farm Dwellers in South Africa. AFRA
- Devereux, S., G. Levendal., and Yde, E. 2017. “*The Farmer does not recognise who makes him rich*”: understanding the labour conditions of women farm workers in the Western Cape and the Northern Cape, South Africa. Women on Farms.
- Dube, S. 2015. Muscular Christianity in contemporary South Africa: The Case of the Mighty Men Conference, *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 71(3), Art. #2945, 9 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i3.2945>
- Du Toit, A. 1993. “The Micro-Politics of Paternalism: The Discourse of Management and resistance on South African Fruit and Wine Farms.” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 19 (2): 314–336.
- ECARP/SCLC. 2006. Advancing Positive Land Rights and Sustainable Livelihoods for Rural Communities. Unpublished report, Grahamstown: ECARP in co-operation with the Southern Cape Land Committee.
- Edmunds, D. and Wollenberg, E. 2001. A Strategic Approach to Multistakeholder Negotiations. *Development and Change*, 32: 231-253. DOI: 10.1111/1467-7660.00204
- Eriksson, A. 2017. Farm worker identities contested and reimagined: gender, race/ethnicity and nationality in the post-strike moment, *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 40(4): 248-260, DOI: 10.1080/23323256.2017.1401484.
- Evans, L. K. 2010. The Makings and meanings of Homeland Spaces: a social history of resettlement in the Ciskei, 1960 - 1976. (Unpublished PhD thesis.) University of Sheffield.
- Ewert, J. and Du Toit, A. 2005. "A Deepening Divide in the Countryside: Restructuring and Rural Livelihoods in the South African Wine Industry " *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 31 (2): 315-332.
- Faysse, N. 2006. Troubles on the Way: An Analysis of the Challenges Faced by Multi-stakeholder Platforms. *Natural Resources Forum*, 30: 219–229.
- Fisher, E., M. Bavinck and A. Amsalu (forthcoming) Transforming conflicts over natural resources in the Global South for social-ecological resilience – an introduction, *Ecology and Society*
- Fraser, A. 2008. White Farmers’ Dealings with Land Reform in South Africa: Evidence from Northern Limpopo Province. *Tijdschrift Voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 99(1): 24-36
- Hall, R. 2007. Transforming Rural South Africa? Taking stock of Land Reform. In Ntsebeza, L.

- and Hall, R. (Eds). *The Land Question in South Africa: The Challenge of Transformation and Redistribution*. Cape Town: HSRC press.
- Josefsson, J. 2014. Safe-guarding the colonial present: game farms on the frontier in KwaZulu-Natal's 'Battlefields Route'. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32(2), pp.258-274.
- Kamuti, T. 2016. Private Wildlife Governance in a Context of Radical Uncertainty. Dynamics of Game Farming Policy and Practice in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis.) University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, and the VU University, Amsterdam.
- Kamuti, T. 2014. The Fractures State in the Governance of Private Game Farming: The Case of KwaZulu-Natal Province, South Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32, 2: 190-206.
- Larson, A. and J. Ribot, J. 2004. Democratic decentralisation through a natural resource lens: an introduction. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 16(1): 1-25.
- Mail and Guardian 2013. Are Whites Really Being Killed 'like flies?' 10 October: Online. <<https://mg.co.za/article/2013-10-10-are-sa-whites-really-being-killed-like-flies>> Downloaded 20 September 2017.
- Manby, B. 2002. A Failure of Rural Protection. *Transformation*, 49: 86-104.
- Mausser, W., Klepper, G., Rice, M., Schmalzbauer, B. S., Hackmann, H., Leemans, R., and Moore, H. 2013. Transdisciplinary Global Change Research: The Co-creation of Knowledge for Sustainability. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 5(3): 420-431.
- McClendon, T. V. 2002. *Genders and Generations Apart: Labour Tenants and Customary Law in Segregation-era South Africa 1920s to 1940s*. James Currey Ltd.: Oxford.
- McClendon, T. V. 1995. *Genders and Generations Apart: Labor Tenants, Law, Domestic Struggle in Natal, South Africa, 1918-1944*. (Unpublished Ph.D thesis.) Stanford University
- Mighty Men Conference 2017. www.mightymenconference.co.za. Accessed 30 May 2017.
- Mkhize, N. 2012. Private Game Farms and the Tenure Security of Farm Workers and Dwellers in Cradock: Implications for Tenure Reform in South Africa. (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.) University of Cape Town.
- Mkhize, N. 2014. Game Farm Conversions and the Land Question: Unpacking Present Contradictions and Historical Continuities in Farm Dwellers' Tenure Insecurity in Cradock. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32 (2): 207–219.
- Nadar, S. 2009. Palatable patriarchy and violence against wo/men in South Africa - Angus Buchan's Mighty Men's Conference as a Case Study of Masculinism. *Scriptura: International Journal of Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa* Volume 102(1):551 - 561.
- NAMC. 2006. Report on Investigation to Identify Problems for Sustainable Growth and

Development in South African Wildlife Ranching: National Agricultural Marketing Council.

- Ngubane, M. and Brooks, S. 2013. Land Beneficiaries as Game Farmers: Conservation, Land Reform and the Invention of the ‘Community Game Farm’ in KwaZulu-Natal. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 31(3): 399-420.
- Ntsebeza, L. 2013. “South Africa’s Countryside: Prospects for Change from Below.” In Hendricks, F.T, Ntsebeza, L. and Helliker, K. (Eds.) *The Promise of Land: Undoing a Century of Dispossession in South Africa*, pp. 130–158. Auckland Park: Jacana.
- Parkins, J.R. and R.E. Mitchell. 2005. Public Participation as Public Debate: A Deliberative Turn in Natural Resource Management. *Society and Natural Resources*, 18 (6):529-540. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08941920590947977>
- Peires, J. 1981. *The House of Phalo: A History of the Xhosa in the Days of their Independence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Platzky, L. and Walker, C. 1985. *The Surplus People: Forced Removals in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Ramutsindela, M. 2012. Property Rights, Land Tenure and the Racial Discourses. *GeoJournal*, 77: 753-763.
- Ramutsindela, M. 2007. *Transfrontier Conservation in Africa: At the Confluence of Capital, Politics and Nature*. Cabi.
- Reuters. 2016. South Africa to limit farm sizes to speed up land redistribution. 21 May by Ed Stoddard. <<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-safrica-landrights-reform/south-africa-to-limit-farm-sizes-to-speed-land-redistribution-idUSKCN0YC0GJ>> Accessed 18 April 2018.
- Scott, J., C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: everyday forms of peasant resistance*. Yale University Press.
- South African Parliament. 2010. “39,982 commercial farmers in SA – Minister”, 30 August 2010 National Assembly – written reply to question 2019, 6 August, 2010
- Snijders, D. 2015. Shifting Species in South Africa: Wildlife Policy, Rural Consequences. (Unpublished PhD Thesis.) VU University Amsterdam.
- Snijders, D. 2014. Wildlife Policy Matters: Inclusion and Exclusion by Means of Organisational and Discursive Boundaries. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32, 2: 173-189.
- Spierenburg, M. and S. Brooks. 2014. Private Game Farming and Its Social Consequences in Post-apartheid South Africa: Contestations over Wildlife, Property, and Agrarian Futures. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 32 (2): 151-172.
- Spierenburg, M., Wels, H. van der Waal, K. and Robins, S. 2009. Transfrontier Tourism, Relations Between Local Communities and the Private Sector in the Great Limpopo

- Transfrontier Park. In: Hottola, P. (Ed.) 2009. *Tourism Strategies and Local Responses in Southern Africa*, Wallingford: CABI, 167-182.
- SPP (Surplus Peoples Project). 1985. *The Surplus Peoples Project: Natal Volume, Volume 4*. Cape Town: The Surplus People Project and Pietermaritzburg: AFRA.
- Taylor, A., Lindsey, P. and Davies-Mostert, H. (2016). With contributions from M. Child, I. Little, G. Martindale and S. Page. An Assessment of the Economic, Social and Conservation Value of the Wildlife Industry and Its Potential to Support the Green Economy in South Africa. Research report prepared under the research funding programme 'Research and Policy Development to Advance a Green Economy in South Africa'. Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa, Greenfund, and the Development Bank of Southern Africa.
- Tengö, M., Hill, R., Malmer, P., CM., Raymond, CM., Spierenburg, M., Danielsen, F., Elmqvist, T. and Folke, C. 2017. Weaving knowledge systems in IPBES, CBD and beyond – lessons learned for sustainability, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability* 26/29: 17-25
- Van Sittert, L. 2005. Bringing in the Wild: The Commodification of Wild Animals in the Cape Colony Province in c. 1850–1950. *Journal of African History* 46: 269–291.
- Van Sittert, L. 2002. Holding the Line: The Rural Enclosure Movement in the Cape Colony, c. 1865–1910. *Journal of African History* 43: 95–118.
- Van Zyl, J., Kirsten, J. Binswanger, H. P. 1996. *Agricultural land reform in South Africa: policies, markets and mechanisms*. Oxford University Press Southern Africa.
- Van Zyl, Vink, Kirsten, and Poonyth, D. 2001. South African Agriculture in Transition: the 1990s. *Journal of International Development*, 13: 725-739.
- Voß, JP. and Borneman, B. 2011. The Politics of Reflexive Governance: Challenges for Designing Adaptive Management and Transition Management. *Ecology and Society*, 16(2): 9. URL: <http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol16/iss2/art9/>
- Waldman, L. 1996. Monkey in a Spiderweb: The Dynamics of Farmer Control and Paternalism. *African Studies* 55(1): 62-86.
- Wels, H. 2015. “‘Animals Like Us’: Revisiting Organizational Ethnography and Research.” *Journal of Organizational Ethnography* 4 (3): 242–259.
- Wilderman 2015. “From Flexible Work to Mass Uprising: The Western Cape Farm Workers’ Struggle.” Working Paper 4. Society, Work and Development Institute, University of the Witwatersrand.
- Williams, G., Ewert, J., Hamann, J and Vink, N. 1998 Liberalizing Markets and Reforming Land in South Africa *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*. 16:65–94