



Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences
Department of Urban and Rural Development
Bachelor thesis, a “Minor Field Study”
HT 08, 2008

“The Baby of the Government”

*-A case study of the implementation of the Massive Food Production
Programme and genetically modified maize into smallholder farming in rural
South Africa*

Authors: Anna Nilsson and Hanna Karlsson

Supervisor: Klara Jacobson

Table of contents

<i>Abstract</i>	4
<i>Sammanfattning</i>	5
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	6
<i>Definition of concepts</i>	7
1. Introduction	8
1.1 Research questions, purpose and assumptions	9
1.2 Background and the choice of study region	10
1.2.1 Maps over South Africa and Eastern Cape	12
1.2.2 Bt-maize	14
1.2.3 Massive Food Production Programme (MFPP)	14
1.2.4 Theoretical background	15
1.2.4.1 "Putting the last first" - Robert Chambers	15
1.2.4.2 "African Identity and the Postcolonial" - Maria Eriksson-Baaz	16
2. Methodology	17
2.1 Methods in Xopozo	17
2.2 Methods with external actors	19
2.3 Interpreters and language	19
3. Analysis	20
3.1 Planning and initial purposes of Massive Food Production Programme	21
3.1.1 Villager's impressions of the goals of MFPP	23
3.1.2 MFPP was planned with a top-down approach	23
3.1.3 Structure of MFPP on local level	24
3.1.4 The involvement of input suppliers in the planning process	24
3.1.5 Introduction of new agricultural technologies and no-till practices	25
3.2 Outcomes of Massive Food Production Programme:	25
3.2.1 Selection of areas and participants in MFPP	25
3.2.2 Late deliveries of inputs in the initial phase of MFPP	26
3.2.3 The payment plan.....	27
3.2.4 The the employment of contractors.....	28
3.2.5 Large units of land in MFPP	29
3.3 MFPP, input suppliers and genetically modified crops	29
3.3.1 Monsanto as input supplier in MFPP	29
3.3.2 Monsanto's role in MFPP	30
3.3.3 Monsanto in Xopozo	30
3.3.4 Seed varieties in MFPP used in Xopozo.....	30
3.3.5 Training arranged by Monsanto in Xopozo.....	31
3.3.6 The usage of genetically modified crops in MFPP	32
3.4 Reasons why MFPP failed according to stakeholders	33
3.4.1 Images of "the rural poor"	34
3.4.2 Are farmers not motivated enough?.....	35
4. Discussion	36
4.1 Views about rural poverty	36
4.2 MFPP as a top down approach	36

4.3 The aims of MFPP.....	37
4.4 Technical solutions in MFPP	38
4.5 Information and genetically modified crops from ECDA	39
4.6 Reflections on our role as outsiders.....	39
6.7 Conclusion 1: the planning and implementation of MFPP	40
6.8 Conclusion 2: the usage of GM crops in MFPP	40
5. <i>List of references</i>	41
5.1 Articles, books and reports	41
5.2 Oral sources:.....	44
5.3 Personal Communication:	45
6. <i>Appendix</i>	46
6.1 Interview plan ECDA	46
6.2 Interview plan Monsanto.....	51
6.3 Interview plan Xopozo.....	54

Abstract

Massive Food Production Programme (MFPP) is a development programme initiated by the South African state with the aim of increasing the agricultural production and generating economic development. The initial plan of the programme was to improve the quality of life in rural areas by changing the smallholders' agricultural techniques and make them adopt methods of industrial agriculture and modern seed varieties. The agro-chemical company Monsanto has an important role in MFPP, as an input supplier as well as a provider of technical advice. In some of the villages that participated in MFPP the smallholders have been growing genetically modified maize, as did the villagers in Xopozo. Xopozo is a rural village in the province Eastern Cape where part of the fieldwork of this study was made. The purpose of this study is to investigate how the objectives, implementation and results of MFPP have been interpreted by different actors. MFPP has failed or been stopped before the planned ending date in many villages where it was implemented. We attempted to analyse the reasons for this failure. The study also includes an analysis of the introduction of genetically modified crops in MFPP, how this corresponds with the objectives and how the usage was interpreted by different actors in MFPP. The study is based on interviews with officials at different levels within the Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture (ECDA), agricultural extension officers involved in MFPP representatives from Monsanto and villagers in Xopozo. The methods employed are mainly semi-structured interviews but also PRA methods and observations. Our conclusion is that MFPP is a top-down planned programme, and that there has not been any possibility for the participating smallholders to affect its planning or implementation. Lack of information within MFPP explains a part of the failure of the programme. The actors interpreted the objectives and the purpose of the programme in different ways. The lack of information and participation from smallholders are important factors to why MFPP failed. Another important factor behind the failure are the views on poverty and development coming from the ECDA. MFPP is merely offering technical solutions in form of increased food production. Because of the focus of increasing food production genetically modified crops match the objectives of MFPP. This focus in combination with the views about poor people as lazy, passive and irrational has contributed to the failure of MFPP.

Sammanfattning

Massive Food Production Programme (MFPP) är ett utvecklingsprogram, initierat av den sydafrikanska staten med ändamål att öka jordbruksproduktionen och där igenom att generera ekonomisk utveckling. Den ursprungliga planen för programmet var att förbättra livssituationen för småbrukare på landsbygden genom att få dem att använda konventionella jordbrukstekniker och utsädessorter. Det agrokemiska företaget Monsanto har varit en viktig aktör i MFPP, som leverantör och som deltagare i form av rådgivning. I vissa av de byar som medverkade i MFPP odlades genmodifierad majs, exempelvis i Xopozo. Xopozo är den by på landsbygden i Eastern Cape där vi har genomfört delar av vårt fältarbete. Studien syftade till att undersöka hur programmets mål, utförande samt resultat uppfattas av olika aktörer inom MFPP. Eftersom MFPP i flera fall misslyckades och har avbrutits i förtid på många platser har vi analyserat bakomliggande faktorer för misslyckandet. Studien innefattar också en analys av hur användandet av genmodifierade grödor överensstämmer med målen och hur användandet av dessa har tolkats av olika aktörer inom MFPP. Materialet som denna studie baseras på består av intervjuer med tjänstemän på olika nivåer på jordbruksdepartementet i Eastern Cape (ECDA), rådgivare inom MFPP, representanter från Monsanto och bybor i Xopozo. Som metod för insamling av data har främst semistrukturerade intervjuer används, och i viss utsträckning även PRA- metoder samt direktobservationer.

Vår slutsats är att MFPP var ett toppstyrt program utan möjligheter för deltagarna att påverka planering och utförande. Detta grundas på ett dåligt fungerande informationsflöde inom MFPP och aktörernas olika tolkningar av programmets mål, syfte och implementering. Bristen på information samt bristen på deltagande är viktiga faktorer som resulterade MFPP:s misslyckade. Utmärkande i denna studie är synen hos aktörer vid ECDA på fattigdom och utveckling. På grund av ECDA:s fokusering vid ökad livsmedelsproduktion så matchar användandet av genmodifierade grödor programmets mål. Detta fokus i kombination med en syn på fattiga som lata, passiva och irrationella har bidragit till MFPP:s misslyckades.

List of Abbreviations

Bt	<i>Bacillus thuringiensis</i>
DoA	Department of Agriculture
GM	Genetically Modified
EC	Eastern Cape Province
ECDA	Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture
MFPP	Massive Food Production Programme
PGDP	Provincial Growth and Development Plan
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
TRACOR	The Transkei Agricultural Corporation

Definition of concepts

<i>Developing country</i>	Mainly defined by low levels of living, high rate of population growth, low income per capita and general economic and technological dependence of developed economies. ¹
<i>GM-crop</i>	In this thesis GM-crop is used as an abbreviation for a genetically modified crop or plant. A genetically modified crop, or a GM-crop is genetically modified where the genetic material has been altered genetically with the intention to create a change in the plant that cannot occur by itself in nature ²
<i>Industrial agriculture</i>	A form of agriculture, relying on high inputs and uses high yield varieties (most common in developed countries). ³
<i>No-till</i>	Farming without tillage (e.g. without turning the soil) that includes methods of planting and weed control without ploughing. ⁴
<i>Smallholder.</i>	Diverse agro-ecological zones and population densities make it necessary to use different kinds of criteria for defining smallholders in different parts of the world. In high populated areas the definition of smallholders are those who have access of less than one hectare of land or handle ten head of livestock. ⁵ In our case in Xopozo smallholders are generally people in highly populated rural areas with about one hectare of land per family.

¹ Todaro & Smith, 2006: p. 810

² <http://www.un.org/esa/documents/ecosoc/cn17/2000/ecn172000-7add2.htm>, 10.12.08

³ <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/005/AC621E/ac621e05.htm>, 07.12.08

⁴ <http://www.123exp-food.com/agriculture>, 07.12.08

⁵ Dixon, Tanyeri-Abur & Wattenbach (2004)

1. Introduction

The area now called Eastern Cape consists of two former “homelands” which were created for certain ethnical groups with “African” background to live during the Apartheid era. These former homelands are marked by environmental destruction and overpopulation due to the fact that too many people were forced to live on too little space.⁶ During Apartheid the “migrant labour system” resulted in that a big part of the able-bodied worked outside the reserves (often in industries or mines). Due to this, agriculture in the homelands was not often prioritised⁷. Still today it is common that the young and healthy migrate to urban areas searching for jobs. Although almost all rural households in Eastern Cape have a small garden and a field, agriculture is seldom more than a part of the livelihoods and people are relying on other sources of income (such as piece jobs, small business or grants)⁸. Today, 14 years after Apartheid, people are no longer forced to stay in these reserves but few educational possibilities and high unemployment causes difficulties for great portions of the population of Eastern Cape⁹. Rural people may not be farmers –they are just poor people that happen to live in rural areas.¹⁰

There is a high political motivation for the government to change the situation for the rural poor in South Africa. One of the governmental actions is the agricultural development programme *Massive Food Production Programme (MFPP)*. MFPP is run by the Department of Agriculture in Eastern Cape (ECDA). The programme is meant to facilitate increased agricultural production and to bring economic development to the province.¹¹ MFPP aims to make use of the fertile uncultivated agricultural land in rural Eastern Cape. In a short time the ECDA wanted to establish a large scale agricultural production in these uncultivated areas. MFPP intended to introduce a high level of inputs, a big amount of hectares with many actors involved (farmers, suppliers, extension officers etc.).¹²

This is a case study that intends to compare the initial plan of MFPP with how it has been implemented in one village, mainly focusing on the ideas about the aim and outcome of the programme among different actors. We have looked at views of officials working on different levels at ECDA and employees at the company Monsanto, key persons in the village Xopozo (the chief and the steering committee) as well as households there. Xopozo is a rural village in Eastern Cape. The village participated in MFPP for four years from 2003 to 2007. Central actors and households in Xopozo have been interviewed about how MFPP was implemented. Observations and interviews were made to get an idea of how the actual outcome of the MFPP has been in this village. Monsanto is one of many input suppliers in MFPP and the company provided inputs and training for the villagers in Xopozo. The participants of MFPP in Xopozo have been growing the genetically modified (GM) maize, Bt-maize. The issue of genetically modified crops is controversial in the development debate, in South Africa like as in the rest of the world regarding the benefits, risks and

⁶ Andrew & Fox, 2004: 694-95, Haag & Hajdu, 2005: 483 f and Bank & Minkley, 2001: 21

⁷ Haag, F & Hajdu, F, 2005: 487

⁸ Ntsebeza, 1999: 34 f, Damgaard Hansen, 2006: 11

⁹ Bank & Minkley, 2005: 21

¹⁰ Ntsebeza, 1999: p 34

¹¹ ECDA- Massive Food Production Programme (planning document ECDA)

¹² Daamgard Hansen, 2006: 7

suitability of the technology for smallholders and the agricultural sector in developing countries¹³. The GM-technology is often proposed as a solution for poor rural smallholder farming because of the potential of increasing agricultural production¹⁴. On the other hand, critics against the introduction of GM-crops with poverty reducing purposes into smallholder farming, argues that those technical solutions directs the focus towards increased agricultural production. As a result of this the critiques fears that the factual causes of rural poverty (like for example social circumstances and power relations) will be neglected¹⁵.

The title of this thesis; “The baby of the government” is taken from one of our interviews with an employee at ECDA. “The baby” in this case is referring to MFPP. We believe that this phrase captures the main features of the planning and implementation of MFPP, the participants of MFPP did not feel that they were a part of the programme and furthermore the ECDA claims that the participants did not put enough effort into the programme.

1.1 Research questions, purpose and assumptions

- 1) *How has the state supported Massive Food Production Programme worked from the perspective of local realities, and how and why do the ideas about the aim and output of the program differ between the Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture, the seed company Monsanto and the local people in the village Xopozo, Eastern Cape, South Africa?*
- 2) *In what way was the introduction of GM maize connected to the aims of the MFPP in general and how did the different actors in the process (from the Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture, Monsanto and the smallholders) understand the aims and the use of GM maize in the small farmer setting?*

This study aims to investigate the planning, implementation and outcomes of MFPP during the project time in Xopozo. According to information that we had prior to our field work (from a previous MSc thesis on the MFPP by Damgaard Hansen (2006))¹⁶ and from personal communication with our supervisor, PhD student Klara Jacobson) it seems to us that the outcomes of MFPP had not been as good as it was intended in Xopozo, and it looked like many other villages also preformed poorly in the programme. The aims of MFPP to make smallholders produce enough maize to be self sufficient but also to enable them to produce enough so that they can sell¹⁷ did seldom seem to have work.

We will investigate the implementation of MFPP in Xopozo, based on interviews and observations as along with the study of other work made on the MFPP (e.g. Damgaard Hansen).

Our focus will be on different actor’s opinions and experiences about MFPP since we believe that there are possible differences in how the programme was viewed and understood. We

¹³ Personal communication with Swanby, H, African Centre for Biosafety, and Pschorn-Strauss, E, GRAIN Africa (2008). Pschorn-Strauss, E & Swanby, H, <http://www.grain.org/m/?id=201>, (2008-11-26.), Pschorn-Strauss, E. (2004)

¹⁴ Wambugu (1999), Chrispeels (2000), Machuka (2001)

¹⁵ Glover (2003), Scoones (2002)

¹⁶ Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁷ Massive Food Production Scheme (planning document from ECDA)

think this is an important part in why the programme did not deliver as it was planned. How do these opinions differ between the Department of Agriculture in Eastern Cape (ECDA), Monsanto and the smallholders that participated in the programme? We will also discuss why these opinions differed, although this is complex and we don't believe that we will come to a clear answer. But we still believe that this is an important discussion and that our outsiders view on this case might contribute with some new ways of viewing the issue.

Since Monsanto is the company that has been supplying Xopozo with genetically modified maize in MFPP, we have also carried out interviews with representatives from Monsanto. This was done to understand how the introduction of GM maize suited the goals of MFPP and how well integrated the introduction of the GM maize was in the MFPP. What were the hopes that GM maize could deliver within MFPP and how has it worked in the local setting? Based on our pre-existing knowledge of MFPP before we started our fieldwork, as well as the writings by Chambers (1983), we assume that the failure of MFPP is a product of lack of understanding, participation and information between the groups involved in the programme. MFPP is a programme planned and run by the ECDA, the lack of participation from smallholders in the planning and running of the programme contributed to the negative outcomes of MFPP.

1.2 Background and the choice of study region

Eastern Cape is South Africa's largest province in geographical size and the third largest province regarding population¹⁸. The majority of the population in Eastern Cape lives in rural areas¹⁹. Agricultural production is seen as being low and insufficient and few farmers in the area are producing a surplus according to research executed in the area²⁰. There is potential for the agricultural production to increase if industrial agricultural methods should be used to a greater extent than at the present²¹. To develop the agricultural sector in a large-scale industrial direction is prioritised as a poverty reduction strategy by the South African government and therefore of high priority²². In the development debate about the "new" South Africa, areas of former homelands are of main concern for new development strategies by the government. But even though the creation of new laws, policies and governmental programmes is targeting rural poor today there is still a long way to go.²³ With a history distinctly shaped by colonialism, segregation and on top of that, apartheid, big social and economical inequality has risen in Eastern Cape²⁴.

Eastern Cape includes two former "homelands" (Transkei and Ciskei) that were designed as living areas for black South Africans during the time of apartheid regime²⁵. Betterment planning schemes were introduced in the homelands by the South African apartheid regime from 1930 to 1994, and aimed to generate economic growth with focus on agriculture. This was done through converting the use of rural land and resources and had big social and

¹⁸ Haag & Hajdu, 2005: 483-494

¹⁹ Nel & Davies, 1999: 1 f

²⁰ Andrew & Fox, 2004: 688 and McAllish, 2000: 1

²¹ McAllister (2000)

²² Nel & Davies, 1999: 5 ff

²³ Hajdu, F (2006)

²⁴ Ntsebeza, N, 1999: 8, Hajdu (2006)

²⁵ Haag & Hajdu, 2005: 483 f

environmental consequences for the rural population²⁶. The planners of the betterment schemes often had a view of the rural livelihoods that did not correspond with the reality. Policy makers and planners often lived in urban centres with minimum interaction with rural people. Therefore they had little knowledge about rural life and priorities of local people. Furthermore people in rural areas had minimal influence in decision making regarding the development programmes.²⁷

One type of development programme that was implemented was maize production schemes, arranged by an outside agency (in Transkei this was commonly arranged by TRACOR – The Transkei Agricultural Corporation) in collaboration with the local Department of Agriculture. The maize production schemes aimed to mechanise small scale maize production and were designed in a top-down system where they even forced smallholders to participate. Local people often ended up in dept due to high production costs in these betterment schemes. Monoculture of maize was brought in with the schemes and inter-cropping was forbidden.²⁸ The intention was that MFPP should be a different development programme compared to the previous government's cropping schemes and to convert smallholders into independent producers. The plan was that the participants should be empowered rather than more dependent upon governmental systems.²⁹

The politics from the Apartheid regime led to devastating social and economical consequences; not at least the “migrant labour system” that drained the regions from people capable of working.³⁰ Many people that returned to their rural villages after 1980s identify themselves as job seekers and see their stay in the village as temporary. Many people living in rural areas today do not identify themselves as permanent inhabitants.³¹ Today unemployment in South Africa is high and a big part of the employable population lack formal employment also in rural areas. This differs from other African countries where unemployment often is concentrated to urban centres. According to Klasen & Woolard (2008) an open employment rates are approximately 30 % in South Africa and the rate is even higher if counting unemployment in rural areas. Rural people are relying on informal employment and other sources of income, like remittent as well as governmental grants.³² Most people living in rural areas are not reliant on agriculture as the main source of income, but even if they mainly depends on other sources of incomes, agriculture often contributes for sustaining the households, at least partly³³.

Our supervisor, Klara Jacobson, is writing her PhD-thesis about how livelihoods and farming in Xopozo have been affected by the introduction of MFPP and the GM maize. This study is meant to be a complement to her fieldwork. Though Jacobson mainly has been concentrating on villagers we have focused our study on external actors in relation to MFPP and Xopozo, to investigate the implementation and execution of MFPP in Xopozo.

²⁶ Ntsebeza, 1999: 15 f and Bernstein, 1997: p. 2-3

²⁷ Haag & Hajdu, 2005: 483-494, de Wet, 1990: 444 and Bank & Minkley: 2005: 21

²⁸ de Wet, 1990: 441 f

²⁹ Damgaard Hansen, 2006: 19

³⁰ Haag & Hajdu, 2005: 483-494, de Wet, 1990: 444 and Bank & Minkley: 2005: 21

³¹ Ntsebeza, 1999: 34 f

³² Klasen, S & Woolard (2008)

³³ Ntsebeza, 1999: 34 f, Damgaard Hansen, 2006: 11

1.2.1 Maps over South Africa and Eastern Cape



Fig 1. South African Map
www.fao.org (2008-11-30)



Fig 2. Eastern Cape regional Map (modified from South Africa Explored): http://www.sa-venues.com/maps/eastcape_regional.htm, (2007-12-05)



503097 10-76
Fig 3. Transkei as of 1978,
 (From Wikipedia, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transkei>, 2007-12-05,
 Produced by the CIA. From the Perry-Castaneda Map Collection)

1.2.2 Bt-maize

Bt-maize is a genetically modified crop that contains a small part of genome from a common and naturally occurring soil bacterium, named *Bacillus thuringiensis*. This bacterium produces a substance (Bt delta endotoxin) that is toxic to the *Lepidoptera larvae*. When the plant contains a particular gene from the bacterium, it also produces this substance and therefore the plant becomes resistant to corn borer. In practice, when cultivating Bt-maize, insecticides don't have to be used for control of these parasites. The substance is produced in all cells of the plant, which means even in the root, stem and fruit.³⁴

Biotechnology in agriculture offers new possibilities in the adaptation ability of modern farming systems. There are expectations that genetically modified crops will contribute to the maintenance and intensification of rapid growth in agricultural production. Pesticides, artificial fertilizer, mechanisation and irrigation have played important roles in the production growth during the 20th century, but it is within the plant processing (GM technology) that the most spectacular discoveries have been and are developing. Advocators of GM crops state that some of these kinds of crops suit the farming systems in developing countries. Opponents of genetically modified crops points out there are many risks involved, as for example increased dependency of external actors and risk for ecological degradation.³⁵

1.2.3 Massive Food Production Programme (MFPP)

MFPP is an agricultural development programme planned and run by the Department of Agriculture in the Eastern Cape. The programme is an important part of the development reform initiative PGDP (the Provincial Growth and Development Plan). Since the planners of MFPP believe that quality of life and welfare of the population of Eastern Cape is significantly linked to agriculture and food production, the strategy of the programme is to increase the agricultural production. The agricultural sector is viewed as an underdeveloped resource in Eastern Cape and one of the sectors in which the ECDA sees great potential for development.³⁶

MFPP was introduced in five districts in the Eastern Cape, starting in the agricultural season of 2002-2003. New agricultural techniques were introduced in the programme as well as new varieties of maize.³⁷

Xopozo is located in the OR Tambo district in Eastern Cape. According to ECDA there is high potential for maize production in the OR Tambo district along with the Alfred Nzo district. The region should be capable of producing enough maize to feed its own population but also for export. Therefore ECDA views the agricultural sector and maize production as one of the possible sectors where it is possible to contribute to enhancing the overall economic development in the region. ECDA believes that the region has the potential of being net exporters of maize within ten years.³⁸

³⁴ Gouse & Pray, 2005: 84 f

³⁵ Ismael, Bennett & Morse, 2002: 1 ff

³⁶ Massive Food Production Scheme (planning document from ECDA)

³⁷ Ibid

³⁸ Ibid

Smallholders in Xopozo joined MFPP in 2003. In 2007 they were pulled out of the programme. The reason why MFPP stopped in Xopozo is the fact that the smallholders did not follow the repayment plan of the programme according to several officers at the ECDA.³⁹ It is important to notice that MFPP did not fail or stop in all the places in which it was implemented. There have been places where the programme has been more successful. But none of our respondents at ECDA claims that the programme has been successful as a whole.

1.2.4 Theoretical background

1.2.4.1 "Putting the last first"- Robert Chambers

Chambers (1983) argues that professionals concerned with rural development have an outsiders' view of rural people's conditions and needs.

The two main groups of professionals that Chambers defines are academics and practitioners. He says that these two groups differ because they have different priorities and work in different realities with dissimilar perspectives and aims with their work. Academics want to find interesting research cases and practitioners working with rural development (like aid agencies and staff at the national or local government) want to find what is useful and can deliver results in a short time perspective. These two groups also view poverty differently. Academics (preferably social scientists) view poverty as a cause of social and economic conditions. On the other hand practitioners (and also natural scientists) view poverty as a cause of physical and ecological circumstances.⁴⁰

Professionals often live in urban centres and they base their picture of rural life and poverty on prejudices and short visits in rural areas (preferably rural areas close to urban centres). Development in rural areas is being obstructed by this gap between academics, practitioners and the rural population (note that Chambers emphasises that the gap is existing between all three of the groups; that means not only between the practitioners and the rural poor, but also between the academics and the practitioners). There is a lack of information flow between the rural poor and the professionals, especially the flow of information from the rural poor to academics and practitioners.⁴¹

*"Not only do urban-based professionals and officials often not know the rural reality, worse they do not know that they do not know"*⁴²

The urban perspective of rural development results in a position that focuses on the urban, capital intensive and the highly technological.⁴³ Local peoples' knowledge and practises are, according to Chambers, often considered to be primitive, conservative and backwards. Rural people are seen as lazy, irrational, backwards, stupid, unaware and on top of that responsible for their own poverty. This viewpoint lives on even though several case studies show that poor people are not less hard working, intelligent or flexible than people in general. Poor people's practises are often suitable for their local environment and climate, as well as their economical and social situation. They have to fight against problematic situations that lock

³⁹ Interview with mentor local ECDA, officer district ECDA, head district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer local ECDA, head provincial ECDA.

⁴⁰ Chambers (1983)

⁴¹ Chambers (1983)

⁴² Ibid: (1983)

⁴³ Ibid: (1983)

them into dependency; poverty itself, physical weakness, isolation, vulnerability and powerlessness to mention some motives. This leads them to having a lack of buffer and increased vulnerability against catastrophes, physical incapacities and unproductively because of lack of resources.⁴⁴

A common view according to Chambers is that people are poor because they deserve it. They are lazy and do not have any force to change their situation. He claims that poor people may not save, they do not always work visibly, and they might seem to be passive. But this does not mean that they are lazy, stupid or lack capabilities. To “not be saving” can be a result of the need of direct consumption. “Laziness” is working when job is available depending on which season. Adoption to a less energy consumed way of living caused of poverty can, from an outsider’s point of view, be seen as to be unproductively. It is a part of the strategy to *keep lying low*. Poor are not stupid or ignorant. Chambers means that stupid or ignorant people are created by stupid or ignorant outsiders. Poor people can not afford to be stupid or lazy.⁴⁵

1.2.4.2 “African Identity and the Postcolonial” - Maria Eriksson-Baaz

The broad development discourse is strongly influenced by stereotypical presumptions about Africa and the African identity that can not be discussed without remarking the postcolonial heritage. How to define what the substance in what “an African identity” in actual fact is can’t be considered without a historical context and the consequences of Western colonialism.⁴⁶ Eriksson-Baaz emphasizes two central discourses within this; the imagination of the other and the evolutionary theory. She concludes that even though identities are dynamic and change over time, the postcolonial view of Africa does not differ to a great extent from colonial presumptions. The colonial imagination of Africa as the others was presented in relation to the Western ideal. Traditional Africans were seen as underdeveloped, irresponsible and backwards compared to the enlightened Westerners which were seen as developed, responsible and modern. The picture of Africa emerged from dissimilarities compared to the West, and this dichotomy was part of a hierarchic system where Africans were observed as “the edge of humanity” according to Eriksson-Baaz. Societies from all over the world were positioned into this order, to show which grade of development they had reached. The colonial dynasty was on the top of the ladder and Africa was to be found at the bottom. Eriksson-Baaz argues that this view is still very much alive, not just to exemplify chaos and backwardness in Africa, but also to demonstrate an alternative to the “overdeveloped” West. People of African are seen as being a picturesque and innocent group of people who are living an easy life without having been destroyed by modernity.⁴⁷ The depiction of the stereotypic Africans as passive and uncivilized prepossesses political policies and poverty reducing strategies, and is often used as an argument to explicate why development programmes fail⁴⁸.

“*Putting the last first*” was published in 1983. It was the first of its kind, to discuss rural development in this way. We believe that today, after 25 years of discussion and work with rural development, the topics are still critical, relevant and up-to-date. One example of more recent research that comes to similar conclusions as Chambers did in the 80’s is that of Maria Eriksson Baaz (2002).

⁴⁴ Ibid: (1983)

⁴⁵ Ibid: (1983)

⁴⁶ Appiah (1992) in Eriksson Baaz M (2001)

⁴⁷ Eriksson Baaz (2001)

⁴⁸ Eriksson Baaz (2002)

We think these theories complement each other. Eriksson-Baaz adds to Chambers' ideas of planners of development programmes as outsiders with little understanding of rural realities. She complements Chambers' theories with theories on the colonial heritage and disrespect of the African people in contrast to the west. The picture of the developed west placed at the top of the evolutionary ladder is still very much alive, and if there are many opinions on how to transform rural poor to be able to climb higher up. Chambers and Eriksson-Baaz both conclude that the rural poor are still not involved in the development programmes. Instead of active participants, they become passive bystanders as the planners expect them to be.

2. Methodology

This is a case study with the purpose to explain how the implementation of MFPP worked but also an attempt to analyse why the programme failed in the village Xopozo.

This study is a theory consuming study that aims to explain why the MFPP failed and to identify the main reasons behind the failure of the programme. A theory consuming study is characterised by the fact that the case itself is the base for, and centre of the study and theories are used only to explain why things turned out the way they did. The usage of theories differs in different studies. Studies can be testing theories, where a theory is tested against an empirical material; or a theory developing study where the study and the empirical material are expected to bring new explanations for the phenomenon that is studied. a theory consuming study on the other hand only uses theories to explain what has been studied⁴⁹ This study is a theory consuming study because it does not aim to develop or test theories, the theories that are presented in this thesis are meant for explaining this particular case study.

Triangulation, which means that the information has to come from at least three different sources to be regarded as facts, was an important factor for us when collecting information. Therefore several interviews were needed in this study and information gathered with different techniques and methods and from informants independent of each other.

Triangulation is important when confirming the trustworthiness of accumulated data and the information has to come from sources independent from each other.⁵⁰ Individual semi-structured interviews were the most frequently used method in this study as a tool for collecting data. Semi-structured interviews are a mix between a structured interview and a regular conversation. This form of interview creates an opportunity for the respondents, to a certain degree, affect the outcome of the interview.⁵¹ We wanted the respondents to have this opportunity because they might highlight perspectives and information that we hadn't thought of when constructing the questions. Besides this we also used some other methods that will be described below.

2.1 Methods in Xopozo

In the village we used participatory interview techniques (PRA, Participatory Rural Appraisal) in addition to the semi structured interviews that also were made there. We chose to use PRA to gain an increased understanding of the complexity of the systems and to collect

⁴⁹ Esaiasson, Gilljam, Oscarsson, Wägnerud (2007)

⁵⁰ Copestake & Morris (1993)

⁵¹ Kvale, 1997: 27

local visions and views to add up to our empirical material.⁵² PRA methods were used mainly in the beginning of the study, to get an introduction and a deeper understanding of the reality and life in the village. The PRA tools were also thought to be useful in the village due to the language barrier. One method we used was to make rich pictures together with a few households in Xopozo. The purpose with this was to try to get an overview and an increased insight in the every day life, regarding flow of resources within the household, the way of farming and family relations. Seasonal calendars were made in some households to understand the farming activities, the growing season and the division of work regarding agriculture but also other tasks within the household during a year in Xopozo. We had a group meeting, trying to find out about the history of the village and the farming practises in the area. After collecting this data we did eleven test-interviews in the village, from which we constructed the questions that later were used in the individual semi-structured interviews.

We were living in the village on and off for two months. During this stay we lived in a family where we also tried to participate in activities in the family and in the village. This gave us an opportunity to observe the daily life in the village, and to understand and see things that people might not think of telling us about.

When selecting the respondents we used data from the social mapping that our supervisor made together with smallholders in three sub-villages in Xopozo. In this mapping households were numbered and ranked in wealth status by the villagers themselves. We selected two numbers (25 and 75) randomly in all three sub-villages, without having any other information about the households. We did not take the wealth ranking into account when selecting the households. This meant that both poor and relatively rich households had a chance to be among the interviewed as well as both people that were involved in MFPP and people that were not. If the person in the selected household were unavailable or if it was an empty household we decided to interview the household right below or above the selected number. So if household 25 in one sub village was empty or was not available, we took number 24 or 26 in the same sub-village instead.

Due to our short stay in Xopozo and the fact that only a few of our respondents (only two out of six) took part in MFPP limits our conclusion. We chose to make this random selection of respondents to try to get a representative sample from the villagers. Now afterwards we think it might have been better for our study if we had made a strategic selection from Jacobson's questionnaires consisting of information from all households in the three sub-villages. Since, in one way, it could have been more useful for us to only interview smallholders that had participated in MFPP. On the other hand our random selection provided a representative selection of villagers and might give a better picture of the general knowledge regarding how common it was for people in Xopozo to participate in MFPP. But to answer that question one would have needed a much bigger sample. We believe that at the time we lacked sufficient knowledge about the villagers to make a strategic selection, and there were also too little time for us to acquire that kind of information. Therefore it would have been hard for us to make a strategic selection without running risks that Chambers (1983) mentions; to unconsciously select stakeholders or in our perspective "convenient" respondents (like for example the ones living closes to our resident or close to the centre of the village or maybe chose households that is more "easy to see" than other households as our respondents).⁵³ We wanted to avoid those risks. It was also interesting for us to hear the story about how MFPP was experienced by those villagers that did not participate in the programme.

⁵² FAO, 2008-10-14

⁵³ Chambers, 1983: 18 f

The purpose of our study was not to evaluate how all villagers in Xopozo experienced MFPP, which is one of the subjects of Jacobson's PhD-thesis. Our intention was to get an idea how participants in a village involved in MFPP experience the programme, and compare their experiences with external actors from ECDA and Monsanto.

When planning this study we hoped to use PRA methods to a greater extent than in fact proved to be possible. We had difficulties in motivating our respondents in drawing pictures and using models, this might be a result most of some of them being illiterate and unaccustomed to use pencils and paper. Our intention was to arrange group meetings but it turned out to be difficult to organise. We do not know the cause of this, it might be a result of the difficulty to inform people that it was suppose to be a meeting or maybe the cold and rainy weather or any other reason that we not do not know about.

Two persons in Xopozo were interviewed because of their unique position in the village, with the regard to MFPP. the Chief, one member of the MFPP steering committee.

2.2 Methods with external actors

In addition to the interviews with villagers in Xopozo, central actors in the process of MFPP where interviewed. They were selected deliberately for their unique knowledge and their central positions in Xopozo and within MFPP. These were the following: the mentor of MFPP that used to work in Xopozo, local extension officers, employees at the ECDA at local, district and provincial level, representatives at Monsanto and local farmer supplies. We used a semi-structured interview methodology, where we had defined some particular areas of interest, but the interview situation was performed as a conversation between us and the informant/respondent. To some extent we also used PRA-methods when trying to get an increased understanding of power relations, organisational structure and locations within MFPP and ECDA.

The situation was different compared to the interviews we made in Xopozo. Even though the external actors generally were free spoken, this partly made it easy for us to make the interviews. The concept of semi-structured interviews was well suited, and made it possible for our respondents to tell their own story while we at the same time could keep the main thread. A problem in some interviews was rather that our respondents talked about their favourite issues and not about MFPP. It seemed that many did not want to talk about the early stages of MFPP. A possible explanation for this might be the failure of MFPP. They rather wanted to tell us about their present work or talk about future plans. And when they started to talk about these subjects, it was hard for us to make them stop. But all these sidetracks were interesting and contributed to this study; what they intended to do, why they thought MFPP was not a success and how it could have been different. Power relations also had an impact, we as two young women and they were often men in their middle age in an important position at the ECDA or Monsanto. They were used to be in command and do as they wanted. But our position as young students may have been to our advantage when we were not seen as a "threat".

2.3 Interpreters and language

The local language in big parts of Eastern Cape including Xopozo is Xhosa, and therefore we had to use interpreters when collection our data. We mainly used the interpreters in the village

but also at some other meetings and interviews. One interpreter came from another village, close to the nearest town. She lived with us in the village and this helped us a lot in communicating and understanding the cultural and social context as well as the linguistic context. The other interpreter was living in Xopozo and helped us with local contacts. The fact that we had to use interpreters resulted in some misunderstandings in the communication. Sometimes we also experienced difficulties in the cooperation with one of the interpreters. The cooperation problems could have had to do with a number of things. One thing that perhaps was relevant is the different gender relations in the village compared to what we are used to, and we acted in a way that he maybe did not expect us to. For example it seemed hard for him to see us as employers and to be told what to do from us.

Another limitation was that since we do not speak Xhosa we could not make sure that the interpreters understood our questions correctly or if they gave us the correct translation from the interviews. Our lack of experience in holding interviews and using interpreters were of course obstructing the situation for us and our interpreters. The language difficulty also complicated the interviews even without interpreters. English is our second language and that limited our possibility to communicate freely.

3. Analysis

Through discussing with each other, taking notes and reflecting over new information continuously during our fieldwork, and perhaps mostly by thoroughly going through all interviews during the transcription process, we identified several recurring themes. We have based our analysis on these themes.

- Planning and initial purposes of Massive Food Production Programme and stakeholders' ideas of the same.
- Actual outcomes of MFPP and stakeholders' ideas of the same.
- MFPP and genetically modified crops: Actual outcomes as well as stakeholders' ideas of the same

We have discussed how the aims of MFPP correspond with the needs and reality of poor smallholders. The analysis shows how MFPP worked, the outcomes and why it failed in Xopozo. We focused on information paths, because we believe that access to information at different levels among the implementers and the participants is a critical factor when implementing a development programme. Our intention was to show why MFPP worked like it did, and why it failed in Xopozo. We believe that access to information might be one of the weak links in MFPP therefore we tried to show how the information channels worked or did not work. The choice to usage genetically modified crops in some of the participating villages, including Xopozo, has been analysed with regard to the attitudes within the ECDA towards GM crops, Monsanto and villagers in Xopozo. The construction and framework of the programme concerning the selection of input supplier and variety of seed have been discussed. In an attempt to reflect on the diversity of views and ideas among implementers and stakeholders we choose to focused on several actors. This diversity of views was an important factor for the outcome of MFPP itself, but also for the reliability of this study. The different opinions coming from different actors increased the credibility of our results and analysis.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ Copestake & Morris (1993)

As basis for the analysis we identified three central groups and divided them into sub-groups. These are as follows;

- ECDA; provincial, district and local (all having a link to the MFPP and especially Xopozo)
- people in Xopozo (Chief, steering committee and villagers) and
- The input supplier Monsanto (representatives with different responsibilities within the company but we analyze all as one group).

These sub-groups were selected because people within each sub- group have similar roles in relation to MFPP or work at a similar level in the decision process. Each group was essential to the implementation of MFPP in Xopozo. This system was selected for trying to get a picture of the different actors' role and the involvement in MFPP. Representatives from Monsanto were treated as one group, because we did not get a clear understanding of the different roles of the actors and their specific role within Monsanto in connection to MFPP.

<i>Group</i>	Implementers:	Participants:	Input supplier:
	Department of Agriculture in Eastern Cape (ECDA)	Village (Xopozo)	Monsanto
<i>Sub-groups</i>	Provincial	Chief	
	District	Steering Committee	
	Local	Villages	

To understand how the planning and execution MFPP worked, our approach has been to compare ideas and interpretations about the programme. The division into groups and sub-groups is not used so much when evaluating the planning of the programme. This was because of the fact that it was staff from the provincial level at ECDA only that planned the programme and the other groups were not involved in the planning process. We present the opinions about the plan of MFPP coming from other groups when relevant.. By putting these opposing views in contrast to each other we want to investigate how the different actors think the programme has worked, as individuals and as a group.

We have made the choice to include the input supplier of seed (in the case of Xopozo this was Monsanto) because we are interested in the different actors' relation to the use of genetically modified crops in MFPP in particular and the introduction of Bt-maize into smallholder farming in general. The input supplier was therefore included in the analysis and not other central groups like for example chemical providers, tractor contractors or the local municipality.

3.1 Planning and initial purposes of Massive Food Production Programme

ECDA identify several difficulties related to the area of Eastern Cape, regarding the poverty rate and the development of the agriculture sector and economy within the region. The challenges that the ECDA mentions are as follows;

- Limited technological knowledge among the rural population due to the historical discrimination of the area.

- Access to credits.
- Management of the communal lands that has lead to overgrazing and erosion.
- Research for improving natural resource management is poorly financed.
- The average age of farmers is high and the younger generation under 15years doesn't see agriculture as a viable alternative for earning an income (41.8% of the population in Eastern Cape are under the age of 15).
- The over representation of white farmers in income-generating agriculture.

55

The MFPP was meant to address all of the above mentioned challenges. All which threatens to undermine possibilities for development within the agricultural sector.

According to planning documents from ECDA the Massive Food Production Programme was aimed to achieve following goals;

- Contribute to goals from the Provincial Growth and Development Plan (PGDP) concerning food security, poverty reduction, economic growth and agrarian transformation by stimulating the production of basic food, primarily in the undeveloped rural areas of Eastern Cape.
- Stimulate the private sector engagement in providing crop production inputs such as fertilizers, seed and crop protection chemicals in a manner which makes these inputs available and affordable within rural communities.
- Promote a viable private sector contracting capability functioning in rural areas, in order to provide efficient and economical soil preparation, crop protection, harvesting and post harvest services, which will enable producers to apply modern conservation farming technologies and ensure that product quality and market competitiveness are met.
- Stimulate a sustainable agriculturally based economy in the rural areas, based on the sound business principles, leading beyond dependency on government services towards sustainable and profitable productivity of a vibrant farming community in rural areas.
- Secure the adoption of Conservation Farming principles (minimum tillage and retention of soil cover) within the agricultural sector in order to reduce environmental degradation, prevent soil erosion and improve the water quality in streams and rivers.

56

MFPP was built up on a conditional grant system. In the first year of MFPP smallholders didn't have to pay anything for the inputs. By the second year they had to pay 25% of the costs for the inputs they got during the first year. The plan was that in the second year the smallholders should have produced some surplus, and by selling that surplus they should be able to pay back 25% to MFPP. The third year the participants were supposed to pay back 50% of the input costs for the second year, the fourth year 75% and the fifth year 100%. According to the plan, in the fifth year the production should be economically sustainable and the smallholders should be capable to "stand on their own". The plan was that the participants were getting a loan (for one year, to be paid back after harvest the same year) for the repayments of 25%, 50% and 75% from UVIMBA bank which is the agricultural bank of ECDA. The other costs (for example the 75% that the farmers didn't have to pay for the first

⁵⁵ Department of Agriculture, 2003 (planning document from ECDA)

⁵⁶ Massive Food Production Programme notes and observations, (planning document from ECDA)

year) were covered by ECDA, a traditional grant, under the conditions that the participants had paid the agreed amount for each year.⁵⁷

Smallholders were supposed to form units with an aggregated field size consisting of 50 hectares or more. That meant that smallholders had to apply together to be able to join the programme.⁵⁸ According to one planner of MFPP at provincial level at ECDA bigger units of land were formed because large scale mechanised agriculture with land preparation, harvesting and transportation etc. is much easier done on a larger piece of land. Everything less than 50 hectares should be too small. That is why the plan made the smallholders to have a cohesive piece of land.⁵⁹ The plan of the programme was that all decisions regarding choice of input supplier, seed, contractors etc within the villages were presumed to be taken collectively, according to informants at ECDA⁶⁰.

3.1.1 Villager's impressions of the goals of MFPP

The Chief in Xopozo says that the goal of MFPP was to promote food security and to transform the black smallholders in rural areas into commercial farmers⁶¹. Similarly to what the chief says, the steering committee member says that the goal MFPP was to help people that are too poor to be able to plant. The purpose according to this informant was that smallholders were offered the possibility to become commercial farmers and to buy commodities for the money that they made.⁶² Some informants in the village had similar ideas of the goal as had the chief and the steering committee member, whereas others had other ideas. One of the participants in MFPP in Xopozo said that he was told that the government was supposed to fight starvation and poor conditions. He is very critical towards the programme and thinks the ECDA is lacking knowledge about maize production.⁶³ One of our respondents that were not participating in MFPP, thought that the goal from ECDA was to take and own the fields of Xopozo⁶⁴. Another respondent claimed that the plan of MFPP was to show the right techniques of planting⁶⁵. A respondent that participated in the programme and took part on the first meeting said that the goal of MFPP was to develop the farming in the village⁶⁶. Before MFPP started, the chief says that there were hopes that MFPP should create job opportunities in the village. These expectations were never were fulfilled according to the Chief.⁶⁷

3.1.2 MFPP was planned with a top-down approach

⁵⁷ Massive Food Production Administration, (planning document from ECDA) and interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA and head provincial ECDA

⁵⁸ Interview with head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, head district ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, district coordinator of MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA.

⁵⁹ Interview with manager provincial ECDA

⁶⁰ Interview with head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, head district ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA.

⁶¹ Interview with the Chief of Xopozo

⁶² Interview with SG Xopozo

⁶³ Interview with hh 75 in Rwanzana

⁶⁴ Interview with hh 25 in Sihlehleni

⁶⁵ Interview with hh 77 in Sihlehleni

⁶⁶ Interview with hh 25 in Ok

⁶⁷ Interview with the Chief of Xopozo

According to one of the responsible managers at provincial level for planning the MFPP, the planning process of the programme involved three persons at ECDA. Smallholders did not influence the process at all.⁶⁸

*“So it has got all the marks of a constantly top down scheme lead by a group of whites in a black society.”*⁶⁹

The chief in Xopozo confirms this and says that they were invited by ECDA for an information meeting about the programme, where they were informed that Xopozo could participate in MFPP.⁷⁰ The view of MFPP as a top-down planned programme is shared among many informants at local, regional and provincial level at ECDA as well as among representatives at Monsanto⁷¹. One of the general managers at ECDA that were involved in the planning of MFPP explains that the top- down approach was chosen because ECDA wanted to save time, and they also had a lot of experience within the organization that they could rely on⁷². As we understands it, the initial plan offered the smallholders three decisions, the choice to join the programme or not, the choice of input suppliers that they should use and the choice of which mechanization contractors to employ.

3.1.3 Structure of MFPP on local level

A steering committee was formed in each village to be a link between ECDA and the participants within MFPP. The steering committee was supposed to channel administrative information regarding MFPP but also practical information concerning agricultural issues to the villagers, and to bring information from villagers to ECDA. The members of the steering committee were elected and organised by villagers themselves. The steering committee got special training which they were expected to spread to the participants in the villages. Each steering committee was presumed to follow up on MFPP in their village.⁷³ From our point of view, it seems that our respondents define the role of the steering group in a similar way. But the how the members of the steering committee understood their tasks and what kind of possibilities they had to fulfil these obligations is unclear to us.

3.1.4 The involvement of input suppliers in the planning process

According to one of the goals ECDA sought to involve the commercial sector into the programme in order to generate access to inputs for smallholders and stimulate a development towards industrial agriculture⁷⁴. This is also mentioned by one of the provincial managers at ECDA. He emphasises that that ECDA sought to involve the input suppliers to establish contacts between the companies and the smallholders. Therefore the input suppliers played a

⁶⁸ Interview with head provincial ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

⁶⁹ Interview with head provincial ECDA

⁷⁰ Interview with the Chief of Xopozo

⁷¹ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, employee Monsanto a, former employee Monsanto a, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA

⁷² Interview with head provincial ECDA

⁷³ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head district ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, officer district ECDA and SG member in Xopozo

⁷⁴ Massive Food Production Programme notes and observations (planning document from ECDA)

significant role also in the planning process according to the manager.⁷⁵ According to two informants at Monsanto there were a lot of discussions between Monsanto and ECDA when planning MFPP⁷⁶. Monsanto interviewees state that they always work in corporation with ECDA when introducing new technologies⁷⁷. It is nevertheless unclear to us how and to what extent the input suppliers contributed in the planning process of MFPP.

3.1.5 Introduction of new agricultural technologies and no-till practices

In the initial goals from the ECDA no-till practices were to be used in MFPP for conserving soils and to prevent erosion. Two of our informants at Monsanto emphasised that no-till practices were aimed to be used in MFPP.⁷⁸ Agricultural officers that were involved in the early stages of the planning process underlined the importance of the no-till concept (for smallholders.)⁷⁹ Besides them, few of the other interviewed agricultural officials brought up this information. We believe that the emphasis on the no-till concept somehow disappeared or weakened along the way or as time went by. Maybe the information about that MFPP aim to implement no-till practises did not reach the employees at local level at ECDA, and it is the staff at the local level that are responsible for the contact with the smallholders. Another possibility is that the local staff did not view this goal as important, or did not have the opportunity or funds to inform and educate the smallholders in no-till practices. As the plan was interpreted on local level the aim was directed towards creating local work opportunities, and therefore contractors for mechanisation became a big part of the expenditure.⁸⁰ This was also an objective according to the planning documents⁸¹. As we understand it the plan contained contradicting objectives that was difficult to combine in the local context.

3.2 Outcomes of Massive Food Production Programme:

3.2.1 Selection of areas and participants in MFPP

The areas included in MFPP were chosen by officers at the local ECDA. The initial criteria for the programme were that areas of high potential for maize production should be included in the programme. Environmental characteristics like rainfall, temperature and soil were supposed to determine which areas that could participate. That means that the smallholders in areas identified as high potential areas (for maize production) had the opportunity to join the programme.⁸² A demand from ECDA was that areas included in the programme should not be smaller than 50 hectares. Smallholders that wanted to take part in MFPP therefore had to form

⁷⁵ Interview with head provincial ECDA

⁷⁶ Interview with agronomist marketing Monsanto and former employee Monsanto b

⁷⁷ Interview with agronomist marketing Monsanto, former employee Monsanto b, employee Monsanto a and former employee Monsanto a

⁷⁸ Interview with former employee Monsanto b and agronomist marketing Monsanto

⁷⁹ Interview with officer district ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

⁸⁰ Interview with the Chief of Xopozo and SG Xopozo

⁸¹ Administration of the Massive Food Production Scheme (planning document from ECDA)

⁸² Interview with extension officer district ECDA, officer local ECDA, head district ECDA, mentor MFPP and manager provincial ECDA

bigger units together.⁸³ Local extension officers had the responsibility to make sure that these conditions were fulfilled⁸⁴.

Staff at provincial and district level at the ECDA state that the plan was misunderstood by the implementers at local offices⁸⁵. The staff at the local level and the provincial level had different opinions or information about how the plan should be interpreted. This led to an selection of participants into MFPP that did not correspond with the originally identified target group and made the original design of the programme fail⁸⁶. The fact is that areas that were not supposed to be in the programme ended up being in the programme anyway. According to officers at district and provincial level, this was mainly a result of lack of time for the implementation as well as political pressure to include as many people as possible.⁸⁷ They also say that there was lack of information between ECDA at provincial level and the local extension officers; this is confirmed by several respondents at ECDA⁸⁸. Two officers at ECDA state that the MFPP was not targeted at the poorest of smallholders, but the poorest ended up in the scheme because of the circumstances mentioned above⁸⁹.

3.2.2 Late deliveries of inputs in the initial phase of MFPP

One of the first problems that the programme faced was late deliveries of inputs (fertilizer and seed) for the first growing season. As a result of the delays the participants had to plant later and this resulted in lower yields than expected or no yields at all.⁹⁰ The ultimate planting time for maize in Eastern Cape is late November or early December. The inputs did not arrive to the villages up until January, and that led to the delay of the planting according to our informants.⁹¹ Various reasons made the smallholders to harvest the maize before it got ripe; according to informants at the ECDA if they had waited longer the maize had get caught by the frost and people needed to use the fields for grazing⁹².

The inputs were late because of the slow and inefficient bureaucracy within the ECDA. This inefficiency and the unfamiliarity with MFPP regulations and procedures were delaying the orders to the input suppliers. This story for explaining the late deliveries is told by informants at all levels within ECDA.⁹³ ECDA decided to pay for all the cost for the first season because of the delays, and determined that the programme should make a restart the following season. So the participants in Xopozo did not have to pay anything the first year (as they were not

⁸³ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA and extension officer district ECDA.

⁸⁴ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head provincial ECDA, mentor MFPP local ECDA, extension officer local ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

⁸⁵ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head provincial ECDA, officer district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA.

⁸⁶ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, officer district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

⁸⁷ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head district ECDA, manager provincial ECDA

⁸⁸ Interview with head district ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA and head provincial ECDA

⁸⁹ Interview with officer district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

⁹⁰ Interview with the chief of Xopozo, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer local ECDA

⁹¹ Interview with head district ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA, manager provincial ECDA and employee Monsanto b

⁹² Interview with officer district ECDA and extension officer local ECDA

⁹³ Interview with employee Monsanto b, head provincial ECDA, head district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer district ECDA and local extension officer

supposed to according to the plan). But they did not have to pay anything the second year either as a result of the late deliveries the first year.⁹⁴ The third and fourth year there were still problems with delays in the administration within ECDA, and to some extent this resulted in late deliveries of inputs. But according to interviews at all levels at ECDA it improved with time.⁹⁵

3.2.3 The payment plan

None of our respondents in Xopozo except Chief and the member of the steering group knew about the MFPP payment plan when the programme started⁹⁶. Out of our six household respondents in Xopozo only two participated in MFPP but all interviewed households attended the first information meeting about MFPP arranged by ECDA⁹⁷. It seems that information about the payment plan did not get through to the participants. From the information meeting our respondents remember that they were informed that MFPP was going to supply the villagers with mechanisation services and inputs.⁹⁸ Five of our six respondents thought that everything in the programme was supposed to be for free and they say that they did not know about the payment plan at all. One respondent says that she knew about the payment plan and that is the reason why she decided not to join the programme⁹⁹. During the run of the project the other respondents found out that they had to pay for continuing involvement in MFPP. Now when the programme has stopped in Xopozo, none of the respondents that participated in MFPP have paid the expected amount to ECDA.¹⁰⁰ The Chief says he was informed by ECDA that MFPP should take a certain amount of the villagers' harvest and assist the participants with marketing and selling. He mentions the problem with estimating harvests since the ECDA did not do any measurements. And if the sizes of the yields are unknown, how can one know how much each household should pay? The Chief was thereby misinformed about the payment. It was not a portion of the harvest that were supposed to be repaid but a portion of the costs for the inputs the year before.¹⁰¹ The member of the steering committee says that the payments were supposed to be in money, but the amount of money depended on the size of the harvest¹⁰². In this point his understanding of the payment plan resembles that of the Chief. The steering committee member also says that the participants in Xopozo did not pay anything the three first years due to bad harvests.¹⁰³

The information about the structure of MFPP and the repayments did not get through to the extension officers at local level either, according to two respondents on provincial level at the ECDA¹⁰⁴. This is also confirmed by two respondents at district level; they say that the

⁹⁴ Interview with head district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, officer local ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

⁹⁵ Interview with head district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer local ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

⁹⁶ Interview with steering group member and Chief

⁹⁷ Interview with villagers (hh 77 Ok, hh75 Rwansana, hh 25 Ok, hh 27 Rwansana, hh 77 Sihlehleni, hh 25 Sihlehleni)

⁹⁸ Interview with hh 75 in Rwansana, hh 25 in Sihlehleni, hh27 in Rwansana and hh 77 in Ok

⁹⁹ Interview with hh 25 in Ok

¹⁰⁰ Interview with villagers hh 77 Ok, hh75 Rwansana, officer local ECDA, extension officer local and SG

¹⁰¹ Interview with the chief of Xopozo

¹⁰² Interview with SG

¹⁰³ Interview with SG

¹⁰⁴ Interview with manager provincial ECDA and head provincial ECDA

agricultural officers did not understand the plan of MFPP from the beginning, including the plan for payments¹⁰⁵.

“...in fact four years down the line we [are] still talking to governmental officers to understand, they still not understand.”¹⁰⁶

Two officers at the local office at ECDA believe that the participants were informed but they say that rural smallholders do not want to pay. The two officers also say that the smallholders believe that everything that comes from the government is for free.¹⁰⁷ A third informant at local level, who was working as a mentor in MFPP, believes that the payment plan did not work. This because the plan was not constructed in a way that could benefit the smallholders and he believes that commercial farming can't be practised under the present conditions. He believes that this resulted in that smallholders did not have money to pay back to ECDA.¹⁰⁸ On district level our informants' claims that the payment plan failed because of poor administration within the ECDA that resulted in mentioned effects like the incorrect selected participants into the programme, late deliveries of inputs to smallholders etc.¹⁰⁹

3.2.4 The employment of contractors

The participants, or more correctly each unit of participants, in MFPP should according to the plan choose contractors for mechanic assistance by themselves¹¹⁰. This is one of the areas which the staff at the ECDA and the participants is most disappointed within regard to the outcomes of MFPP. Informants at village level, at ECDA and at Monsanto, all claims that this system for selecting the contractors did not work in a satisfying way. The contractors lacked equipment of good quality and they were undertaking bigger areas than they could manage to complete according to informants at ECDA, Monsanto and in Xopozo.¹¹¹ Informants located on local, district and provincial positions within the ECDA say that the participants contracted their own friends or people in the village to plough their fields. Therefore they got contractors with poor equipment and the job was not done.¹¹² Many say that the participating smallholders chose the “wrong” contractor and that the contractors got paid even if they did not fulfil their missions and therefore they didn't do their job properly¹¹³.

The Chief says that the problem with contractors was one of the complications that the village faced in MFPP, he says that there were no link between the villagers and the mechanisation contractors, the ECDA paid the contractors even if they did not fulfil their promises. Villagers in Xopozo had the responsibility to choose contractors, but the ECDA handled the payments

¹⁰⁵ Interview with extension officer district ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

¹⁰⁶ Interview with manage provincial ECDA

¹⁰⁷ Interview with officer local ECDA and extension officer local ECDA.

¹⁰⁸ Interview with mentor MFPP

¹⁰⁹ Interview with officer district ECDA, head district ECDA, officer district ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

¹¹⁰ Interview with head district ECDA, local extension officer, head provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, mentor MFPP, and manager provincial ECDA.

¹¹¹ Interview with officer local ECDA, mentor MFPP, extension officer district ECDA, officer district MFPP, head district ECDA, head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, former employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto b, former employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto, SG member, the chief of Xopozo

¹¹² Interview with head provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer local ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹¹³ Interview with the chief of Xopozo, officer local ECDA, head provincial ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

to the contractors. The Chief says that therefore the participants did not have satisfying control over the situation and lacked the capability to influence because the ECDA paid the contractor any way, as mentioned earlier.¹¹⁴ One agricultural officer at the district office agrees with Chief. He says that lack of accountability between the farmers and the contractors was one of the main problems in MFPP. The fact that the ECDA paid the contractor even though the job was poorly done or was not done at all ruined the contractor system within MFPP.¹¹⁵

3.2.5 Large units of land in MFPP

The plan of MFPP was as mentioned to form units of at least 50 hectares, and that this land should be administrated collectively in the village. This kind of organisation creates difficulties when not everybody is committed to farming to the same extent. Villagers in Xopozo say that this is impossible to put in to practice and point out that not all smallholders are putting enough effort into farming. This creates difficulties in the cooperation and conflicts within the village according to our respondents.¹¹⁶

3.3 MFPP, input suppliers and genetically modified crops

3.3.1 Monsanto as input supplier in MFPP

ECDA invited companies for an information day to inform about MFPP and the opportunity for them to provide the programme with inputs¹¹⁷. According to the plan and goals of MFPP, the programme intended to establish a link between input suppliers and smallholders¹¹⁸. Companies should promote their products (seed, fertilizer, herbicides) directly to the farmers in MFPP without any direct involvement from the ECDA¹¹⁹. So in theory the participants (the unit or group of participants) were supposed to choose input suppliers. According to two local agricultural officers the participants in Xopozo selected input supplier by themselves.¹²⁰ In opposition to this, two agricultural officers at district and provincial levels say this was what was supposed to happen in theory but in practise someone else made the decisions for them. But it seems that the village made the decision of which input supplier they would contract. The Chief says that Monsanto were in the village before the programme started. Because Monsanto gave the villagers samples of seed at that time and because of the company's ability to assist Xopozo the village choose to contract Monsanto as their input supplier.¹²¹

¹¹⁴ Interview with the chief of Xopozo

¹¹⁵ Interview with the chief of Xopozo and extension officer district ECDA

¹¹⁶ Interview with villagers (hh 77 Ok, hh75 Rwanasana, hh 25 Ok, hh 27 Rwanasana, hh 77 Sihlehlani, hh 25 Sihlehlani)

¹¹⁷ Interview with head provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head district ECDA, former employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto b and former employee Monsanto

¹¹⁸ Massive Food Production Programme notes and observations, (planning document from DoA in Eastern Cape) and interview with Head provincial ECDA

¹¹⁹ Interview with former employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto b, District coordinator MFPP ECDA, provincial manager ECDA, head provincial ECDA, the chief of Xopozo and extension officer local ECDA

¹²⁰ Interview with officer local ECDA and extension officer local ECDA

¹²¹ Interview with the chief of Xopozo

3.3.2 Monsanto's role in MFPP

Monsanto arranged trainings and demonstrations in villages; among them Xopofo. Informants at Monsanto say that the purpose of Monsanto's involvement in MFPP was to train the farmers in no-tillage, to teach them how to apply chemicals for weed control instead of manual work and to make them use Monsanto products including hybrids and Bt-maize and herbicide tolerant maize to increase the yields.¹²²

Two employees at Monsanto say that the company's role was simply to provide the participants of MFPP with inputs. The employees emphasise that Monsanto as a company is not only focusing on the participants of MFPP but on all smallholders. By that we think that they mean that MFPP is not that important for Monsanto as a company or to the input supplying companies, but it is the unconquered smallholder market that is most important for the company.¹²³ But as two officers at the ECDA emphasise; there is a lot of money to earn within MFPP. MFPP is a big governmental programme with a huge budget, so an input supplier in the area or a company interested in access to markets in the region, would be stupid not to take that opportunity.¹²⁴

3.3.3 Monsanto in Xopofo

Monsanto arranged trainings in Xopofo but it seems like the training mainly consisted of trials and demonstrations with the main purpose to promote Monsanto products¹²⁵. In Xopofo a now retired agronomist working for Monsanto at the time (around 2002-2004) organized trainings where he mainly promoted no-till practises¹²⁶.

3.3.4 Seed varieties in MFPP used in Xopofo

The participants were free to chose which kind of variety of seed they were going to use in MFPP¹²⁷. On the demonstration arranged by Monsanto in Xopofo a number of varieties were compared; Bt-maize, Roundup Ready maize and normal hybrids and open pollinated varieties¹²⁸. We believe that the villagers chose variety of maize based on the information they got on the demonstrations that were held in the village just before the programme started. It might be wrong to say that it was the participants of the programme that chose input supplier and seed variety. Even though we only interviewed two villagers that participated in MFPP, it can not be neglected that none of them knew how the variety of seed were selected or who made that choice.¹²⁹ The selection of seed variety was supposed to be made by the group of smallholders that participated in MFPP and not on an individual basis. An important fact is that the smallholders were not aware of which kind of seed that were used in MFPP, and this indicates that they had little influence in the decision making. The Chief, and possibly the

¹²² Interview with Former employee Monsanto and employee Monsanto b

¹²³ Interview with employee Monsanto and former employee Monsanto

¹²⁴ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

¹²⁵ Interview with former employee Monsanto, former employee Monsanto and employee Monsanto

¹²⁶ Interview with former employee Monsanto, officer local ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, employee Monsanto b

¹²⁷ Interview with officer local ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA and head provincial ECDA

¹²⁸ Interview with former employee Monsanto

¹²⁹ Interview with hh nr 25 in Rwansana.

member of the steering committee, were involved in the decision making process since they know which company that provided the villagers with seed, and they are both aware of which kind of seed that the villagers have been growing during the programme¹³⁰. According to the steering committee, the selection of seed was made by the agricultural officer and the coordinator of MFPP and not the steering committee themselves¹³¹. The Chief says that the village of Xopozo chose Monsanto as input supplier because Monsanto contacted them before MFPP started. Samples of different kind of maize varieties were given to the villagers so they could try it by themselves in their own gardens. This is the reason why Xopozo chose to contract Monsanto, according to the Chief.¹³²

Some of the smallholders in Xopozo that participated in the programme would like to buy the maize that they have been growing during the programme, now when MFPP has stopped in Xopozo. But they do not know where to buy the maize, or what the maize is called¹³³. The problem of accessibility of Monsanto products is mentioned by the employees at Monsanto. The company sometimes uses special outlets, disconnected to the established agricultural supplies.¹³⁴ It's not clear to us why they did not sell Monsanto products through the ordinary farmer suppliers, and it seems that our informants aren't knowledgeable about it either.

In Xopozo the participants grew Bt-maize for three years within MFPP¹³⁵. The fourth year they grew hybrid maize¹³⁶. The reason that they grew hybrid maize in their last season is that the mentor was appointed for the MFPP that year and he says that he doesn't see the point in villagers choosing the seeds for themselves. So he selected the variety that was planted in Xopozo the following season¹³⁷.

3.3.5 Training arranged by Monsanto in Xopozo

ECDA arranged "Farmers days" every year, where equipments and different varieties of seeds were shown to the farmers. On these "Farmers days" the ECDA attempted to get the farmers into commercial agriculture. The training in Xopozo was arranged by Monsanto in cooperation with agricultural officers at the local ECDA in Flagstaff.¹³⁸ Three members from the steering committee were also selected for special training in Umtata¹³⁹.

An agronomist from Monsanto that was responsible for the training was teaching no-till practices¹⁴⁰, in line with one of the goals of MFPP that was to encourage minimum tillage¹⁴¹. At the same time a big amount of the budget in MFPP paid mechanical contractors for ploughing¹⁴² despite the goal to support the use of no-till practices. We believe that this must

¹³⁰ Interview with the chief of Xopozo and SG member

¹³¹ Interview with SG member

¹³² Interview with chief

¹³³ Interview with hh 27 in Rwansana, hh 75 in Rwansana, hh 25 Sihlehleni, hh 77 OK

¹³⁴ Interview with former employee Monsanto, former employee Monsanto and employee Monsanto

¹³⁵ Interview with employee Monsanto b and the chief of Xopozo

¹³⁶ Interview with mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹³⁷ Interview with mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹³⁸ Interview with head provincial ECDA, head district ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, employee Monsanto b, SG member and the chief of Xopozo.

¹³⁹ Interview with SG member

¹⁴⁰ Interview with former employee Monsanto b

¹⁴¹ Massive Food Production Programme notes and observations (planning document from ECDA)

¹⁴² Interview with manager provincial ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA and officer district MFPP

have been confusing for participants in the village when they were trained in no-till and on the other hand MFPP contracted mechanical staff for ploughing.

Many of our respondents find it hard to arrange training for the smallholders. Monsanto arranged training/ field trials in Xopozo¹⁴³ and the employee from Monsanto that arranged training in Xopozo said;

*“Yeah, you see, maybe you have picked it up already, to train these people is a hell of a job, it is not easy. Because I say that a high percentage of the farmers, the small scale emerging farmers they are “intrainable”.”*¹⁴⁴.

3.3.6 The usage of genetically modified crops in MFPP

According to three respondents at Monsanto genetically modified crops (including Bt-maize) are one of the solutions for developing smallholder farming, and also a way for smallholders to reach the goals of MFPP. They claim that Bt-maize is less labour intensive and it has the potential to increase yields.¹⁴⁵ This is why Bt-maize will solve problems for African smallholder farming according to two informants at Monsanto¹⁴⁶.

*“People are dying of AIDS, people are getting older and do not hoe, they can not use hoes to control weeds. So the best thing for them is to use Roundup...If you could have Roundup Ready maize, Bt maize and drought tolerant maize, we will have no problem in Africa. The problem will be solved. For Africa.”*¹⁴⁷

Two informants at Monsanto have another opinion and are concerned about the price of genetically modified crops and they view this as a problem for smallholders regarding Bt-maize¹⁴⁸.

One of the main goals of MFPP was to increase yields in smallholder farming with the target of a yield around four tonnes per hectare. The policy from ECDA was neither to promote nor prevent genetically modified crops according to informants at ECDA.¹⁴⁹ They say that if there is a modern solution for the poor families, the poor should have the right to use this opportunity¹⁵⁰. In the end MFPP comes down to support the people to produce as much food as they can, and the government did not interfere in which kind of maize the smallholders were growing¹⁵¹.

Besides the agricultural officer working in Xopozo during the initial stages of MFPP, no one of the informants at the ECDA knew the fact that genetically modified maize was used in Xopozo during MFPP. Many of the informants were not aware about the specifics about Bt-

¹⁴³ Interview with former employee Monsanto, employee Monsanto b, extension officer local ECDA, officer local ECDA, the chief of Xopozo, officer district ECDA

¹⁴⁴ Interview with former employee Monsanto b

¹⁴⁵ Interview with employee Monsanto a, employee Monsanto b and former employee Monsanto b

¹⁴⁶ Interview with employee Monsanto b

¹⁴⁷ Interview with employee Monsanto b

¹⁴⁸ Interview with employee Monsanto a and former employee Monsanto a

¹⁴⁹ Interview with officer district ECDA, manager provincial ECDA and head provincial ECDA

¹⁵⁰ Interview with head provincial ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

¹⁵¹ Interview with head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, officer district ECDA, head district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA.

maize.¹⁵² The Chief and steering group seems to be the only ones in Xopoza that are knowledgeable about what kind of variety that had been used in MFPP¹⁵³. But they do not seem to have any information about the discussion around genetically modified crops besides information they got from Monsanto.

3.4 Reasons why MFPP failed according to stakeholders

People from ECDA and Monsanto involved in MFPP draw similar conclusions as to why the programme failed. A dominant impression from our interviews is that people are disappointed about the implementation and the unsatisfactory results of MFPP. In spite of the similarities in opinions in this area of analysis we have tried to highlight the most common views among our respondents at ECDA and Monsanto. As mentioned earlier, MFPP had problems with late deliveries of inputs especially in the first years. Almost all of our respondents mention the late deliveries as one of the causes behind the failure.¹⁵⁴

A majority of our informants at ECDA and Monsanto think that the initial plan was good. There are only two that do not agree with that and that is the mentor within MFPP and one informant at Monsanto and both criticise the payment plan.¹⁵⁵ The ones that think that the plan of MFPP was good and well suited to fulfil the goals believe that there were only the circumstances regarding the implementation that caused the failure, and not the construction of the plan itself. They mention for example lack of commitment from the smallholders, the late deliveries, and the fact that the contractors did not do their job and misunderstandings of the plan among the local implementers. Many also think that the “wrong” smallholders and the “wrong” areas were selected in to the programme.¹⁵⁶ Two respondents at ECDA claim that it was impossible to reach the economic and agricultural goals in the programme; the original design of MFPP did not benefit the poorest smallholders, even they were selected into the programme and that their actual needs and their current conditions were neglected according to them.¹⁵⁷ But it is important to state that this view is quite uncommon among our respondents within the ECDA, in general many believe that a modernized agriculture and MFPP in itself is an effective way to decrease poverty.¹⁵⁸

The absence of access to markets for the products is mentioned as a contributing factor to the failure by staff at ECDA on local and district level and one respondent at Monsanto¹⁵⁹. We think it is worth noting that not everybody underlines the importance of accessibility to markets, though one of the main goals of MFPP was to transform smallholders to commercial farmers, a goal hard to accomplish without access to market.

¹⁵² Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, head provincial ECDA, officer local ECDA, head district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹⁵³ Interview with the chief of Xopoza and SG member

¹⁵⁴ Interview with employee Monsanto b, employee Monsanto, head district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, SG member, officer local ECDA, officer district ECDA, chief of Xopoza and villagers.

¹⁵⁵ Interview with mentor MFPP local ECDA and employee Monsanto b

¹⁵⁶ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, officer district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹⁵⁷ Interview with officer district ECDA and mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹⁵⁸ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA, officer local ECDA, mentor MFPP.

¹⁵⁹ Interview with employee Monsanto, mentor MFPP local ECDA, officer district ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA and officer district ECDA

The Chief, steering committee member and staff at the local ECDA explain the difficulties with lack of storing facilities for inputs and harvest. This is one of the reasons why MFPP failed according to those respondents¹⁶⁰. When it comes to the villagers in Xopozo, they do not have anything to say because they did not have any insight or information about how the plan of MFPP was constructed. We believe that it is difficult for our respondents to imagine how the plan could be constructed differently, because they did not participate in the designing of the programme.

The Chief in Xopozo when talking about life in the village and why he thinks it is hard to make rapid changes:

*“...then you stay with people that are less fortunate in terms of education then it is not easy, to, I mean to come up with new things, and you know, such will change their lives, it is not going to be easy.”*¹⁶¹

3.4.1 Images of “the rural poor”

There are many reasons why MFPP failed according to our informants at Monsanto and ECDA. When explaining why people in the rural areas do not seem to understand the concepts of MFPP, or why they did not adapt to commercial farming, several informants at ECDA and Monsanto are using the term “dependency syndrome”. By “dependency syndrome” they mean, as we have understood it, smallholders’ relationship to the government and the governmental grant system. The respondents say that the smallholders are depending too much on the government and on the governmental grant system. They also say that the smallholders expect everything coming from the government to be for free.¹⁶²

*“Deep rural areas think that when something comes from the government they think it’s free...people pretend to be lazy because there is some grants that they are getting from the government so they don’t take care of what they have.”*¹⁶³

According to our respondents the “dependency syndrome” makes rural people passive and that rural people, instead of acting to change their conditions, are expecting the government to do everything for them. The term “dependency syndrome” is used to explain why the smallholders did not put enough effort into MFPP.¹⁶⁴

*“Ok, the other thing the programme it self how is it structured, you know people, South African people in particular, they have got this tendency of dependency to the government.”*¹⁶⁵

Rural people are seen as lazy and passive not by all the respondents at ECDA and Monsanto, but respondents at all levels mention this as a contributing explanation for the failure of

¹⁶⁰ Interview with the chief of Xopozo, SG member, extension officer local ECDA, employee Monsanto, officer local ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

¹⁶¹ Interview with Chief Xopozo

¹⁶² Interview with manager provincial ECDA, officer district ECDA, head provincial ECDA, officer local ECDA, extension officer local ECDA and officer district ECDA

¹⁶³ Interview with local extension officer

¹⁶⁴ Interview with extension officer local ECDA, officer local ECDA, head provincial ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, head district ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

¹⁶⁵ Interview with district coordinator MFPP ECDA

MFPP¹⁶⁶. Even though this view is not represented by all, it is a common opinion that is embodied at all levels and groups among our informants.

3.4.2 Are farmers not motivated enough?

Respondents at the Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture say that they had difficulties in getting people engaged in MFPP. Several respondents view the laziness of the smallholders as one of the contributing factors behind the failure of MFPP. In their opinion the smallholders missed a great opportunity to develop themselves when they failed with their performance in MFPP.¹⁶⁷ Views about the smallholders are expressed in different ways, here in the words of an officer at provincial level;

“They don’t want to do things for themselves; they want someone else to do it for them.” ¹⁶⁸

Not all people living in the rural areas are engaged farmers. Staff at the ECDA says that MFPP failed to find the motivated farmers. According to the respondents at ECDA that is one of the reasons behind the failure of the programme. So they see one possible solution in the future, and that is to design the implementation of MFPP so that the programme finds and includes the motivated farmers only.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁶ Interview with officer local ECDA, former employee Monsanto and head provincial ECDA

¹⁶⁷ Interview with extension officer local ECDA, district coordinator MFPP ECDA, head district ECDA and former employee Monsanto

¹⁶⁸ Interview with head provincial ECDA

¹⁶⁹ Interview with mentor MFPP local ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, manager provincial ECDA and district coordinator MFPP ECDA

4. Discussion

4.1 Views about rural poverty

Our respondents at ECDA and Monsanto tend to blame the participating smallholders for the failure of MFPP and claim that the smallholders are lazy and did not put enough effort into MFPP. This is similar to what for example Maria Eriksson Baaz have found in her studies of how development agencies act in Tanzania¹⁷⁰. We would like to counter the statements of our respondents. As Chambers (1983) argues; one can not expect poor rural smallholders to engage in a development programme without information or any guarantee for positive outcomes, and without sufficient information about what an involvement would result in¹⁷¹. We believe that there is no more laziness among smallholders in Xopozo, or in other villages in Eastern Cape, then anywhere else. Rural poor are just as rational as rich or poor urban citizens and they are acting out of their own reality.

This explanation, that the failure of the programme was caused by laziness and passivity from the participants, is commonly used according to Eriksson-Baaz (2002). The existing view that smallholders in MFPP are backward people that are unwilling to adopt new technologies is, according to Eriksson Baaz a postcolonial remnant that still influences the planning and implementing of development programmes.¹⁷² We think that there are reasons why people just do not throw themselves into a programme that they have no influence in and that they have little or no information about, or even do not see any prospects in. Eriksson-Baaz states that the picture of the undeveloped and primitive Africa that needs to be transformed to be like the Western world is still present¹⁷³. In line with this, the initial plan of MFPP intended to convert smallholders into commercial farmers and illustrate the view that is common among respondents at ECDA. They believe that if the smallholders should practice industrial agriculture they should not be trapped into poverty anymore.

4.2 MFPP as a top down approach

MFPP was planned with what Chambers (1983) calls an “outsider perspective”. Planners based in urban areas are acting from experiences grounded in their own realities (and knowledge from large scale industrial rather than small scale, low input farming). So was the case with MFPP. That kind of perspective doesn’t have to be wrong in all situations, but it does not coincide with local people’s views and priorities in this case. The plan of MFPP was designed by three officers at ECDA in a typical top-down manner and the smallholders did not influence the planning process at any stage¹⁷⁴, this is also concluded by Daamgard-Hansen (2006) in her study of the MFPP and its implementation in some other villages in the Eastern Cape¹⁷⁵. We consider the top-down approach to be problematic. We can think of many possible reasons for that but just to mention a few; even though the planners may obtain

¹⁷⁰ Eriksson Baaz (2002)

¹⁷¹ Chambers (1983)

¹⁷² Eriksson Baaz (2002)

¹⁷³ Ibid (2002)

¹⁷⁴ Interview with head provincial ECDA and manager provincial ECDA

¹⁷⁵ Damgaard Hansen, 2006: 43

knowledge about the rural context and the needs of the rural population, not including the smallholders in the process can result in lack of commitment from the smallholders. The lack of commitment and engagement could possibly lead to difficulties in the attempts to promote development. Not that the smallholders do not want to engage in development programmes. But rather because they may not be knowledgeable about the aim with the programme and what a possible involvement could result in. The design of the programme may not match the needs of the smallholders (they are not a homogenous group that have the same wants or needs). A huge programme like MFPP with an inflexible structure could possibly suite a few, not everybody. It is possible or likely that the planners do not have complete information about what the rural poor really need, or really want, and a process of including the rural population in the development efforts will therefore result in a more suitable design.

In Eastern Cape there have been many development programmes similar to MFPP¹⁷⁶. Therefore we believe that employment of a top down design is possibly even more problematic in an area like Eastern Cape. One villager in Xopozo expresses his distrust to the government when saying;

*“...he had the feeling on the first time that this project thing will never continue, it has no power to plant, so I did not get rid of my old maize”*¹⁷⁷

No sustainable results can be reached without involving local people in the process, as Chambers argues¹⁷⁸. To create a sustainable organisation of development efforts, participation of all members in a group is needed in the process of forming common rules. The rules should be adapted to the local environment in order to work.¹⁷⁹ This was definitely not the case in MFPP. We believe there is a lack of reflection within the organisation about MFPP and an absence of insight and feedback or regarding how programmes like MFPP could be constructed in another way, for being able to change the situation for the rural poor.

4.3 The aims of MFPP

Even though MFPP aimed to eradicate hunger and poverty, the officers at ECDA blame the failure of MFPP on the fact that smallholders were incorrectly allocated into the programme¹⁸⁰. The officers think that the participants were too poor, unmotivated and that they did not put enough effort into the programme¹⁸¹. We think this idea is questionable when looking at the goals which aimed to eradicate poverty. If poor smallholders were supposed to be participating in MFPP, how could one state that the “wrong kind” of people was selected?

Damgaard-Hansen (2006) concludes that the organisation of aggregating land and engage large clusters of people in the decision making and the implementation of MFPP was irresponsible. She also concludes that there is a lack of understanding within ECDA for the

¹⁷⁶ de Wet (1990), Ntsebeza (1999) and Bernstein (1997)

¹⁷⁷ Interview with hh 75 in Rwansana. All citations from Xopozo are not direct citations with no modifications from what we have been told by the translator.

¹⁷⁸ Chambers (1983)

¹⁷⁹ Ostrom (1990) in Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁸⁰ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, extension officer local ECDA, officer district ECDA, mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹⁸¹ Interview with extension officer local ECDA, district coordinator ECDA, head district ECDA,, manager provincial ECDA and Former employee Monsanto b

local situation.¹⁸² Our findings support this conclusion. The objective of MFPP to aggregate 50 hectares or more in larger fields to be managed as units is to our understanding difficult to employ in a village like Xopozo with a complex and collective structure of land use compared to individual farming. We agree with Daamgard-Hansen when she states that communal lands implicate a more complex and resource scarce living situation. And therefore the design of MFPP possibly could suite individual farmers but not smallholders in communal lands.¹⁸³

4.4 Technical solutions in MFPP

The fact that the aim in MFPP to implement no-till practices did not correspond with the goal of employing mechanisation contractors for ploughing, is an evidence of the ambiguity within the structure of MFPP¹⁸⁴. The planning documents from ECDA are focused on finding technical solutions to fight poverty and to get black people into commercialized agriculture to balance the present dominance from white farmers. But in the same document, ECDA conclude that the younger generation in general is not involved in agriculture and that it is mainly elderly people that are engaged in farming in the villages.¹⁸⁵ The aged work force within the agriculture has been mentioned by many of our respondents¹⁸⁶. Despite that the plan and objectives, ECDA are strongly focused on getting people involved in commercialized agriculture, without any investigation on what people are interested in or what they are prioritising.

MFPP was supposed to show the capability of the “new South Africa” and lift poor smallholders out of poverty. ECDA wanted to avoid ending up as the former development programmes (betterment-schemes) in the past, where people become passive receivers instead of active participants. Large scale tractor schemes that ended up with indebted smallholders were supposed to be replaced with a contractor business, repayment plans and commercialised farmers. Instead, everything ended up in exactly the same way as before. Damgaard-Hansen claims that the approach of MFPP was more about changes of land arrangements and became similar to previous betterment schemes during the apartheid regime, which rather degraded than managed to empower people.¹⁸⁷ This is also what we found in our study, and is in line with our conclusion.

MFPP was focusing too much on physical resources and technical solutions. This is in line with Chambers when he says that practitioners who often views poverty as being caused by physical limitations rather than political issues.¹⁸⁸ In our opinion when looking at the goals, the planning and the execution of MFPP, the programme only offered technical solutions without any social analysis. The planning documents and the views from the people working with MFPP reflect how they look at the causes of poverty and how to find solutions to improve the living situation for rural poor.

¹⁸² Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁸³ Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁸⁴ Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁸⁵ Department of Agriculture, 2003 (planning document from ECDA)

¹⁸⁶ Interview with extension officer local ECDA, manager provincial ECDA, officer district ECDA, mentor MFPP local ECDA

¹⁸⁷ Damgaard Hansen (2006)

¹⁸⁸ Chambers (1983)

4.5 Information and genetically modified crops from ECDA

Information about how the programme was planned to be like, is one of the weakest links in MFPP. Information did not get through even within the ECDA itself, and less so to the smallholders of concern.

Regarding this, it is not just information about the structure of the programme that is needed but also information about which alternatives that are offered and benefits as well as disadvantages with the programme. On this point, it is controversial to introduce genetically modified seed varieties like Monsanto did during MFPP. Representatives at ECDA claim that it is everyone's right to grow whatever kind of variety one wish to grow. In the case of Xopoza we would like to question whether genetically modified crops are sustainable economically and socially and if people have actually chosen "what they like to grow", since people in general do not seem to know what kind of seed they have been supplied with.

We would like to question if genetically modified crops are suitable for smallholder farming. Without any ecological, financial or social buffer at all there is a big risk and high exposure for smallholders. We think it is problematic to introduce GM technology without informing about which kind of maize that they are growing (the smallholders that are growing the maize) and the extension officers that are working in the area. There are specific characteristics concerning GM-crops and risks that might be involved. The fact that the ECDA does not have a clarified policy towards the introduction of genetically modified crops is notable¹⁸⁹.

4.6 Reflections on our role as outsiders

We do not claim to have the full information about rural life in Eastern Cape and we do not know the answer to how to find a solution for rural poverty. Even though we also have an outsider's perspective, we do want to emphasize that the planners and implementers of MFPP were not knowable of the reality of rural poverty. It is not uncomplicated for us as Swedish students (supported by the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency) to travel to a developing country to study poverty and rural development. Many times we have thought about our studies and how we could possibly contribute with our findings. This is only a bachelor thesis and we do not have any claims to change the situation for the rural poor, which would have been unrealistic. What we can do is contribute to the knowledge about the situation in developing countries in general and in South Africa in particular. We believe that our outsiders perspective can bring a "fresh look" on South African agricultural development, and although there is a lot that we do not know about or understand about South African development work or South African realities we believe that our outsiders perspective can give ideas to South African developers as to what we as outsiders react to when studying a development programme. We also believe that we as non- South Africans sometimes have had the opportunity to speak more freely both with poor rural people and development workers and to get closer to both groups of people than they commonly do to each other.

¹⁸⁹ Interview with manager provincial ECDA, head provincial ECDA, head district ECDA

6.7 Conclusion 1: the planning and implementation of MFPP

MFPP aimed to eradicate hunger and poverty; it failed to reach this goal. In fact MFPP ended being a development programme with many similarities with the ones during time of Apartheid in South Africa: a top down planned programme with no possibility for the participating smallholders to affect the structure, the design or the implementation. As the title of this thesis “the baby of the government” indicates, MFPP is truly not a programme based on initiatives coming from the smallholders that it is supposed to assist. This was also not the initial aim with the programme. The aims and the implementation of the programme were not understood in the same way among the different actors. What is most astonishing is how little information and guidance people at local level got regarding MFPP.

What surprised us a bit were the views and ideas about the rural poor, about them being lazy and unwilling to work etc. coming from almost all of our respondents even the smallholders themselves. To our understanding these views in combination with the top-down structure and the lack of possibilities for participation as well as lack of information between all groups is the most important factors behind the failure of MFPP.

Regarding the incentives for Monsanto’s involvement in MFPP the company does not seem to have been involved in the planning, at least not to significant extent. But it had a great part in the training of the smallholders in the programme. The purpose of Monsanto’s involvement was also to promote and implement their products.

6.8 Conclusion 2: the usage of GM crops in MFPP

The ECDA wanted to accomplish an industrialised agriculture sector in Eastern Cape. In that way, the introduction of GM crops fit the aims of MFPP. ECDA does not have a clear policy when it comes to the use of GM crops in MFPP. Since many of the actors; at the ECDA (local and district level) and in the village lack information about GM crops in general and Bt-maize in particular it is difficult to say anything about their understanding of the aim and the use of GM-crops. It is unfortunate in our opinion that this kind of information did not reach the smallholders that actually grew the crops, or the extension officer that is supposed to assist them.

Unsurprisingly the position of Monsanto is that GM crops are beneficial for poor smallholders. The opinion that genetically modified crops are more expensive and therefore less suitable for poor smallholders is mentioned by some at ECDA and Monsanto, but it is not a common statement. Even fewer mention the discourse around GM crops and the feared ecological, economical and social consequences from the use of the technology, commonly occurring in the general international debate.

5. List of references

5.1 Articles, books and reports

African Centre for Biosafety (2007) *Monsanto's "Seed of hope campaign" in South Africa, a briefing document.*

Alexandratos, N., (1998) World food and agriculture: Outlook for the medium and longer term, presented at the National Academy of Sciences colloquium "*Plants and Population: Is There Time?*" held December 5–6, at the Arnold and Mabel Beckman Center in Irvine, CA.

Andrew, M., & Fox, C. (2004). "Undercultivation" and intensification in the Transkei: a case study of historical changes in the use of arable land in Nompá, Shixini". *Development Southern Africa* Vol. 21, No 4.

Appiah (1992) in Eriksson Baaz, M. (2001) "African identity and the postcolonial". In: Eriksson Baaz M and M Palmberg: Same and other: negotiating African identity in cultural production. Uppsala: *Nordic Africa Institute*, p.5-18.

Bank, L., & Minkley, G. (2005). "Going Nowhere Slowly? Land, Livelihoods and Rural Development in the Eastern Cape" *Social Dynamics* 31:1 p. 1-38.

Bernstein, H. (1997) Social change in the South African countryside? Land and production, poverty and power. *Land Reform and Agrarian Change in southern Africa. An Occasional paper series.* No. 4, p.1-35

Borowiak, C. (2004) Farmers' Rights: Intellectual Property Regimes and the Struggle over Seeds. *Politics & Society*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 511-543)

Chambers, R., 1983: *Rural development: Putting The Last First.* Essex: Longman

Chrispeels, M. J. (2000) Biotechnology and the Poor. *Plant Physiology.* Vol. 124, p. 3-6.

Collage of Agriculture, 2004: [online] Accessed 04.12.08
<http://www.ca.uky.edu/entomology/entfacts/ef130.asp>

Copstake, J., & Moris, J. (1993) *Qualitative Enquiry for Rural Development.* London: *Intermediate technology publications on behalf of the overseas development institute.*

de Beer, F., & Marais, M. (2005) Rural communities, the natural environment and development – some challenges, some successes. *Community Development Journal.* Vol. 40 No 1.

Damgaard Hansen, K. (2006) The Massive Food Production Scheme, eastern cape- Design Extension Approach and Scope for Adoption of Minimum Tillage. *Department of Pland and Soil Science.* KVL.

de Wet, C. (1990) The socio-ecological impact of development schemes in the “homelands” of South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*. Vol. 86, Jul-Oct, 1990, p. 440-446.

Davies, J., & Nel, E.L. (1999) Farming against the odds an examination of the challenges facing farming and rural development in the Eastern Cape province of South Africa. *Applied Geography*. Vol. 19, p. 253-274.

Dixon, J., Tanyeri-Abur, A., & Wattenbach, H. Smallholders, globalization and policy analysis. (2004) Agricultural Management, Marketing and Finance Service (AGSF) Agricultural Support Systems Division. *Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations. An Occasional Paper*. No. 5, p. 1-80.

ECDA, 2003a: *Department of Agriculture Eastern Cape strategic plan 2003-2006*, ECDA, Bhisho

ECDA, 2004: *Massive Food Production Scheme, documents from the Agriculture Department of Eastern Cape*, ECDA, Bhisho

ECDA, year unknown: *Massive Food Production- Administration of the Massive Food Production Scheme*, ECDA, Bhisho

ECDA, year unknown: *Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture- Massive Food Production Programme*, ECDA, Bhisho

ECDA, year unknown: *Massive Food Production Programme- Notes and Observations*, ECDA, Bisho

Eriksson Baaz, M. (2001) African identity and the postcolonial. In: Eriksson Baaz M and M Palmberg: *Same and other: negotiating African identity in cultural production*. Uppsala: *Nordic Africa Institute*, pp 5-18.

Eriksson Baaz, M. (2002) *The White Wo/Man's Burden in the Age of Partnership: A Postcolonial Reading of Identity in Development Aid*, Ph.D. thesis, PADRIGU, Göteborg: *Göteborg University*.

Esaiasson, P., Gilljam, M., Oscarsson, H., & Wängnerud, L.,(2007) *Metodpraktikan- konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. Vällingby: *Norstedts Juridik AB*.

FAO, 1997: [online] Accessed: 21-12-07 <http://www.fao.org/docrep/X5673E/x5673e05.htm>.

FAO, 1999: [online] Accessed: 07.12.08
<http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/005/AC621E/ac621e05.htm>.

FAO, year: [online] Accessed: 30.11.08 www.fao.org South African Map

Gouse, M., Pray, C E., Kirsten, J., & Schimmelpfennig, D. (2005) A GM subsistence crop in Africa: the case of Bt white maize in South Africa. *Int. J. Biotechnology*. Vol 7. p. 84-94

Glover, D. Biotechnology for Africa? Briefing 10. (2003) Democratising Biotechnology: Genetically Modified Crops in Developing Countries Briefing Series, *Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, UK*.

GRAIN, 2008: *African heritage crops threatened by South African GMO decision* [online] <http://www.grain.org/m/?id=201> Accessed 26.11.08

GRAIN, 2008: *Lesions from a green revolution in South Africa* [online] <http://www.grain.org/seedling/?id=568> Accessed 10.12.08

Haag, F., & Hajdu, F. (2005) Perspectives on Local Environmental Security, Exemplified by a Rural South African Village. *Environmental Management* Vol. 36, No. 4. p. 483-494.

Ismael, Y., Bennett, R., & Morse, S. (2002) Benefits from Bt Cotton Use by Smallholder Farmers in South Africa. *AgBioForum* 5(1): p. 1-5.

Jacobson, K., & Wahlberg, K. Lantbruk på lika villkor – om samexistensen mellan GMO-fritt lantbruk och lantbruk som använder GMO. *Uppsala: Centre for Sustainable Agriculture, the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences*

Klasen, S., & Woolard, I. (2008) Surviving Unemployment Without State Support: Unemployment and Household Formation. *South Africa Journal of African Economies* published online on May 14, [online] Accessed 27.11. 08.

Kvale, S. (1997) Den kvalitativa forskningsintervjun. *Lund: Studentlitteratur*.

Maxhuka, J. (2001) Agricultural Biotechnology for Africa. African Scientists and Farmers Must Feed Their Own People. *Plant Physiology*.

McAllister, P. (2000) Maize yields in the Transkei: How productive is subsistence cultivation? *Land Reform and Agrarian Change in southern Africa. An Occasional paper series*. No. 14, p. 1-28.

McAllister, P. (1992) "Rural Production, land Use and Development Planning in Transkei: A Critique of the Transkei Agricultural Development Study" in: Donaldson A., J. Segar and R. Southall (eds) "Undoing independence: regionalism and the reincorporation of Transkei into South Africa". *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* Vol. 11, no 2.

Monsanto Company, 2007: <http://www.monsanto.com>. [online] Accessed 21.12.07

Ntsebeza, L. (1999) Land tenure reform, traditional authorities and rural local government in post-apartheid South Africa – Case studies from Eastern Cape. *Land Reform and Agrarian Change in southern Africa. An Occasional paper series*. No. 3, p. 1-117.

Ostrom (1990) in Damgaard Hansen, K. (2006) The Massive Food Production Scheme, eastern cape- Design Extension Approach and Scope for Adoption of Minimum Tillage. *Department of Pland and Soil Science. KVL*.

Pschorn- Strauss, E. (2004) *Bt Cotton and Small- scale Farmers in Makhathini- A Story of Debt, Dependebcy, asn Dicey Economics*.

Savenues.com, year unknown: Eastern Cape regional Map (modified from South Africa Explored) [online] http://www.savenues.com/maps/eastcape_regional.htm. Accessed: 05.12.07

Scoones, I. (2002) *Can Agricultural Biotechnology be Pro-Poor? A sceptical Look at the Emerging `Consensus`*. Vol. 33, No 4, p. 114-119.

Todaro, M., & Smith., 2006: *Economic development*, ninth edition.

United Nations, 2000 [online]: Accessed 10.12.08
<http://www.un.org/esa/documents/ecosoc/cn17/2000/ecn172000-7add2.htm>

University of Kentucky, College of Agriculture, 1999: [online] Accessed 27.01.08
<http://www.ca.uky.edu/entomology/entfacts/ef130.asp>.

Wambugu, F. (1999) Why Africa needs agricultural biotech. *Nature*, 400, 15-16.

Wikipedia.org, year: 2006 [online] Accessed: 05.12.07 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transkei>.
(Produced by the CIA. From the Perry-Castaneda Map Collection)

Witt, H., Patel, R., & Schnurr, M. (2006) Can the Poor Help GM Crops? Technology, Representation & Cotton in the Makhathini Flats, South Africa. *Review of African Political Economy* No. 109, p. 497-513.

The language of agriculture, year unknown [online] <http://www.123exp-food.com/agriculture>
Accessed: 09.12.08

5.2 Oral sources:

Eastern Cape Department of Agriculture

Agricultural officer, technical manager and manager of extension services ECDA (Kokstad), Kokstad 21.04.08

Former extension officer at the local office ECDA (Flagstaff) Currently working at the district office at Department of Agriculture in Eastern Cape (Umtata), Umtata 12.05.08

Head at the provincial office ECDA (Bisho), East London 12.06.08

Head at the district office ECDA (Bisho) 12.05.08

Manager and coordinator of MFPP at the provincial office ECDA (Bisho), East London 10.06.08

Mentor in MFPP ECDA (Flagstaff), Port Edward 06.05.08

Officer at the OR Tambo district office, district coordinator of MFPP ECDA (Umtata), Umtata 09.05.08

Officer at the local office ECDA (Flagstaff), Flagstaff 05.05.08

Officer at the OR Tambo district office, head of extension ECDA (Umtata), Umtata 09.05.08

Xopozo

Chief of Xopozo, Xopozo 30.04.08

Households in sub villages of Xopozo; Rwansana (household no.27 02.06.08, household no.75 02.06.08), Sihleleni (household no. 25 01.06.08, household no.77 01.06.08) and Ok (household no. 77 03.06.08, household no. 25 21.06.08)
Member of the steering group, Xopozo 01.05.08

Monsanto

Employee at Monsanto a (Eastern Cape), Durban 23.05.08

Employee at Monsanto b (Eastern Cape), Durban 22.05.08

Former employee at Monsanto a (Eastern Cape) (currently working at Pannar), Flagstaff 06.06.08

Former employee at Monsanto b (Eastern Cape) (retired), Margate 03.05.08

5.3 Personal Communication:

Elfrieda Pschorn-Strauss Programme Officer, GRAIN AFRICA, Cape Town 2008-06-24

Haidee Swanby, researcher and Outreach Officer, African Centre for Biosafety, Cape Town 2008-06-24

6. Appendix

6.1 Interview plan ECDA

About the democracy and chieftaincy

How has the role of the chiefs changed since democracy? What is the role of the chief and what is the role of the democratically elected institutions? How does it work?

What does the chief decide and what do the democratically elected institutions decide?

If we talk specifically about the agriculture, how does it work?

How will it be in the future you think?

About department of agriculture

Can we draw a picture for me to understand the structure of decision making within the department of agriculture. And also to write a list of people that have been involved in the MFPP and their position within this structure. And specifically name all people I need to contact to get the whole chain of information regarding the MFPP and Xopozo.

What is your role/ responsibilities within the MFPP

What is your training? What is your education/background? Which is your main task (as supervisor etc)?

Farming

When did people get the current fields (square)?

How was it before?

How important would you say that farming is for the people in the village?

How has it changed?

What about the grazing lands? How are they organised? Who controls the grazing? Not to have too high grazing pressure?

Other issues?

How do you think it will be in maybe 10 years regarding the farming?

Land

How is the ownership of land? How does it work? Who owns the land? What kind of ownership do people have of their land? Is it communally owned for the village?

Who makes decisions regarding the land?

How is the situation regarding land in the village. I have seen these small fields on top of the football field. Is land becoming scarcer?

Maize

Do you know how long people have grown maize? (sorgum before?)

How did the varieties that people have now come here?

What different Xhosa maize varieties do people grow and what is the difference between them? There are some with English names and some with Xhosa names. Why?

What is the expected yield increase with the Bt maize as compared with the old open-pollinated varieties?

Can you explain to me how it works with cross pollination between maize? (Pink Bt maize)

The little maize cob on top. Is that normal to happen for the Bt maize?

Why do some people say that the name of the new seed is Hekalking?

As I have heard there has also been previous agricultural development programmes here. What have been their aims and how have they worked? In what way is MFPP different?

Can you explain to me about the little bag that is inside the big bag that they are supplied with? What were the instructions for that bag?

People say that the Bt maize gets ripe earlier and that seems to be of highest value for them. Can you explain to me why? And they also seem to value that you can plant it later in the season. Why is that? Is it better to plant later?

Maize Diseases

What is the most common disease in maize in the region?

What is the biggest problem/ constraint in maize farming?

What is the hardest disease for people to tackle?

What creates most yield loss?

Could you tell me the names of the maize diseases in English: Isihlawa, Ingogwana, Isigobantshaka?

Ubuza= is it a common name for all insects that eat maize? Or all insects that are pests? Or what does it mean?

“The insect that causes isihlava is an insect with 2-parted tail. It is called Umbhelekedlana.” Is this right? Name in English?

Isigobantshaka: comes after cold rains in march- what do people mean by that?

Does it happen something when one is growing Bt-maize in the same field during a long time without inter cropping?

Life

What is good and bad about living a life in the village?

What do you think is the most important change that is needed for the village to improve people's life quality and reduce poverty?

Regarding MFPP

Regarding the aims with and function of MFPP

What is your role in MFPP?

Can you give me detailed description of how the MFPP worked (how did it start, which villages were involved and why? How did villages get their seeds/ inputs/ contractors for tractors etc, how did they pay? Get a loan?)

What was the aim with the MFPP? Why did you choose this type of project?

In what way was smallholder farming in need to be improved. (from the MFPPs perspective)

What was/ is needed to change the situation? (from the MFPPs perspective) Did the project fulfill your expectations?

What was the expected result of the programme? What should have happened by the time the program finished?

How has it worked? What failed and what was successful?

What is your experience of the project? How long have you known about the project? How have you worked with the project?

If you have positive and/or negative opinions about the project, which you believe can help the development of this project (or other), can you report this further? To who?

The payments? How did it work? What was the plan initially? I heard from people 2006 when I was here that they expected to give away an increasing amount of their harvest every year but in the end it didn't happen. And that they first thought that all would be for free but then they were told to pay 200 rand that they didn't know about in the beginning.

What seeds could people choose between?

In what way could Bt maize specifically help to reach the aims of MFPP?

How do you think that the project has changed the situation for people living in the villages involved? Has the agrarian conditions changed after the project started?

How was the cooperation between the corporate sector (supplying seeds, inputs etc) and the ECDA organised? Did they supply seeds/ chemicals for free or at a good price? How was it decided which chemicals/ seeds etc should be used. Was it decided by ECDA before a request was put to the companies, or did the companies decide what should be supplied?

Regarding the organisation and structure of decision-making

What did the contract say between the dep of agriculture and the village?

What were the responsibilities for the dep of agriculture and the village respectively within the MFPP

Who belonged to the steering group?

How was it put together?

What did the steering group do?

What kind of help/ information was the village supplied with?

Why were the deliveries late in season many times? Were both the seeds and the tractors late?

Regarding information and training

Who gave the people in the village training?

Has Monsanto been involved in any training? What kind of information was provided? Which type of contact do you have with Monsanto? What kind of training was given to the supervisors? What kind of information was given to the people in the villages? Has it been any ongoing information given to the participants during the project? Has it been any written information? Can we look at it? Do you think that it has been enough information?

I have seen certificates from Monsanto. But also other training from other people? How did it work?

Is there an extension agent that they have contact with? In that case: how often? Which kind of extension? Do you think that these kind of contacts been important? How?

Who gave them information about the bt maize and what is special with that. What information? (isihlava resistant?)

What kind of training? For steering group? For local people?

Which seeds could you choose between? Also seeds that were not modified? Did you order/ get different seeds every year. Specifically what kind of seeds CG.... Every year?

Do you have a list of what you could choose between and do you have a copy of your orders?

Restart of the program?

What do you know about a restart.

In what way will it be different this time?

What do you think about the future for the project? Are you going to continue working within the project? What do you think about the future for the people that have been involved in the project?

If there not will be any restart, is something else going to happen instead?

Practicalities

Do you have rainfall data for Flagstaff area?

Population data for Xopozo?

Agricultural data for Xopozo?

All MFPP documents to copy?

Do you have a list of the orders from Xopozo every year? And other communication with Xopozo? Can I copy them?

6.2 Interview plan Monsanto

Farming

What role do you see for GM crops in low input resource poor smallholder farming?

Now?

In the future?

Can you list positive (and negative aspects) with GM crops? What kind of GM crop do you think is best fitted to the life of poor households? Where do you see the biggest needs in the agriculture for smallholders?

Monsanto and MFPP

Can you give me detailed description of how the MFPP worked and in what way Monsanto was involved (how did it start, which villages were involved and why? Which seeds were promoted and why etc?)

In what way is this linked to the seeds of hope campaign?

(Monsanto has had a “seeds of hope” campaign in many countries over the world, targeting poor people specifically, with the aim to help improve their farming and following also the life quality. Seeds of hope have also been in KZN connected to the state initiated land care programme)

What was the aim with the MFPP? (Which was the target group?)

Why did Monsanto decide to engage in the MFPP?

In what way was smallholder farming in need to be improved. (from the MFPPs perspective)

What was/ is needed to change the situation? (from the MFPPs perspective)

What was the expected result of the programme? What should have happened by the time the program finished?

Did the project fulfill your expectations?

Do you pass your experience on to someone higher up in the organisation so that future projects can learn from these experiences? To whom?

How has it worked? What failed and what was successful?

In what way could Bt maize specifically help to reach the aims of MFPP?

What is Monsanto's role/ responsibilities within the MFPP?

What kind of information about MFPP is available in the organisation of Monsanto? Where does this information come from? What kind of help/ information was the village supplied

with from Monsanto? From other agents? Has it been any information from the villages involved given to you during the time of the project? Has Monsanto been providing information to the participants in MFPP during the project? (ECDA, the smallholders, extension agents etc). Has the information been satisfying?

What types of different seeds did Monsanto provide the MFPP with? Did it vary over the years?

Can you explain to me about the little bag that is inside the big bag that they are supplied with? What were the instructions for that bag?

Future

How is the plan for making the seeds accessible to local people after the programme has finished?

How does it work when Monsanto seeds are sold locally? Information/ training to outlets. Giving instructions to buyers?

Is there any restrictions regarding how it should be planted? Or regarding saving seeds? How is it ensured that the restrictions work in practice?

Heard from chief that the seeds cannot be kept in the same storage room as other seeds to avoid mix-up?

What kinds of instructions are given to people in outlets when buying GM maize?

How do you think that the project has changed the situation for people living in the villages involved? Has the agrarian conditions changed after the project started?

Restart of the program?

What do you know about a restart?

Will Monsanto be involved again?

In what way will it be different this time?

Are Monsanto involved in any other development project in South Africa? If yes, can you tell us a little about them? Which results came out from these projects, or what are the expectations?

What do you think about the future for the project? Are you going to continue working within the project? What do you think about the future for the people that have been involved in the project?

If there not will be any restart, is something else going to happen instead?

Maize

What is the expected yield increase with the Bt maize as compared with the old open-pollinated varieties? Under what conditions?

Can you explain to me how it works with cross pollination between maize? (Pink Bt maize)

The little maize cob on top. Is that normal to happen for the Bt maize?

Why do some people say that the name of the new seed is Hekalking?

What is the optimal planting and harvesting time of Bt maize in the Flagstaff area?

People say that the Bt maize ripens earlier and that seems to be of highest value for them. Can you explain to me why? And they also seem to value that you can plant it later in the season. Why is that?

Does it happen something when one is growing Bt-maize in the same field during a long time without inter cropping?

Maize Diseases

What is the most common disease in maize in the region?

What is the biggest problem/ constraint in maize farming?

What is the hardest disease for people to tackle?

What creates most yield loss?

Practicalities

Copy documents?

6.3 Interview plan Xopoza

We would like to know what you have to say about the project, how it started, how the plan was from the beginning etc. But also some general questions about maize, farming and rural livelihoods that we think that you might know about.

Are you the head of the household? Are you involved in the farming?

Farming and Maize

Do you have a field? Are you growing in the field?

For how long have you been growing in the field?

Is it sometimes that you not are growing in the field? Why? Are you growing in the field this year? (Why not?)

What kind of maize varieties do you grow? Who told you that it is called like that?

Have you been growing the project maize? What kind? Who told you that it is called like that? For how long have you been growing the project maize? What do you think about the new maize? Why?

Could you choose different kind of varieties of seeds from the project? Did you grow different kind of varieties different years?

If not: why?

What do you use the maize for; mainly for household consumption or do you sell the maize? (For how long have you been selling the maize? How much do you sell? Is it an important income for the household?)

About the project

Have you been taking part in the project?

For how long time?

Why did you decide to join the project?

If not: what did you hear about the project? Why did you decide to not join the project?

If you think about how the project worked, do you regret that you didn't join the project?

What was the purpose with the project? Why the project did come? What was the project suppose to do?

Who came with the project? Did someone come and told you anything about the project? When was it? What did the say?

How has the project worked?

Information & Training

Did you hear anything about the project before you joined? Was it any meeting before the project started? Did someone else from this household participate on the meeting? Why did that person participate (out of the household)? How was it?

If you think about what you heard (was told) about the project before/ or when you joined it, how did they say that it should be? Did it become like they told you? Why/why not?

Has the project helped you with anything regarding the farming? What kind of help? Who came here to help? How often? Did you get any practical help from the project?

Did you (or someone in the household) take part in any training organized by the project? (Why did you choose to send that person to participate?) What kind of training was it? Who organized the training? How often did the project organize trainings like that? What did they say?

Did you (or someone in the household) take part in any training organized from other people than the project? When was that? What did they say?

Has the project change your way of farming? In what way? Do you think that people in the village have changed their way of farming since the project come? In what way? Why/why not?

Grazing land & cattle

Is it something in the village that you are using together with other people in the village? For example the forest, the river and the grazing land. Can you think of anything else that you are using together?

Is it something that is limiting the use on for example the grazing land? Why do some people keep more animals than others? Can everybody buy more animals and put them into the grazing land? Can it be too many animals in the grazing land? What happens if it would be too many animals?

Can people from other villages put their animals in the grazing land belonging to Xopozo? What happens if they do that?

What do you think about putting all the fields in the village together and share it with other people living in the village? Would it work? Why/ why not?

We have heard that this was the plan for the project in the beginning. Have you heard something about that?

What is the difference between sharing the grazing land and the fields?

About the future and the life in the village

What do you think will happen now when the project has stopped? Why do you think that the project has stopped? Do you think that the project will come back? Will you take part in it if the project comes back?

What do you think about the project maize comparing to the old maize varieties?
Do you want to keep on growing the project maize even if you have to buy it your self?

Can you save seed from the project maize if you want to?

What do you think will happen in the future regarding the agriculture?

What do you think about the youth generation? Do you think they will continue with the farming?

Is it some where in Xopozo that it is better to live than other places? What are the differences? If you could choose, where would you like to live? Why?

Practicalities

Do you have any documents from the project? Did you sign anything when joining the project? Can you show us?