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I. Executive Summary

De Doorns is a small rural farming town in the Western Cape, and one without many economic and social opportunities, besides seasonal work on the surrounding table grape farms. High season occurs five months of every year (October-February), after which widespread unemployment is present in the community, most notably in the informal settlement of Stofland. This high, seasonal unemployment is coupled with many social challenges. Additionally, the people of De Doorns face continued, multifaceted racial and socio-economic segregation, which is fundamentally entrenched in the spatial divide of the town and setup on the farms.

When comparing the data from Phase I and Phase II with regards to the locals’ interactions with foreign nationals, we received somewhat conflicting reports. Whilst we spoke to more South Africans in Phase I, it became evident that the community’s interactions differ with respect to the two predominant groups of foreign nationals in the area, namely the Sothos (from Lesotho¹) and the Zimbabweans. Sothos are very much considered to be South African, and therefore part of the community, whereas the Zimbabweans are considered ‘outsiders’, and get treated as such. Perhaps as a result of this, the researchers found that significant tension exists between the Sothos and the Zimbabweans. Generally, xenophobic sentiment towards Zimbabweans was deemed high in De Doorns. In Phase II, however, the unhappiness of local South African residents appears to have shifted towards the Sothos, mainly because they are seen as being particularly violent. Indeed, no explicit tension between the Zimbabweans and Sothos were discussed by any interviewees in Phase II.

De Doorns is particularly interesting in that it is the only rural site of xenophobic violence that occurred during the 2008/2009 nationwide attacks. The attacks occurred in Stofland, reportedly to drive the Zimbabweans out of the community. This was because Zimbabweans were perceived to be, at the time, systematically accepting lower wages from the farmers and, as a result, the farmers preferred to employ them over the locals. About a year later, after being displaced to a sports field in town, the remaining Zimbabweans were displaced.

¹ There are Sesotho speaking South Africans, but in De Doorns the Sotho population is almost exclusively from Lesotho.
reintegrated into the community. Some community members, mostly Coloured, expressed their disappointment over the return of the Zimbabweans to Stofland.

Further collective violence occurred more recently. In 2012/2013, De Doorns was at the epicentre of the provincial farm workers’ strike. At the time, farm workers were being paid R69 per day. This extended strike, which was particularly violent, aimed to see this daily rate increased to R150. After much negotiations, led by a prominent trade unionist, the daily rate was agreed to at R105 per day. While this was perceived to be a victory, the implications for those who took part in the strike were far-reaching, and many struggled to secure work on the farms thereafter.

This report is organised into eight main sections. The background information section (III) examines the geographical layout of this rural farming town and its socio-economic profile. Thereafter, the report assesses the main social interactions and perceptions between the groups of people in the area (IV). This section provides details on the lives of farmworkers and the everyday challenges that they face on the farms. This is followed by an assessment of the community’s leadership structures and how people in the community typically seek to solve social problems (V). Thereafter, the report considers the history of collective violence, and in particular examines the farm workers’ strike that took place in 2012/2013 and the xenophobic violence of 2009 (VI). Section VII provides an analysis of the underlying causes and triggers of this violence, as well as the social and economic implications thereof (VIII). The conclusion presents the major research findings (IX).

II. Methodology

This community profile is drawn from numerous sources. A background document was compiled before Phase I of the fieldwork took place, which incorporated Census 2011, crime and elections data, as well as a range of media articles, news reports, local government and civil society publications, and academic papers. These have subsequently been expanded upon in this version of community profile. The SaVI research team conducted fieldwork in two phases in De Doorns: Phase I in May 2016 and Phase II in November 2016.
The research team made use of semi-structured, in-depth interviews, ranging from seven minutes to 90 minutes in length. Phase I of the fieldwork, from the 9 – 13 May 2016, was during the off-season (harvesting) period, in which the team of four field researchers conducted 30 interviews with 42 respondents (25 females and 17 males). An additional key informant was interviewed in Paarl on 1 July 2016. About half (16) of the interviews were conducted in Afrikaans, nine in isiXhosa, four in English, one in Shona and one in Sesotho. In terms of race, 17 interviewees were Coloured, 20 Black African, three White and two Asian/Indian. In terms of nationality, ten foreign nationals were interviewed and the remaining 32 were South African. Phase II of the fieldwork, from 21 – 24 November 2016, enabled the researchers to assess dynamics of De Doorns during peak farming season. The purpose of Phase II was to fill in knowledge gaps, and the team interviewed eight individuals. Three of these respondents were foreign national farmworkers as this population group had not been well represented in Phase I. Many of the interviews in Phase II were conducted in the evenings, as employed seasonal workers were busy during the day.

The research team, after both Phase I and Phase II, were unable to interview a labour broker or police representative. Perhaps reflecting the illicit and controversial nature of their work, it was very difficult to identify labour brokers. One broker was identified but refused to be interviewed. Additionally, the police in De Doorns were unwilling to be interviewed without written permission from their cluster commander, who referred the team to the national police authority for clearance. The team did not get this permission in time for either phase of the fieldwork. During Phase I of the research, the research team faced occasional hostility from a few potential respondents in De Doorns. This mainly pertained to white residents, who appeared to be very suspicious of the team and the motives for conducting the research.
III. Background information

Physical Layout

De Doorns is a relatively small rural settlement in the Breede Valley Municipality, lying along the main arterial roads of the Cape Winelands District Municipality. This is a district municipality that is located in the Boland region of the Western Cape province, where the largest towns in the municipality are Paarl, Worcester, Stellenbosch and Wellington. De Doorns lies in the centre of the Hex River Valley, 35 km north of Worcester, and is geographically constrained by mountains.

The town maps below have been juxtaposed to offer a sense of the specific demarcations in the town. Figure 1 provides a close up of the town, De Doorns East and Stofland township. These three ‘zones’ represent the main social demarcations: town is predominantly white, De Doorns East is largely coloured with some black residents, and Stofland houses mainly the black population, with a high proportion of migrants predominantly from Lesotho. Figure 2 shows the political wards in the greater area of De Doorns. It shows that the greater area of De Doorns stretches across three wards: Ward 2, Ward 3 and Ward 4, where De Doorns itself (the area of analysis) is geographically made up of a relatively small proportion of each of these wards. In terms of the complex ward separation within De Doorns, Ward 3 lies on both sides of the railway line and includes about 75% of the residences of De Doorns town. Ward 4 includes the farming communities within the greater De Doorns area. Ward 2 includes Stofland, which is on the opposite side of the N1 highway from the town centre.
Figure 1: Map of De Doorns
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Source: Open Street Map

Figure 2: Map of the Ward allocation in the greater De Doorns area
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Source: Wazimaps
De Doorns is a segregated society, and the segregations work on multiple levels. First, the town layout separates, and that there are no roads that directly join all three parts of De Doorns. The railway line separates the valley into an eastern and western side, and this division has become synonymous with the socioeconomic divide in De Doorns. The western side is traditionally the white area, including a low-density residential area, as well as some commercial developments. The town is small with only one main road, with other smaller roads branching off. There are not many shops in town (some of these are foreign-owned – Chinese, Pakistani, and Bangladeshi mostly). Most businesses within the area are located in town, as well as some schools, the municipality offices, councillors’ offices, and the police station. Several streets that branch off from the main road lead into the suburban areas of De Doorns. This is a seemingly affluent neighbourhood compared to the rest of De Doorns, with large, solid brick structures and well-maintained lawns.

On the eastern side, little commercial development has taken place, but schools, churches and a small number of shops can be found. To access De Doorns East from the town, you have to cross over the railway tracks by foot, or drive out of town, back on to the N1 and then enter De Doorns East (separate entrance off the N1). De Doorns East consists of mainly formal housing that is not as well-maintained as the houses in town. The clinic, which services the entire De Doorns area, can be found in De Doorns East. The grocery stores found in the area are mainly foreign-owned spaza shops. Two small informal settlements are located in De Doorns East, namely Hasie Square and Ekupumleni.

Stofland is roughly divided into two non-distinct areas: Mpumelelo and Lubisi. Mpumelelo consists of mainly small RDP houses, which have been relatively recently constructed. Some of the more main roads within this area are paved, but not many. Lubisi is the area within Stofland where mostly shacks are found, and none of the roads are tarred. Stofland distinctly lacks formal amenities and large grocery stores. Stofland is a predominantly Black African area, although it also includes some Coloured people who live in RDP houses. The RDP houses are owned and rented by South Africans, whereas within Lubisi (within Stofland), many black South Africans from other towns, Sothos from Lesotho and Zimbabweans live in shacks:
“There are people from Lesotho, people from Zimbabwe...there are people from the Transkei, Ciskei. There are people from Upington and Oudtshoorn, there are people from everywhere that stay here in De Doorns that work here.”

In addition, there is a common perception that the population of Stofland has increased quite dramatically since it was first established in 2002. This is because people moved into the area from outside De Doorns, in search of work on the surrounding farms. This has also happened because farmworkers have been evicted from the farms. As a union representative indicated:

“...if I look at De Doorns, especially Stofland, De Doorns has a lot of migrant workers. Lots of people come in from the outside, that’s why De Doorns has become so big. In Stofland, it’s not the people of De Doorns who live there. Most of those people are migrant workers from other places that come to look for work, or people that get brought in from Upington maybe, or from another town. Now they lose the work on the farm, then they erect a shack there. That’s what happens, that’s how the area got bigger and bigger.”

Socio-demographic data

According to Census 2011 data, the population in De Doorns is 10 583 (see Table 1). It is important to note that De Doorns experiences a significant influx of seasonal farm workers during the months of September to April, which alters the socio-demographic makeup of the area during this time. In 2011, the Census took place in October. This is in the beginning of high season, so some but not all of the seasonal workers would have arrived in De Doorns.

There is an almost equal gender distribution in the area: 53% females and 47% males. In terms of population group, 52.5% of the population are Coloured and 38.6% are Black African. Only 6.4% of the population are White. These population group statistics

---

2 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
3 Coloured female, Women on Farms member, 10 May 2016
4 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
5 This figure has most likely increased since 2011, but the census data is the most reliable, up-to-date information available.
correspond with the distribution of mother tongue language within the area, with 63.4% of the population having Afrikaans as a first language, and 24.5% isiXhosa. Less significant are Sesotho speaking people (3.7%), people who speak ‘other’ languages (2.5%) and English speakers (2.4%). During our fieldwork, it was found that many people in De Doorns spoke Afrikaans, and it certainly appeared to be the most common language spoken in the area, particularly on the farms. This implies that farm workers (particularly black workers) have to either learn basic Afrikaans, or cope as best they can without understanding Afrikaans. This is discussed in greater detail later in this report.

**Table 1**: Population group in De Doorns by race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Group</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>4080</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>5555</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian or Asian</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011

The majority of people (93.5%) have South African citizenship, with a small percentage (4.1%) of the population without South African citizenship. It was found during the period of fieldwork that there were Chinese, Indians, Pakistanis, Somalis, Sotho from Lesotho and Zimbabweans living in De Doorns, with Zimbabweans and Basotho forming the largest representation among foreign nationals.

Similar findings are revealed in the place of birth of the population (Table 2), where the majority of the population (83.4%) were born in the Western Cape and 7.5% in the Eastern Cape. Similarly, 4.3% were born outside of South Africa.

**Table 2**: Place of birth of residents in De Doorns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>8814</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Labour Force</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Cape</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free State</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpumalanga</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limpopo</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside South Africa</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011

The harvest season in the Hex River Valley lends itself to seasonal employment. This, coupled with the geographically isolated nature of the valley, results in widespread unemployment for the majority of the year. According to the 2011 Census data, the unemployment rate is only 12.2%. This could be attributed to the fact that the Census was in the high season, when most people of De Doorns are employed on the farms. It is anticipated that this unemployment figure would be significantly higher during low season. It is also important to note that a significant number of people (2,697) are not economically active (see Table 3). As a general pattern, the research team found that most of the people who live in De Doorns, work in De Doorns. Many of those who live in Stofland are farm workers, and most often they are seasonal farm workers who work intensely for five months (October - February) and are unemployed for the remainder of the year.

**Table 3: Employment statistics of De Doorns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labour Force</th>
<th>4200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>3687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not economically active</strong></td>
<td>2697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discouraged work seekers</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other not economically active</td>
<td>2649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Unemployment rate (strict)</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was estimated by the Agri Wes-Cape Communications Manager that there are at least 125 farms in the area that require about 14 000 jobs during peak season, leading to a significant shortfall of labour during this time. The size of the labour force according to the 2011 Census is 4 200, implying that an additional 9 800 jobs are created during this time. Farmers therefore recruit labourers from surrounding towns and other areas and countries during peak harvest season.

Tables 4 and 5 give an indication of the number of people from South Africa, Zimbabwe and Lesotho who are employed year-round within the Hex River Valley area in 2013/2014. In-season, 79.5% of the total workforce in Hex River Valley are South African. Of the foreign nationals employed, 14.8% are Zimbabwean and 5.9% are Sothos (for a total of 20.7%). In the off-season, far fewer people are employed overall, and the proportion of foreign workers drops to 16.5%. These off-season figures are indicative of the size of the permanent work force in the area.

**Table 4: Number of workers employed in the Hex River Valley area in-season (September – April)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
<th>Lesotho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 665</td>
<td>5 218</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7883 = 79.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1468 = 14.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>590 = 5.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Hex River Table Grape Association producer survey, plus own calculations

**Table 5: Number of workers employed in the Hex River Valley area out-of-season (May - August)**

The majority of the households (72.7%) receive an income of R3 200 per month or less. This suggests that the quality of the jobs that are held by the population in De Doorns is poor and potentially low skilled. This is not surprising, considering the levels of education within the area are so low, where 4.2% of the population have no schooling, 6% completed primary school and only 13.7% completed secondary school.

There is a generally fair level of service delivery/infrastructure around the dwellings in De Doorns. 92% of households have access to a flush toilet that is connected to a sewerage system. About two thirds of the households (65.8%) have their refuse disposed of by the local municipality or a private company once a week. In addition, 43.5% of households have a tap inside the dwelling, while 30.9% have a tap on a community stand less than 200m away.

Table 6 below depicts the main socio-demographic categories for town, De Doorns East and Stofland. Within the town the Coloured population equates to just under half (47.9%) of the total, with the White population the second largest group at 27.3%. In De Doorns East, the largest race group is the coloured population (66.6%), followed by the Black African population of 30.2%. Within Stofland the main population group is Black African (61.5%). An overwhelming majority (96.6%) of this population resided in informal dwellings at the time of the 2011 Census.

---

7 It is important to note here that what is previously defined as ‘town’ is a much smaller geographical area than what is considered ‘town’ in the data. This report referred to town as a predominantly white area, whereas the data captured here appears to include some surrounding farm area as well, and will therefore be more racially diverse. It is also important to consider that Stofland is likely to have been one of the fastest expanding sections of De Doorns since the 2011 Census, implying that the population of Stofland is likely to have increased significantly since then.
Table 6: A comparison of socio-demographic data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>De Doorns East</th>
<th>Stofland</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2419</td>
<td>4767</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>10583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian / Asian</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isiXhosa</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesotho</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African Citizenship</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.8%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>95.5%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside SA</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling type</td>
<td>Brick/concrete</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>Brick/concrete</td>
<td>Brick/concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-detached</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal dwelling</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>Informal dwelling</td>
<td>Informal dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census 2011
Socioeconomic Challenges in De Doorns

In terms of socio-economic challenges, the community of De Doorns has one of the highest malnutrition rates in the country, according to the Department of Social Development (DSD). Furthermore, De Doorns faces substantial societal challenges, such as poverty, substance abuse and the presence of foetal alcohol syndrome. Unemployment, gang-related violence, drug abuse (specifically tik⁹), alcohol abuse, murder and rape were the most identified social problems by the people of De Doorns. It was also said that one of the gangs, called the JCYs,¹⁰ now found in De Doorns, have come in from the town of Touwsriver and Worcester. These issues are expected to mostly affect the people from the areas of Stofland and some parts of De Doorns East, particularly its youth.

When asked about the problems De Doorns faces, a CPF representative responded:

“If we talk about problems, we talk about crime, 'dan steek baie goedjes sy kop uit' ('then lots of things rear their heads'). Amongst other things, assault, rape, murder is starting in the valley, which was not previously an issue. It is usually rape, assaults, normal assaults and less serious assault. Then break-ins and theft, and in this way you can carry on.”¹¹

According to some respondents, De Doorns “was never like this”, and has changed significantly over the last few years. The problems of increased violence in De Doorns are attributed to its rapidly growing population. Interviewees blamed the presence and growth of shacks (and the presence of people who come in from the outside, both South Africans and foreign nationals) in Stofland for the problems the community faces:

“I think it's because the place got bigger and bigger. When I started working in De Doorns, Stofland wasn't so big. There were only a few 'hokkies' ('shacks'). The community has grown. And if the community gets overcrowded, then gangsterism

⁹ A slang name for Methamphetamine.
¹⁰ Another gang found in De Doorns is called the Americans.
¹¹ Interview with CPF representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
starts and drug abuse and alcohol abuse, those types of things. Then our people start to fight with one another. And it’s not just in Stofland, it goes to the farms too.”

“De Doorns wasn’t like this... We tried to move to Stofland because we didn’t have homes. We wanted houses there and every ‘jan rap en sy maat’ (‘every other person’) came there to put up shacks. And there the ‘broeines’ (‘breeding ground’) began. There are guns that we don’t know about. ‘Inkomers’ (‘people who come in’) come and stay there... If there weren’t shacks, it wouldn’t be this dangerous.”

Moreover, the common phenomenon of dropping out of school to become farmworkers seems to be perpetuated by the absence of support mechanisms for school-going youth, and employment options for matriculants. Potentially, it can be as a result of pressures from the household for an additional income.

With regards to the police, while not happy about the level of service delivery, particularly response times to calls for service, Stofland residents generally report crimes or lay complaints with the SAPS. A contributing factor to the dissatisfaction could be that there is only that one bridge from De Doorns East to allow SAPS into the informal settlements; with the police station in De Doorns town, there is no quick access to Stofland. According to a resident:

“...maybe there is just one on call, or one of the vans is there and the other there. So our people find that to be a problem, they don’t come immediately.”

The inadequate level of policing by SAPS in Stofland has reportedly resulted in vigilantism by certain community members in an attempt to serve justice and prevent crime. It is said, that particularly when the crime is relatively ‘petty’ (like a mugging), the community will chase the perpetrators, and then assault them if caught. It is only thereafter that the police are called. One respondent stated:

---

12 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
13 Interview with coloured female, Women on Farms member, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
14 Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, 11 May 2016
15 Interview with coloured female, Women on Farms member, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
“If our children steal something of theirs, they hit the children until they are half dead, the police do nothing. For example, I’m a ‘tikkop’ (‘person who smokes tik’), now I come to steal your things from the washing line. Then they come tonight...those people...then they beat me half to death in the street.”

A few respondents voiced their mistrust in the police, because they feel that the police are “walking together with the skollies” and are corrupt:

“...the police are just as dirty...Police are also just people. You understand? Because how do the drug lords get the information that is silently out here? They go and shake him down and find nothing. But then I know that guy sells tik. I know.”

On the other hand, the SAPS reportedly have a good relationship with the farmers and often respond to their calls for service in a timely manner. The same apparently is the case with white residents within the town of De Doorns. This has created the perception that the white population of De Doorns and the farmers (also white) are ‘more important’, and receive a more efficient service from the SAPS. As a farm manager explained:

“No we are 'reg' (right) with the police. I can’t say anything bad about them, there have been a few times when I needed them because at one stage there is a guy that was banned from the farm, and when I came here I didn't really know his story, and then I phoned the police, and tell them I have a problem. Five minutes later he is in the van. Yes, so I don't know if it's just (name of farm) because my boss supports them financially, like when the police had a function, he donated a few rands. So it helps, it keeps our foot in the door... I have to say, I don't know how it's going in town but on the farms, they are all right. We don't have complaints.”

In addition, farmers are supported by Farm Watch: a type of neighbourhood watch that has two vehicles and patrols the town and the surrounding farms.

---

16 Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, 11 May 2016
17 Interview with coloured female, farm worker, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
18 Interview with coloured female, Women on Farms representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
19 Interview with farm manager, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
Crime Statistics

Table 7 outlines the total number of reported contact and contact-related crimes for the area of De Doorns for the past 11 years (from 2005 to 2016). The figures suggest there is evidence of a general upward trend in reported crime. Importantly, the drug-related crime statistics mirror the claim by residents that drugs have become a major and growing issue of concern.

In 2009, the year of the xenophobic attacks, when numerous Zimbabweans were being displaced from the area of Stofland, the number of attempted murders was particularly high. Furthermore, the murder level for that year was the highest when compared to all the other ten years. This could be attributed to an event that occurred in February 2009, which saw seven Zimbabweans killed. Another significant ‘spike’ in crime was experienced in 2013, the catalyst for which was possibly the 2012/2013 farm workers’ strike. Notably, attempted murder and the number of arsons were unusually high in 2013.

Table 7: Crime statistics for De Doorns, 2005 – 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sexual Offences</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempted murder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Assault</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Robbery</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery with aggravating circumstances</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious injury to property</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary at residential premises</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug-related crime</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Crime Stats SA (www.crimestatssa.com)
IV. Social interactions and collective efficacy

This section examines the social effects of the spatial divide and other major social interactions in De Doorns. It also examines the lives of farmworkers within the community, and the tensions that arise between farmers and farmworkers. The section highlights the interactions and tensions foreign nationals have with South Africans.

The social effects of the spatial divide of De Doorns

As mentioned previously, the spatial divide of De Doorns corresponds with its racial divides, translating into an ‘us and them’ attitude held by many community members. Even though the white population is mostly located in the town area of De Doorns, there was a definite self-proclaimed sense that the town itself does not ‘belong’ to the farmers or the whites of De Doorns (contrary to the perception from the residents in De Doorns East and Stofland that the town ‘belongs’ to the whites). For example, white interviewees often go to Worcester to do their shopping. A white resident of De Doorns mentioned that she feels unsafe going into town on the weekends:

“...at certain times I feel safer than other times (laughs). Like on a Friday...I won’t really come into town...it’s just very busy on a Friday afternoon, very busy on a Saturday morning. It feels as if the whole of Stofland and the whole of all the farms are in town, because all the farmers who come drop off their farmworkers. There are long queues at the ATMs, you just don’t feel safe to go and stand there in a queue.”

On the other hand, spaza shop owners from De Doorns East and Stofland visit the town almost on a daily basis to buy stock from the wholesalers, most of which are Chinese-owned. Community members from De Doorns East and Stofland also have to go to town to access banks and ATM machines and more extensive grocery shops. Not many taxis run the route from De Doorns East and Stofland to town, which means community members have to walk into town.

20 Interview with white female, social worker, De Doorns, 13 May 2016
The various communities of De Doorns are generally disconnected from one another. It was said that the people who live on the farms are on their own, and those living in the township are on their own.²¹

Life on farms and the life of farmworkers

As already discussed, the major employment opportunity in De Doorns is work on farms, with most people becoming either seasonal or permanent farmworkers. During the season, there is a significant influx of farmworkers into De Doorns from outside areas. Labour brokers play a central role in this employment. Labour brokers operate entirely informally, using their connections with farms to place farmworkers. All nationalities, if recruited through an informal labour broker, have to pay R5 per day to the broker. Labour brokers also get commission from the farmers. This ‘middle man’ system makes the working relationship between the employer and employee ambiguous.²² There are between 60-80 labour brokers in the Hex Valley area, who divide themselves and often recruit according to nationalities. Often, a Zimbabwean labour broker will facilitate the employment of Zimbabwean farmworkers, Sothos for Sothos, and South Africans for South Africans. This is

²¹ Interview with Black African female, community member, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
²² Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 28
certainly a controversial system of procuring labour, and some farmers choose to recruit labour without a broker. There is a perception that brokers complicate the relationship between the farmers and their employees, and that they provide an unreliable employment stream to the farmers. They will tend to take the farm workers to the farms where they can get the highest rate per worker.23 A union representative explains:

“The labour broker gets the workers, and then he goes to the farm and asks how many workers [the farmer] wants. Then he goes into an area like Stofland. And [that’s] where the other problem comes in, where people fight with each other about work. The broker will get more Lesotho people or migrant workers people, will give them preference over the South Africans...Brokers recruit the people and take them to the farms... Most of the brokers are men [who]...were previous farmworkers. Some of them were farmworkers in De Doorns, some of them are councillors that were labour brokers. Some migrants are labour brokers.”24

This union representative further suggested that the labour brokers use stereotypes about workers – that South Africans are lazy and abuse alcohol, and that foreign nationals are hard workers – to guide them in whom they select for work. Importantly, the system of labour brokering breaks the connections and accountability between the farmer and the farmworker.

An important pattern of segregation is between farmworkers who live in town and Stofland, and those who live on the farms. RDP housing that is becoming available in Stofland means permanent South African farm workers, who live on farms, are moving into Stofland to occupy their houses. Interestingly, during the fieldwork the team spoke to a farmworker who still lived on the farm on which she worked instead of Stofland. She was reluctant to move from the farm because she felt that living on the farm lent her a greater level of protection.25 Indeed, a respondent mentioned that those farmworkers who secure RDP

---

23 Interview with farm manager, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
24 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
25 Interview with female South African farmworkers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
houses in Stofland often want to go back to living on the farms, particularly because they have to pay for services and utilities in relation to RDP houses.26

The movement of farmworkers to Stofland has changed the dynamic of farm work in several ways. As a result of vacating farm houses, they become open for others to occupy. In this process, permanent South African farm workers are effectively becoming seasonal farm workers. The freed-up housing is offered to seasonal, often foreign, workers. Farmers reportedly prefer to give housing to Zimbabweans.27 Some Zimbabweans who started as seasonal workers now live on the farms permanently, and in this manner become permanent staff members.28

The farmworkers who live on the farms are further distinguished between those who are permanent (often South Africans) and those who are seasonal or occasional (often foreign nationals). Here, housing conditions are somewhat separated, with the worst housing offered to seasonal workers. In terms of general working conditions on the farms, it was claimed that these vary greatly from farm to farm.

The life of a farmworker is heavily monitored, often through a (usually coloured) foreman who reports directly to the farmer. Any interpersonal conflicts can result in dismissal. On some farms, the farm workers are monitored by CCTV cameras. This is the case for weekdays when they are working, but also for weekends during their ‘private time’:

“On one farm, there are even cameras where the farm workers stay. Where they stay is a camera, inside, so that the employer can see what you do on the weekends. There is no privacy.”29

As another means of control, the farmers will close their gates at certain times, not allowing people to enter or leave the property. Similarly, other vehicles may be prohibited entirely from coming on farm property:

26 Interview with councillor, De Doorns, 24 November 2016
27 Interview with female Sotho farmworkers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
28 Interview with coloured female, community leader for Ward 4, De Doorns, May 2016
29 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
“Like this farm is small, and taxis aren’t allowed to come here to deliver things because you never know who is sitting in the taxi, who brings what…”

Foreign national farmworkers in South Africa travel around the country in cycles. They seem to travel to certain regions, following the presence of jobs, based on the seasons. Typically, foreign national farmworkers will spend six months working on citrus farms in areas such as Clanwilliam and Ceres (in the Western Cape) and some areas within Limpopo where after they migrate to other regions for another six months when the grapes are in season. Some foreign nationals establish themselves in De Doorns upon securing employment, and then reportedly encourage family members from back home to join them in De Doorns. This is explained briefly by a South African community leader, albeit with language with xenophobic sentiment:

“Many of them bring...they start to teel (breed), and then next year they will bring their aunties and other people. Then they teach the people they bring.”

Having said that, a Zimbabwean farm worker explained that he leads an isolated existence in De Doorns, with only his close family as connections within the community. He prefers not to be engaged with other community members, particularly Sothos, since he feels it has the potential to result in conflict:

“...but I don't even have a friend. My friend is my wife, and my sister who calls me. I am afraid to be engaged with them [the locals and the Sothos]. That's where the flame starts.”

Furthermore, there appears to be some discrimination towards foreign farmworkers from the farmers themselves. This discrimination manifests itself in numerous ways, as highlighted below:

30 Interview with farm manager, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
31 Interview with coloured female, community leader, De Doorns, 24 November 2016
32 Interview with Zimbabwean foreign national, male, 22 November 2016
“…we had a meeting and some of the women told us if they go to the clinic, they have to pay R3 for the bakkie to take them, but if a South African worker wants to go to the clinic, they pay nothing…and then UIF gets deducted from their salaries too, but the employer knows they won’t be able to draw it. Lots of them don’t have legal permits to work here on the farms, so the employer tells them ‘you don’t have a permit, so you won’t tell me’.”  

“… even in De Doorns, the people who don’t join the unions are the foreign workers. They are scared and I understand their reasoning, they are scared they will lose the jobs that they have…They won’t take a case further, whereas a South African worker will say, ‘yes, take my case to the CCMA’, they will leave it.”

This suggests that farmers utilise the vulnerable position of foreign nationals to provide reduced salaries and/or benefits. These assertions of discrimination are in juxtaposition with the perceptions of some South Africans in the area. For some, it is felt that farmers ‘protect’ the foreign nationals, mostly in two ways: firstly, the way in which they safeguarded the foreign nationals on their farms after the xenophobic attacks; and, secondly, that they help ‘cover up’ for those foreign nationals who do not have the correct residency documentation. Of course, these two assertions are not mutually exclusive. Given the benefits they can accrue, it may be in the interests of farmers to take the risk of employing undocumented workers. However, if caught, the farmer will face fines and other consequences.

It was widely stated that the Zimbabweans are being accommodated by the farmers because they prefer to employ them. Firstly, because there is a perception that they are still accepting less pay and secondly, because they are seen as hard working compared to the locals. This in turn means that South Africans feel they are viewed as lazy and greedy by their employers.

---

33 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
34 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
35 Interview with male farmworker, De Doorns, 13 May 2016
36 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
There is a perception that Zimbabweans are not only perceived to be more trustworthy, with a stronger work ethic, but also that they are regarded as being physically stronger than South Africans:

“...we try to employ mostly South Africans because otherwise, yes, you want to have more local people... I have strong Zims also on the farm, that is permanent people... The South Africans, you can sometimes realise, are lazy (laughs).”

This discourse has reportedly led to some animosity and “discomfort” between the South African residents and the Zimbabweans.

Afrikaans, which is often not initially spoken by foreign nationals, is the primary language of communication on farms. Language can thus contribute to exclusion. It was said that foreign nationals often have to ask the coloured farm workers what meetings with the farmers are about. A union representative explained how the language barrier can lead to serious miscommunication, and how foreign nationals (and others who do not understand Afrikaans) are made to sign contracts in Afrikaans:

“I know about a farmworker who was fired by his foreman... He didn't understand what the foreman was saying to him, Afrikaans was being spoken, and he can't speak the language... I told them 'you know for a fact that if you get migrant workers, you need to get someone who can speak their language'. Then I was told the farmworker doesn't have a contract with them. The worker can't sign a contract that is in Afrikaans or English if the worker cannot understand it. The worker works with a contract he doesn't understand. He signs it because he needs the work, but he doesn't understand anything. He follows what the other workers are doing.”

Some foreign national farmworkers explained that they felt a certain level of discomfort when they are around coloured residents in De Doorns, simply because they feel that they do not understand them, and in turn, will not be understood. Afrikaans, as the medium of languages, serves as a barrier to communication and understanding.

---

37 Interview with farm manager, details required
38 Interview with coloured male, church representative, De Doorns, 22 November 2016
39 Interview with Sotho farmworkers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
40 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
instruction in the wider De Doorns community, also has the potential to exclude the foreign nationals from social or community occasions too, such as CPF and ward meetings.

Farmers and foremen reportedly antagonise farmworkers by showing preferential treatment to certain groups. They also have a tendency to talk badly or ‘gossip’ about certain groups behind their backs. This causes tension between coloured and black workers on the farms.

“...the way people are with one another, especially if you are so-called coloured and you have a migrant worker or a Xhosa speaker, a black worker, you can see the difference. They get weighed up against one another, so there is a lot of conflict. Because the employer plays them off against one another. The races, against one another...he maybe gives the coloured people a bit more than the Xhosa-speaking worker, or say to the black workers that the coloured people are lazy. And the housing on some farms, you can see where the coloured people live, and where the migrant people stay are different houses. Most of the places you still find compounds where the black people stay, Xhosa-speaking people who tell us that apartheid is still not out. It is still in place to divide people.”

Figure 6: Photograph of vineyards on a table grape farm

41 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
Interactions with foreign nationals in De Doorns

In general, the researchers found there to be high levels of xenophobic sentiment in De Doorns. The term ‘inkomers’ – meaning ‘people who come inside’ – was used by some to describe foreign nationals, with some obvious negative connotations of ‘not belonging’. This ‘othering’ seems to refer to foreign nationals only. Even though coloured people appear to think they have a distinct territorial ownership of De Doorns, claiming it as ‘their space’, Xhosa-speakers seemed welcome in the area:

“...we don’t get along that well with everyone. Because like the ‘inkomers’, maybe like the Zimbabweans...we are used to our Xhosa people here. And we got along with them. But now everyone is together, so now there is just something that stops us from really getting along with each other.”42

In Phase I of the research, there was the impression that this sense of ‘belonging’ extended to the Sotho migrants too. While not from De Doorns, this migrant group has been accepted by the local, predominantly coloured population. Again, in Phase I, the team found that the Zimbabweans did not experience such welcoming treatment and were clearly excluded.

This xenophobic sentiment was evident in some respondents’ narrative – some of the cruder comments are as follows:

“...they come 'wurm hulle hulself in' ('worm themselves in') and then they go and then they come in again.”43

“...I also feel they must just go back to their countries because they take things from us.”44

“...these ‘inkomers’. They are evil [chuckles].”45

---

42 Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, May 2016
43 Interview with CPF representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
44 Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, May 2016
“...they still have that attitude to say ‘kwerekwere’ you see. They call it ‘kwerekwere’, that name you see. ‘You don’t belong here, you must go.’”

Thus, foreign nationals were considered by many South African residents in poorer communities of De Doorns as not being welcome and not part of the community. There was a strong sense of ‘ons mense’ (‘our people’) where it, context-dependently, pertained to either coloured people who grew up in De Doorns or South Africans as a whole.

In Phase I of the research, it was implied that some South Africans considered the Basotho to be South Africans. Similarly, Sotho-speakers would claim the same. In this way, the Sotho-speakers were often grouped together with South Africans. An example of this was that a Sotho farm worker, when asked who attended the community meetings in De Doorns, she responded: “We all do.” Having said that, the Sotho-speakers see themselves as ‘foreign’ in that they ‘come from far’. They likened themselves to Xhosa-speakers who have also travelled into the area from across the country. This respondent explains the phenomenon:

“It’s them who see themselves as locals. Besides, because they speak a language also spoken here in South Africa sometimes it’s difficult to even differentiate who is from South Africa who is from Lesotho. But generally, people from Lesotho participate in community issues. If there is a protest or community meeting or a cultural gathering they come and participate...”

As the ‘South African’ but not ‘indigenous’ group, the Sothos feel pressure to claim their space and identity in De Doorns (especially because they do not generally speak Afrikaans). Perhaps as a means of distancing themselves from the ‘outsiders’, histories of violence and personal animosities have developed between some Sothos and Zimbabweans. Many respondents reported that foreign nationals did not interact much with South Africans, and

45 Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, May 2016
46 Interview with foreign national, Zimbabwean, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
47 Interview with Sotho farm workers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
48 Interview with community leader, Black African male, 21 November 2016
that on the farms, the Sothos and Zimbabweans rarely spoke with each other. In a context where the two groups directly compete for (often seasonal) work, there is clear inter-group rivalry. As will be discussed later, the violence that sparked the 2009 attacks on Zimbabweans allegedly began after Sothos burnt down a Zimbabwean-occupied house.

In addition, a few respondents mentioned that there was in-fighting within the Sotho-speaking community, where the different groups are represented by ‘blankets’. This was merely hinted at in Phase I, but was mentioned by all respondents in Phase II. The in-fighting was reportedly closely related to the different coloured blankets representing the various clans in Lesotho. The Sothos living in De Doorns, particularly young men, appeared to still be identifying with these blankets from their home country, and the black and red blankets seem to correspond with different recording (music) artists from back home. In this way, a rivalry that appears quite petty and somewhat playful seemingly has the potential to turn violent quickly.

It appears that this in-fighting escalated quite significantly over 2016, from Phase I (May) to Phase II (November) of the research. Indeed, it was postulated by a respondent that, over the past few months, six or seven people had been killed as a result. A Zimbabwean foreign national, who had only been in area for three months, said that he had never before lived in a violent place like De Doorns. When referring to the rivalry between the blankets, he said that ‘they are not afraid of blood.’ He estimates that every weekend, when you step out of your shack in the morning, you will find three to four dead bodies lying around in Lubisi. As a result of this violence, he fears for his life. The research team heard from a few respondents that the different groups also burn each other’s shacks, which is an obvious risk for everyone within the area. This in-fighting is not only prevalent in De Doorns, but can also be found in Robertson and Worcester.

49 The Sothos and the South Africans appear to be more friendly; at least this is what the field work team observed when the researchers spoke to farm workers. On that particular farm, the Zimbabwean women were working on a different part of the farm, which might also account for the lack of interaction with the other groups.

50 Interview with councillor, De Doorns, 11 May 2016

51 Interview with coloured male, church representative, 22 November 2016

52 Interview with Zimbabwean foreign national, male, 22 November 2016

53 Interview with community leader, Black African male, 21 November 2016
There were also perceptions that foreign nationals are living in the area of De Doorns illegally. In Phase II of the research, it became apparent that it was mainly Sotho-speakers from Lesotho who didn’t have the correct documentation in order to work on the farms. As a result of this, the farmers generally chose not to employ them.

Not surprisingly, some South Africans associated foreign nationals with crime and violence. The term, ‘rowwe mense’ – meaning ‘rough people’ – was used to describe the foreign nationals. They are identified as being particularly violent:

“The Lesothos…I don’t know what sort of nation they are but they…I mean those years we could still walk free at night. But now you can’t.”\textsuperscript{54}

“…I am too scared to walk around. Not with the strange nations in this place.”\textsuperscript{55}

These quotes suggest that personal feelings of safety have reduced in recent years, and that a cause of this reduced safety is thought to be foreign nationals. Other interviewees attached the heightened crime rates to drugs and gangs, which do not seem to be associated with Sothos or Zimbabweans. As an extension of the blanket-related tension, a De Doorns community leader points to the Sothos from Lesotho as instigators of other crime, such as rape and theft:

“Like now at the moment we have a big problem with the Sothos. They don’t have IDs and they can’t find work. Now I hear it’s rape and theft, because they have to survive, so they have to steal. That’s our biggest issue, the people who can’t find work.”\textsuperscript{56}

In some instances the blame for social ills and hardship has shifted from the Zimbabweans to the Sothos. As mentioned previously, the Sothos were currently struggling to find employment on the farms, and have allegedly taken out their frustration in numerous ways.

\textsuperscript{54} Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, May 2016
\textsuperscript{55} Interview with coloured female, community member, De Doorns, May 2016
\textsuperscript{56} Interview with councillor, De Doorns, 24 November 2016
“Police will have to be present at the lorries, because they [Sothos] pull people off, because they don’t get work. The Xhosas, they are also against this thing with the Basothos. They also don’t want them here...I see there is xenophobia again. Let’s hope not, because then things get ugly again in De Doorns. Things have changed...the Zimbabweans are being accepted, but the Basothos are now the problem.”

This shifting of the blame may be attributable to a general frustration with the hardships of life in De Doorns, where various groups are scapegoated from time to time. A Zimbabwean likens the people of De Doorns to changes in the weather:

“Community members here are like the De Doorns weather (laughs). Every time you go out you need to carry a jersey, umbrella and so on because you don’t know when the weather conditions are going to change. You can never really trust the people here. They are just like weather.”

It therefore seems that ‘outsiders’ need to be constantly on their toes. Public sentiment towards foreigners or those perceived as not belonging, is malleable and can readily shift from its current position.

V. Leadership and conflict resolution

The main community leadership structures in De Doorns seem to be the ward committees, Women on Farms, and the labour unions. Foreign nationals have virtually no role within these structures. This section explores those groups of people that are considered ‘leaders’ within the community, and how leadership has sought to address community problems.

There seems to be a lack of legitimate conflict resolution mechanisms in De Doorns, and it was mentioned by one respondent that people are ‘scared’ to come together as a collective. In general, there is a perception among community members that each person is on their own. As a union representative explained:

57 Interview with councillor, De Doorns, 24 November 2016
58 Interview with Zimbabwean, male, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
“There aren't really leaders here. I would say, if there is an ANC meeting, then you will see that people come together, or the DA, political meetings. Or maybe Women on Farms meeting, then a whole lot of women will come together. Or churches that come together. People don't really come together.”

Local Politics

Party politics plays an important role in De Doorns, and the major parties are well-represented within the area. There are three councillors in the greater De Doorns area, coinciding with the three wards that make up the area. According to respondents, the political parties that are active in the area are: the ANC, the Democratic Alliance (DA), the Economic Freedom Front (EFF), the People’s Democratic Movement (PDM), and the Congress of the People (COPE). In Phase II, interviewees reported that an ANC Women’s League branch had recently been established within De Doorns. There exists an ANC parliamentary constituency office in the town of De Doorns, which assists people with issues ranging from (mostly farm) labour and unfair dismissals, to evictions from the local farms. It is an office that was also occupied by the ANC ward councillors of De Doorns. None of the other political parties were as well-represented in terms of having a visible space within the town.

The table below depicts the percentage of votes received by the ANC, DA, EFF and other parties in the 2011 and 2016 Local Government Elections, delineated according to Ward.

**Table 8: Local election results for Ward 2, Ward 3 and Ward 4, 2011 and 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ward 2 (Stofland and surrounds)</th>
<th>Ward 3 (Town, De Doorns East and surrounds)</th>
<th>Ward 4 (Town and surrounds, predominantly farming area)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANC</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>10.90%</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFF</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Electoral Commission of South Africa

---

59 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
In the 2016 local government elections the ANC’s support increased quite significantly in Ward 2, from 56.2% in 2011 to 79.8% in 2016. The previous councillor (who had become unpopular) had been forced to step down shortly before the Local Government Elections, so the community was aware that it was voting for a new candidate. As a result of the increased support in the ANC, the support in the DA and other remaining parties decreased dramatically. The most important shift in results occurred in Ward 3, where the ANC (40.5%) were unseated by the DA (49.3%). Tension between the outgoing Ward 3 ANC councillor and the newly-elected DA councillor was reported. The transition was, apparently, a ‘bitter pill to swallow’ for the outgoing councillor, who disrupted meetings called by the new councillor in order to elect the new Ward committees.60

The ward councillors hold community meetings four times a year and many people seem to attend. There is a bi-annual community meeting for residents of all wards, which also brings community members together.

In Phase I, the researchers found mixed views of ward councillors, with many having low confidence in them, and some placing trust in them. This may have been a reflection of the then upcoming 2016 local government elections, or genuine dissatisfaction with the councillors, or both. Despite this, residents reported that they still go to ward councillors to voice problems and concerns about community-related issues.

Interviewees indicated that there were two main unions working (and that have legitimacy) in the area: the BAWSI Agricultural Workers Union of South Africa (BAWUSA) and the Food and Allied Workers Union (FAWU). The former is independent, whereas the latter was (at the time of Phase I) Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU)-affiliated. In August 2016, it was reported that FAWU cut ties with COSATU and the ANC, stating that the latter organisation has “lost its relevance” and is no longer pro-poor and pro-worker.61 The implications of this move for those representatives (and the people they serve) on the ground are unknown. It was reported that BAWUSA, which was established in 2009, is the most popular union in the area, though it seems that FAWU is the longest-standing. The

60 Interview with Ward councillor, 24 November 2016
popularity of the two unions seemed to depend very much on who you speak to. BAWUSA is the union offshoot of the Black Association for the Wine and Spirits Industry (BAWSI) and is currently led by Nosey Pieterse.

Interviewees identified the trade unions as leaders and sources of authority in the community. Having said that, on a recent visit to De Doorns that Labour Minister, Mildred Olifant, suggested, “The trouble is that trade unions are not as strong as they used to be” and that they have become too weak to offer their members effective assistance. This is because they are “small” and “fragmented”. Small trade unions such as Sikhula Sonke, which were reported in the media around the 2012/2013 Farm Worker’s Strike, are no longer active in the area. It was the understanding of the research team that Nosey Pieterse intended on launching a new union in De Doorns after the August 2016 Municipal Elections, namely the Rural Agricultural and Allied Workers Union (RAWU). However, during phase II of the field research there appeared to be no evidence that RAWU had been created. It appears that while the power of trade unions in De Doorns remains somewhat limited, in that they lack capacity to organize and mobilise, they remain important political stakeholders.

Women on Farms

Women on Farms, consisting of female community members who are also farm workers in the area, was identified as a key non-governmental organisation in De Doorns. Amid a lack of other bodies which appear to bring the community together, or that respond to key social issues, Women on Farms has filled the void. They organise community meetings and marches, especially around community-related problems. In addition to this, they organise a sustainable livelihoods initiative, where their members have access to the resources to establish small vegetable gardens in their yards. As a Women on Farms representative commented:

---

“... we are a women’s organisation. We help the women and in the community, we do community work. The problems that there are, we can try to sort it out, and we know to who we can go to with these problems. We can go to Women on Farms. With community problems, we can go to the police and... the community workers from the municipality, if they can give us information.”  

Within De Doorns, Women on Farms has roughly 200 members, although there are about 15 members that are particularly active. The strength of this women’s organisation may also be related to the number of women farmworkers. We saw in Table 4, above, that women make up 64.9% of the farm labourer workforce in-season, and 51.5% out of season.

Women on Farms indicated that they work closely with FAWU and SAPS in addressing key issues that farmworkers and community face. As explained by a FAWU representative:

“There is a relationship where, if Women on Farms go to a farm and there is issues that they cannot handle, then they contact me. They say ‘there is a farm, we were there, can you maybe handle this labour rights case for us please?’ And if I struggle with an eviction, or if I struggle with...substance abuse or violence on farms, then I will bring Women on Farms in... for conflict resolutions, I bring them in. Yes....for health I bring them in to speak to the workers...alcohol abuse and so on.”

In this way, it was evident that Women on Farms represents a key mechanism for resolving conflict, as well as possibly preventing interpersonal violence and substance abuse. FAWU’s role is more formally attached to issues of labour rights relating to evictions and labour practises. A Women on Farms representative explains how they cooperate with the police:

“...and then the police encouraged us to go door-to-door and ask people whether they agree with us that we need an Imbizo, do they agree with us that we can work hand-in-hand with the police against the dangers in De Doorns. Then they said yes.”

63 Interview with coloured female, Women on Farms representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
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65 Interview with coloured female, Women on Farms representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
One of the main community leaders associated with Women on Farmscommented that if something bad happens in the community, it is the women that stand up and gather everyone together in the community. However, the organisation is almost exclusively South African. Apparently, some Zimbabwean women were approached to be a part of Women on Farms, but there were cultural barriers in that the Zimbabwean women first had to “ask their husbands.” This not only applies to the Zimbabwean women, where it was reported that Sotho women were once a part of Women on Farms, but when asked to get actively involved in community activities (such as marches), they “got scared” and left the organisation.

The Community Policing Forum and Street Committees

The Community Policing Forum (CPF) is present within the community, and they have a generally good working relationship with the police. Every two months, they meet with the police to discuss what has been happening within the community. Without being able to interview the police, our overall analysis of the relationship between the CPF and SAPS, is limited, though it is perceived to be effective by the CPF.

Currently it appears the CPF’s work tends to centre on organising community awareness campaigns, principally around social ills, such as drug use and crime amongst the youth. As a CPF member explained:

“...we have plenty of awareness campaigns and this is about all that we use... to overcome these problems....”

The efficacy of these awareness campaigns is unknown. Nonetheless, the issues around which these campaigns centre attempt to enable a means of community unity. More broadly, however, the CPF is deemed ineffective by the community of Stofland, and did not

---

66 This is community-based organisation that aims to deal with issues faced by women who live and work on farms.
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feature in discussions with respondents when discussing the leadership of De Doorns. Upon being prompted, one resident claims that the CPF is “not vibrant”\textsuperscript{70} and another noted:

“...currently they are not visible. Currently, you do not see that they help to solve problems, or make people aware of any problems in the community, there is no involvement. They are not trying to get the community involved in community safety.”\textsuperscript{71}

It is important to note that the forum is geographically and socioeconomically representative of the community. Thus, while the CPF has not necessarily been able to effectively tackle community safety, it has been able to bridge some of the social divides that dominate De Doorns.

Street committees didn’t feature much in discussions. Some of the respondents didn’t even know that they existed on their streets, and if they did, they were unaware of who the members were. The research team was notified that street committees do exist, but only in certain areas and streets where people themselves were organised in some way. Some members of Women on Farms took it upon themselves to organise these within their streets, particularly in Mpumelelo. Neighbourhood watch organisations used to be a feature in Stofland, but it was said that one of the men or policemen involved “het gesmokkel”\textsuperscript{72}, meaning there was some sort of a dirty dealing, smuggling, or embezzling going on, so the structure fell apart. The disbanding of the neighbourhood watch organically led to the establishment of street committees. A street is divided into sections, where each section has a designated group of individuals, responsible for that section alone. Admittedly, buy-in has been more successful in some parts than others, because participation is on a voluntary basis, and without remuneration.

\textsuperscript{70} Interview with Black African male, community member, De Doorns, 12 May 2016
\textsuperscript{71} Interview with coloured male, church representative, De Doorns, 22 November 2016
\textsuperscript{72} Interview with coloured female, community leader, De Doorns, 24 November 2016
The Church

The Dutch Reformed Mission Church and the American Methodist Episcopal (AME) church were two of the first established in De Doorns, dating back to the 1900s. The AME church, for example, started off with a very strong following of approximately 500 members, but over the years, with other denominations establishing themselves in the area, this figure has dwindled. A respondent explains here the process whereby people break away from the already-established churches to form new ones:

“...the figure [number of churches] increases every year...because if the two of us don't agree on a matter, then I won't sit around the table with you and see how we can meet each other half way... I start my own denomination. I become the pastor or the leader, and so I continue.”

As a result, there are many small, independent churches. It was said that on just about every farm, there are three or four churches. It was claimed that there are currently over 700 churches in De Doorns.

The main language spoken reflects the community it has entrenched itself in. In this way, Afrikaans has been divisive in separating those that can understand and communicate in the language, and those that can’t. One Sotho-speaking individual said that she attended the local Anglican church soon after she arrived in De Doorns from Lesotho, only to find it “full of coloured people” and that “when they say let us stand, I won’t hear any of that.”

Another Sotho farm worker explains the warm reception she received from the locals, despite the apparent disbelief when she attempted to worship in her mother tongue:

“They sing, and they are happy to see you when you arrive there, you see. But the trouble is, I don’t understand the song. I’m just standing there. When they sing, I can tell that this is a certain song, so when I sing it in SeSotho, I see them staring at me, amazed.”

---
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This language barrier has also contributed to the fact that those groups of individuals that speak isiXhosa, Sesotho and Shona have formed their own churches. In addition, it was said that people worship separately because “they feel more comfortable amongst their own people.”76 In Phase I, some respondents claimed that a few Zimbabwean nationals were attending the Catholic Church in De Doorns East. In Phase II, one or two additional churches were mentioned where foreign nationals (particularly Zimbabweans) have partially integrated into the church, where they worship “to one side”. In other words, “together but not together”.

Because there are so many churches in De Doorns, the church community as a whole is seen as being very divided. It is said that they do not have a voice in the community and choose not to ‘interfere’ in the problems of the community. This is because if the church is deemed too liberal in its views, or too outspoken on a social issue, it has the potential to lose followers as a result of the stance it takes. Church leaders have been identified as community leaders, though only by those respondents who were church-going themselves. This suggests, perhaps, that they do not hold much power outside of the church, in the greater community:

> “They can’t do anything. They must just go to church. They can do nothing. They must just pray about the situation. They say they are praying about the situation, about the rapes and the drugs. But they can’t do anything.”77

VI. History of group violence and exclusion

While people were happy to talk about De Doorns and the problems they personally face, most respondents were unwilling to talk about recent collective violence in De Doorns. This made acquiring information about who instigated violence and how it was perpetrated particularly challenging. This section explores two events of collective violence that occurred.

---
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in De Doorns: the xenophobic violence that occurred in 2009 against the Zimbabweans in Stofland, and the provincial 2012/2013 farm workers’ strike.

2009 Xenophobic Violence

The most notable xenophobic attacks in De Doorns occurred in November 2009. This is certainly the event that most fieldwork respondents talked about when the subject of xenophobia arose during discussions. De Doorns was the only rural location that experienced xenophobic attacks during this time; other national incidences were all in urban, informal settlements.

The first identified incident of xenophobic violence occurred in February 2009, when seven Zimbabwean nationals (four men and three women) were locked in a shack in Stofland and burnt to death. It was alleged by witnesses that the fire was started on purpose, therefore making it a murder investigation.78 This was said to be a ‘social conflict’ rather than related to xenophobia, allegedly motivated by a lovers’ quarrel.79 One man was arrested and charged for the murder.80 Surprisingly, there was little media coverage of this event, despite its brutality. We heard from a very reliable source that an arson attack, which acted as a prelude to the 2009 xenophobic attacks, was perpetrated by a group of Sothos. This ‘war’, as it was referred to by the respondent, started as a result of an argument between a Sotho and a Zimbabwean man, where seemingly there was a Zimbabwean woman involved. She looked for refuge in a home that belonged to a Zimbabwean. A Sotho male went to fetch some petrol with the intention of torching the house, while other Sotho males were attacking the house with stones. At the time, there were ten people in the house, and only three managed to escape during the commotion. A Zimbabwean survivor explained:

“...the Sothos went back and locked the doors of our house from the outside. They then threw a petrol bomb into the house so everyone inside was burnt inside the

79 Xenophobia conflict in De Doorns; A development communication challenge for developmental local government, Johannes Rudolf Botha, 2012, 45
80 Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35
The brutality of the crime, and the fact it was committed by a group of Sothos, speaks to the already existing tensions and hostility between the two social groups. Furthermore, this incident – of the Sotho-Zimbabwean ‘war’ – acts as a historicised event that solidifies animosity between Sothos and Zimbabweans to this day.

Potentially in response to the February 2009 murders, the police raided the informal settlements in De Doorns on 4 March 2009. In this raid, which was led by the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) and the police, a total number of 367 foreigners were taken to the police station, all of whom lacked legal documentation and were therefore considered ‘illegal’. Police officials claimed that the arrested foreigners were awaiting assistance from the DHA, rather than being in custody, despite being put in cells. After this raid, it is reported that many Zimbabweans fled from De Doorns.\footnote{Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35} In this way, it is possible that the police were heeding South Africans’ demands to expel foreigners from the community.

Warning of the November 2009 attacks came a few months before, when Eskom assessed the area of Stofland in order to provide electricity.\footnote{The investigation found that some of the informal settlements were built outside of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) demarcated area and some had settled right next to the riverbed, making it impossible for Eskom to supply some with the utility. Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35} During community consultation, some told Eskom to avoid Zimbabwean homes since they were intending on ‘doing xenophobia’. Community leaders allegedly said at the time that there was a need to create space for South African ‘brothers and sisters’ in the main Stofland area, so that they could live in an area with electricity.\footnote{Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35} This implies that foreign nationals within the area of Stofland were seen as ‘outsiders’ by South Africans, and not entitled to basic governmental services, and that preference should be given to their South African counterparts. There was no mention of this incident during our field research. However, some of the Sotho female respondents the team spoke to explained that in their shacks they do have electricity and water.\footnote{Interview with female Sotho farmworkers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016}

\footnote{Interview with foreign national, black male, Zimbabwean, De Doorns, 10 May 2016}

\footnote{Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35}

\footnote{The investigation found that some of the informal settlements were built outside of the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP) demarcated area and some had settled right next to the riverbed, making it impossible for Eskom to supply some with the utility.}

\footnote{Fear, Dislike and Hate, Davis, 2010, 35}

\footnote{Interview with female Sotho farmworkers, De Doorns, 12 May 2016}
From 14-17 November 2009, roughly 3000 Zimbabwean nationals (specifically farmworkers) were forcefully displaced from De Doorns (especially Stofland), following the destruction and looting of their dwellings by some South Africans. The research team were informed that people’s shacks were torn down, some people were beaten and others were simply chased out. The overall aim of the xenophobic attacks was allegedly to ‘send a message’ that the Zimbabweans were no longer welcome within the community. This respondent gives a brief account of events on 14 November:

“It started here in Stofland, where South African workers started looting Zimbabwean homes and stole their furniture, took their stuff and started burning down their houses. They went to hit people.”

On the 18 November 2009, the displaced foreign nationals initially sought help at De Doorns police station and were then moved on to the Hexvallei Sportklub (marked in Figure 1), which is opposite the Hexvalley High School in town, as the number of displaced increased. The entire Zimbabwean population of De Doorns was displaced (indicative of the first large-scale displacement of foreign nationals since the national widespread violence in May 2008).

These attacks occurred in mid-November, after an influx of migrants into the area and heightened availability of work as high-season began from October. It is no coincidence that at the very time Zimbabwean workers migrated in large numbers into De Doorns, collective violence against them was enacted. It was at this moment that the economic competition for positions was at its greatest, and where feelings of resentment and entitlement on the part of South Africans, especially those who could not find work, were heightened.

---

86 Violence, Labour and the Displacement of Zimbabweans in De Doorns, Western Cape, Jean Misago, December 2009, Forced Migration Studies Programme

87 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016

No one could tell the researchers who the instigators of the November xenophobic violence were. Some respondents speculated that the local ANC councillor of Ward 2 and the Mayor of the Local Municipality at the time were either directly involved in organizing the violence, or indirectly supportive of it. This allegedly followed from at least two known meetings (on the evenings of the 13 and 16 November 2009), between South Africans and local authorities, including the Mayor and the police. It is perceived by some respondents that these meetings were used to mobilise for the violence to take place over the next few days. In the team’s fieldwork accounts, there appears to have been a meeting with a councillor or several councillors (there were both accounts) two days before the attacks, where a mob threatened to throw the foreign nationals out, and the councillors responded that whatever the mob did, they would have to carry the consequences. In other words, the councillor ‘washed his hands’ of any violence that might take place, and did not work effectively to prevent it. No preventative action was said to have occurred. In this way, the attacks appear to have premeditated.

It is also alleged that labour brokers played some part in instigating the violence, though their exact role is unknown. It was said that some labour brokers are in fact friends with people involved in politics, but whether they are directly involved in politics themselves remains unknown. The brokers were said to have been angered by the Zimbabwean labour brokers before the 2009 xenophobic attacks.

Community leaders and local authorities did very little to stop the attacks. However, it was mentioned by many interviewees that a lot of farmers played the role of (problematic) peacemakers. According to a report, Zimbabweans were disappointed in the police response, in that they had been present on the scene, but had done nothing to prevent or stop the attacks. Our research did find, however, that respondents felt that the police treated them with respect throughout the process:

---
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“...the government really helped us. They gave us food and the police were treating us really well. Until they arranged with the municipality that we should move back.”

During their stay at the sports club, the Zimbabweans continued to be employed by the local farmers. Additionally, many respondents mentioned that the farmers gave housing and shelter to displaced foreign nationals on their farms. There seems to be much resentment and anger from South Africans towards the farmers for doing this:

“There were a lot of farmers who got involved. Many of them hosted the foreign workers, on their farms where they had space. They even came to collect the people and took them to work.”

“We always say, we blame the white people. When we ‘uitwoel’ (‘evicted’) them out of our community, so they took care of them at the track...erected tents for them, built houses for them. Since that time, you can see our town is full...kwerekweres and I don’t know what other things.”

The farmers’ response to the attacks actually entrenched and deepened already existing tensions between Zimbabwean and South African farmworkers. It confirmed, in a way, the South Africans’ perception that farmers ‘prefer’ Zimbabweans. By extending favours that have not been given to South Africans, through providing places on their farms to those affected, sentiments of unfair treatment were confirmed. Given that South Africans had a sense of entitlement towards farm working jobs, and the benefits of working on farms, these acts were considered a direct affront.

Rather than providing a solution to their problem, the eviction of the Zimbabweans from Stofland actually increased South African farmworkers’ woes. Zimbabweans remained employed on the farms, seemingly with even greater benefits, and with even closer ties formed with the farmers and farm management. Similarly, the Zimbabweans were seen as recipients of camp resources during their stay at the camp. From the time of the mass

---
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displacement, there was an inflow of NGOs – including People Against Suffering Oppression and Poverty (PASSOP), Oxfam, Scalabrini Centre, Consortium for Refugees and Migrants South African (CoRMSA), and Black Sash – into the area to provide humanitarian assistance. This group of NGOs provided resources such as shelter, food, and other necessities, which were lacking in De Doorns East and Stofland. Once again, based on our assessments, Zimbabweans were seen as the beneficiaries of resources, which the locals felt entitled to.

Rapid reintegration of the displaced Zimbabweans was proposed by numerous stakeholders, despite messages from South Africans that they were not welcome back within the community. Apparently, there was a continued threat to mobilise South Africans to chase the Zimbabweans from the sports club and farms. Additionally, some community members voiced their concerns over the lack of appropriate services in the area, specifically referring to housing.95

According to a CPF representative, a reintegration task team was formed, which consisted of the CPF and churches in the community. It was in operation for a period of five years after the xenophobic attacks occurred, and the role of this team was to facilitate community dialogue. The CPF said they were successful in their leading role here because the foreign nationals have been integrated peacefully.96 This narrative – of successful reintegration – goes against the feelings expressed by both South Africans and Zimbabweans in our interviews. In addition, and building on the point around the weakness of the CPF and church in tackling social issues, the church did not want to get involved in a controversial issue, and the CPF, represented by locals from the community itself, were unwilling to take a firm stance. A resident explains the difficult situation in which the CPF members found themselves after the xenophobic violence occurred:

“Most of the people are either Xhosa or coloureds that serve on the CPF. Now how do those people take a stand...to help the foreign nationals? It will create the impression that you are favouring the people, or their interests are more important than the other people. So those were the issues that caused them to stand to one side, and

96 Interview with CPF representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
didn’t become part of it… It could be out of fear, because they all stay in the community. The people felt that others could stand up against them too. So they took a neutral position. Let the police get involved and they should help with the reintegration of people. So, with the church, they were quiet and neutral.”

The displacement camp was closed after eleven months on the 13 October 2010. By that time, approximately 350 Zimbabweans were left in the camp, after the majority of the displaced 2 500 had moved from De Doorns following the end of the harvest season in April 2010. Out of the 350 left in the camp, the majority decided to remain in De Doorns, and only 33 decided to return to Zimbabwe.

2012/13 Farm Workers’ Strike

De Doorns was at the epicentre of the farm workers’ strike of 2012/2013, a strike that affected numerous farm working communities within the Western Cape, including Worcester, Ceres, Grabouw, Robertson, Wolseley and Villiersdorp. This strike lasted roughly a month, and its main cause was the low pay received by farm workers within the province.

Before the strikes occurred, workers earned between R69 and R75 a day. Technically, minimum wages are set every three years, and the minimum wage for farm workers was set at R69 on the 1 March 2012. Through our research, it became apparent that during the strike the community had 25 demands, but only one of these were attended to: the demand for R150 per day. Somehow the issue of pay organically became the prominent feature of the strike. Another respondent mentioned that initially, there were eight demands that were handed over to the Hexriver Table Grape Association (HTA) and the ANC constituency office in De Doorns. These eight demands then later grew to 21 demands, all to do with
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improved wages and living conditions, but still the one regarding minimum wage is the one that rose to the foreground in negotiations.

The strike started on Keurboschkloof Farm, which is near De Doorns, on the 27 August 2012. Since the farm owner was sick, he decided to lease out the land to a private company who then decided to pay the farm workers less money. With the help of PASSOP, these farm workers got organised and began to strike peacefully. This lasted for one day, after which their demands were met. It is said that this became an example to others of what can happen when farm workers in De Doorns come together. From this, the strike spread into the Stofland area of De Doorns, and became a more prolonged process. This community leader explained the process:

“Then we heard about that [Keurboschkloof] and we said if that farm can pay like that, then all the farmers can pay like that. So we decided that was our point. That is the main point.”

On 30 October 2012, around 8 000 farm workers staged a violent wage protest, where the N1 was closed off between Touws River and De Doorns. Many farms were set on fire, and approximately 30 hectares of farm land was destroyed.

It is the impression of the white respondents of De Doorns that these attacks were coordinated by either foreigners or people ‘bussed in’ from outside who were not necessarily farm workers themselves. As a farm manager stated:

“It’s ‘uitwerkens’ (outside workers), people from Lesotho and Zimbabwe, that come from outside of South Africa, that came here to fuel the fires. That wasn’t necessarily the people who worked on the farms, they wanted to come work, but the ‘skollie’

---
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element came into it, who then broke things and destroyed it all, so that's how it escalated...they were people who came from outside the farm. I asked my people at the time, who were the leaders, ‘no Mr, they don't even stay here’...but there were definitely trouble makers who were bussed in to blow up the business. I can’t point fingers, to say that they were from the Cape or wherever, but I know for a fact that there were lots of busses from the Transkei and all those places. They came to make trouble here in the Cape.”  

Indeed, it was alleged that it was the Sothos who were at the forefront of the strike, and that they constituted the committee that drafted the eight demands presented to the HTA and the ANC constituency office initially.Apparently, South Africans were in solidarity with the Sothos. By contrast, the Zimbabweans were described as being ‘docile’ during this strike, since they were the ones who kept working. Some Zimbabweans were forced by the locals to join the strike. It was said that if they went to work during the day, at night they would get a beating.

Another source claimed that some foreign nationals from Lesotho were brought in by the farmers during the strike period. It was said, however, that it was the people of Stofland, and not necessarily farmworkers themselves, who were involved in the strike. As a union representative commented:

“We struggled during the strike to get farmworkers involved. Most people involved in the strike were people from Stofland. It was Stofland people who initiated the strike.”

This strike was perceived by some to be politically motivated, as opposed to motivated by labour relations. When the strike first started, the demands of the farmworkers were unclear, and there seemed to be no leadership structure in place. Farm workers in De Doorns were initially led by a committee of about ten people. This was exacerbated by the fact that at the time, only three percent of farm workers in the Western Cape belonged to a  
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trade union.\(^{108}\) This implies that most of the farmworkers were taking part in the strike unprotected and with limited bargaining power. The spokesperson for the Agriculture, Economic Development and Tourism Member of the Executive Council (MEC) said that it was not a labour strike organized by the farm workers, and that it was clearly politically motivated. Interestingly, he went on to say that he was adamant that it was not the ‘traditional’ farm workers who were involved, but the seasonal workers. This is significant because a large proportion of seasonal workers migrate into the area from Lesotho and Zimbabwe, implying it was the foreign nationals who were responsible for the strike.\(^{109}\)

Strikes were suspended on the 2 December 2012, and then started up again on the 4 December, after which they lasted for one day only. Strikes were then reinvigorated in the beginning of January 2013 and ended finally on the 22 January 2013, with the minimum wage being increased to R105 per day (or R 14.25 per hour). Technically, since the minister could not change the minimum wage within twelve months of setting it (on 1 March 2012), this increase only came into effect on the 1 March 2013.

In the end in De Doorns, 181 farm workers were arrested,\(^{110}\) and hundreds of farm workers were fired.\(^{111}\) This result could have contributed to the fact that the people within the community of De Doorns are now hesitant to come together as a collective to solve problems.

Even though the result of the strike led to all farm workers, including foreign nationals, being paid R14.25 per hour, the impression remains that foreign nationals still accept lower pay, and thus farm workers prefer to employ them as a source of cheaper labour. As a community member stated:

“...there’s then now no work for us in the valley. They [foreign nationals] come and take it automatically. You see, the farmers are clever after all; they pay the Zims


\(^{110}\) According to one respondent, about 500 people were arrested and charged.

under the belt. We don’t stand for that... Those people they come and they work for “n appel en ’n ui’ (‘work for peanuts’); they are thus automatically taking our work.”

A union representative concurs:

“It is very difficult for them to work with our people, because our people say they come in and work for less money.”

While it may be the perception that foreign nationals work for lower pay, everyone the team spoke to gets paid the same hourly rate of R14.25. Having said this, farmers now employ farm workers for fewer hours in a day, to keep their total costs down. The number of hours worked by a farmworker therefore determines how much they take home at the end of the day. In this way, it is possible for the farmer to employ those s/he deems more hardworking for more hours in a day. Those who live off the farm, in Stofland, tend to work fewer hours – often because they have fixed times to be picked up and dropped home – and so get paid less. Those of the farm, on the other hand, have the opportunity to work longer hours and get paid more. Currently, this resultant wage disparity between some workers did not appear to be a huge source of contention, but the potential for it to become one is very present. This is especially the case, as we see a pattern of South African migration from farms to town (Stofland), opening space for others, including Zimbabweans, to live on the farms.

One white respondent said that before the new minimum wage was introduced, farmers would remunerate their workers in non-financial means, which has subsequently fallen away since their financial costs are higher. Generally, there was the feeling in the white community, including farm management, that farmers are ‘good’ to their workers and that they get treated well. Farm management said that they do plenty of favours for their workers, especially when it comes to transporting workers to hospitals, church services and the like. A farm manager reported:
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“...I go out of my way to do something a little extra for them. Like this farm is small, and taxis aren’t allowed to come here to deliver things because you never know who is sitting in the taxi, who brings what, so now and then we make an exception and help that the people can get their groceries delivered at home, stuff like that.”\textsuperscript{115}

“...we have three or four elders on the farm and we give them a lorry to go to church on Sundays and now with the Pentecost service, we gave them a lorry.”\textsuperscript{116}

It appears that these benefits still exist, to some extent, on the farms. However, it is clear that the volume and scope of them has reduced since the wage increase.

Another impact of the strike is that it is difficult for those who were actively involved in the strikes to find employment on the farms. This is because these farmworkers are seen by the farmers as ‘trouble makers’. There were five women in De Doorns who belonged to Women on Farms that considered themselves to be amongst the main leaders within the community. Some of these individuals claimed that they were the leaders of the strike, and that they actively mobilised the community to get involved in it. As two Women on Farms representatives stated:

“...after two years we got work again, for two years we couldn’t get work on the farms. They wouldn’t accept us. For two years we sat at home.”\textsuperscript{117}

“For the past four years, I haven’t been getting work on the farms. Because I was part of the strikes. And every time that the farmers saw me on the TV they saw me standing next to Nosey or next to Tony. It was probably a problem for them.”\textsuperscript{118}

It is said that the farm workers in De Doorns do not know their rights, and that they get treated as if they have no rights. As a union representative confirmed:
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“...our people do not have freedom, especially on farms. They have no rights and so. So what ‘baas’ (‘boss’) says is always right. So that’s the type of town it is.”

Farmworkers are considered troublemakers when they know their rights as they are more likely to contest their working conditions, are then often ostracised by the farm foreman, the farm manager and farmer. The work they deliver is also monitored very closely, in an attempt to find fault. This appears to be a clear tactic to prevent dissent. Indeed, the farm management creates a whole set of mechanisms so the foreman will ‘report’ troublemakers, so they can be dismissed or somehow pacified. These ‘troublemakers’ are often those farm workers that belong to a union. A way in which the farmers allegedly discourage membership of a union is that he will often give those who are not in unions a financial bonus, and nothing to those belonging to a union.

Farm management allegedly uses informers to watch/spy on the troublemakers. As an example, on one of the farms, every piece of information or insight that is given to the farmers by these ‘snitches’ is rewarded with R100. A farmworker explains:

“...they are friends when they are out of work, but when they work they are still friends but there are people who work with the white people...they talk badly about you behind your back at the end of the day without you knowing, because they benefit from it.”

Naturally, this causes dissent and divisions on the farms, where people do not stand together. It was explained to the research team that when one farmworker feels like s/he has an issue to take up with the farmer, even after support has been promised by other farmworkers, they will “turn against you”, that one farm worker will be labelled as a ‘troublemaker’ for knowing their rights and for speaking their mind, and will have a good chance of being chased off the farm. Those that appear to betray the troublemakers are labelled as favourites of the farmers, with the following coined phrase: “sy/hy is die boer se kind” (‘s/he is the farmer’s pet’). Additionally, whatever happens on the farm will get

119 Interview with FAWU representative, De Doorns, 10 May 2016
120 Interview with coloured male, farm worker, De Doorns, 13 May 2016
reported back to the farmer by these farm workers, even if it is of personal nature or an event that occurred on the weekend, and will be dealt with the farmer come Monday.121

This behaviour by the farmers results in a deep-rooted dislike towards them. It is said by their employees that there are no ‘good’ farmers, that they are all ‘bad’ people. They appear to operate on instilling fear into their employees in every possible manner. For example:

…”the farmer doesn’t talk to you like the way I’m talking to you now. His voice is loud; he’s like a lion. You must get scared.”122

Threats and risks of xenophobic violence

While De Doorns is considered ‘calmer’ after the 2012/2013 strike, it was in Phase I where the research team felt that the resentment of the locals towards the Zimbabwean migrants remained high. There is still a fair amount of xenophobic sentiment in the area, particularly on the farms. This seems to be something that can only be resolved fully when labour issues are resolved and the farm owners stop playing the foreign nationals and South Africans off one another. Indeed, the fieldwork team found that there is a high risk of violence within De Doorns, especially in light of the continued inequality in treatment perpetuated by the farmers themselves. As two South Africans shared:

“The people are still talking about how they want those people out of De Doorns. They are making things more difficult for us.”123

“…Stofland’s people bustled them out here. And I can see that thing is going to start again now. Because they (the farmers) accommodate the people so much…and they do the jobs that our people have always done.”124
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Having said that, in Phase II De Doorns seemed somewhat calmer when referring to the sentiment towards the Zimbabweans. One respondent claims that the people are trying to handle the situation (of the foreign nationals), that the preferential treatment of the farmers towards the Zimbabweans has been normalised, and that the locals have accepted this quietly.

VII. Underlying causes and triggers

Before the xenophobic attacks in 2009, tension between the South Africans and Zimbabweans had been building for quite some time. Work on a farm, especially during high season, is crucial to the livelihood of the community members of Stofland. It was when foreign nationals started to move into the community, threatening this livelihood, by accepting lower pay (and therefore being guaranteed employment by the farmers), that the South Africans became hostile towards them. This section looks at the potential underlying factors that can be attributed to the 2009 xenophobic violence.

The xenophobic attacks appear to have started when farmers began paying foreign nationals less than South Africans for the same work. Indeed, it is perceived that local farmers have a preference for employing foreign nationals, since they are seen as ‘cheap labour’. There were, however, conflicting reports as to whether Zimbabweans did indeed get remunerated equally, and whether they got paid for overtime and worked on weekends. Some reported that Zimbabweans were getting paid as little as R 30 to R 40 per day (in 2009), whereas South Africans got paid R 60. In addition, some Zimbabweans told the media that they were working on weekends and holidays. It has also been said that farmers prefer employing foreign nationals because they have the dedication required to work long and strenuous hours during the harvest season. In this way, the foreign nationals were accused of stealing the jobs of South Africans. The issue of pay and perceptions of working dedication (of the foreign nationals) were longstanding, but it was when
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preferential treatment reached a certain point, during the season of 2009, that the attacks began.

As mentioned previously, there was an apparent relationship between some labour brokers (some of whom were also apparently on the municipal council) and the ANC councillor for Ward 2. This was also reported in the media.128 These labour brokers allegedly pressured local leaders and incited local residents to chase Zimbabweans out of the community.129 Their involvement in organising the violence was as a result of two points: “i) the councillor reportedly gave in to demands by a powerful pressure group (labour brokers) in order to protect his position during the upcoming local elections; ii) some ward committee members have interests in protecting their jobs as contractors.”130 The 2009 xenophobic attacks in De Doorns were led by locals who were mobilised by the frustrations farmworkers were feeling regarding the preferential treatment the foreign nationals were receiving from the farmers. Perhaps the attacks were sparked by the economic benefit that the Ward 2 councillor and his friends (as labour brokers) would have reaped, should the Zimbabweans be expelled from the community.

It had been suggested in reports and in the media that the presence of a satellite Home Affairs office in the area attracted foreign nationals into the area. More specifically, it was a satellite Refugee Reception Office (the closest office of its kind was previously in Nyanga, Cape Town), which could issue asylum and permit papers, allowing foreign nationals to work on farms. Labour brokers and local leaders felt that this office was attracting too many foreigners into the area, which potentially fuelled the tensions between the two groups. Less significance was placed on this fact in our field research findings, and it was only mentioned once upon being prompted. When the respondent was asked whether they thought the office specifically attracted people to the area, the response was ‘no’, instead it aimed to help people who were already there for farm work. It was reiterated, however, that local leadership was against the establishment of this office, which came at the request

---
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of farmers. The exact dates of its opening and closing remains uncertain, though it was estimated in our fieldwork that the office closed about five years ago.

VIII. Socio-economic implications of violence

According to some community members, the xenophobic attacks have led to the presence of ‘paranoia’ amongst the Zimbabweans. Some described them as still being “skittish” because they were threatened during the attacks. It also seems to have contributed to a reduction in socialising between foreign nationals and South Africans, especially on farms.

The 2012/13 strikes cleared up a source of contention about wages that had existed. Apart from demanding higher wages in general, the farm workers wanted there to be better regulation of wages. By ensuring ‘fair wages’ that are universally applied to all nationalities, a key source of community tension could be resolved. Furthermore, the strikes gave a sense of collective action and collective belonging for South African (and Sotho) farmworkers in De Doorns. It enabled community dialogue. It also represented a process in which farmworkers were able to access their labour rights, and collectively gain from group action. In this way, the strike brought the ‘in-group’ in the community closer together. Some community members believe the space created for dialogue as a result of past tensions will enable community members to solve their differences amicably without resorting to violence.

“You know our community is not divided, they feel as one happy big family. As you can take your mind back in 2012 when people going out on a farm working strike...So definitely that will show you the people are unite in De Doorns, they are not divided.”

On the other hand, tensions with the ‘out-group’ – Zimbabweans – were not fundamentally resolved. The preferential treatment that Zimbabweans are still perceived to receive fuels
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ongoing tensions. Indeed, one community respondent said she thought that the community will act together and ‘do xenophobia’ in the near future. Generally, among those interviewed, many felt disappointed that so many foreign nationals chose to stay in De Doorns after the xenophobic attacks.

IX. Conclusion

De Doorns is a complex community. It is an isolated, underdeveloped farming town in the Western Cape, creating an environment of little social and economic opportunity other than farm work. This, together with the development of the informal settlement, has contributed to the many social challenges, namely widespread unemployment (especially during low season), drug abuse, gangsterism and the distinct lack of opportunities for its youth. Furthermore, groups in De Doorns continue to be highly segregated, often by race, both in town and on farms. There is a perception that De Doorns town is for the white population, but they seem to avoid claiming it, leaving the question of who it belongs to and who belongs there. Coloured people tend to be located in De Doorns East, and the majority of the black population of De Doorns live in the informal settlement of Stofland, where both of these population groups travel into town for groceries and the like. De Doorns East, and labour opportunities on farms, are collectively ‘owned’ by the coloured population, who claim the space as their own.

Community leadership structures within De Doorns appear relatively weak. Despite not having much faith in the ability of the councillors to address their needs, community members do turn to these political figures when they face problems. The main unions within the area are FAWU and BAWUSA, and these seemed to have some legitimacy in solving the problems of those that belong to these unions, specifically farmworkers. Having said that, these unions are not widely represented in the area. Additionally, Women on Farms stood out as an important, leading movement in the area, and has provided a network for the farm working women of De Doorns.
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Farmworkers, both those that live on the farms and those that reside in Stofland, face many problems. When working and living on the farms, farmworkers face multiple-levels of segregation. Most importantly, farm management creates animosity between groups of farm workers – often divided along racial lines – by playing the different groups off against one another. In general, farmworkers lead a very restricted and monitored life on the farms.

Generally, the spatial segregation of De Doorns reflects the racial divide in the area, and the tensions that follow as a result of this has led to direct confrontation between population groups – although these have been particularly directed at one group, Zimbabweans, who are seen to be at the centre of the social problems. The purpose of the 2009 xenophobic attacks was to drive out the Zimbabweans, who were seen as accepting lower wages, which threatened South Africans’ jobs. Quite a few respondents felt unhappy that many Zimbabweans chose to stay in De Doorns after the attacks, which suggests that new efforts to displace them may yet occur.

According to some, the 2012/2013 provincial Farm Workers’ Strike in which De Doorns was the epicentre, unified the community. It was said that Sotho and South African farmworkers came together to demand a higher wage, and after they succeeded, showed them what can be achieved. Yet the tensions between the community members and the ‘outsiders’ (particularly Zimbabweans) appear to be largely unresolved. There continues to exist a high level of xenophobic sentiment among community members in De Doorns, with explicit suggestions that xenophobic attacks were likely to happen in the future. Given that underlying causes of this sentiment have not been addressed, foreign nationals within De Doorns remain at risk of encountering xenophobic violence.