

**THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC OUTCOMES OF THE FAST-TRACK LAND  
REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME (FTLRP): WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO  
KIPPURE-IRAM RESETTLEMENT SCHEME IN MASVINGO PROVINCE, ZIMBABWE**

By

**GOLDMARKS MAKAMURE** 

**Dissertation Submitted in (partial) Fulfillment of the requirements of Master of  
Arts**

in

**SOCIOLOGY**

By Research

in the

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**(School of Social Sciences)**

at the

**UNIVERSITY OF LIMPOPO**

**SUPERVISOR: Prof SL Sithole**

**CO-SUPERVISOR: Dr AV Dhliwayo**

**2014**

## DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation submitted to the University of Limpopo, for the degree of Master of Arts in Sociology has not been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other university; that is my own work in design and execution, and that all the material herein has been duly acknowledged.

---

**Surname, Initials (Title)**

---

**Date**

## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to my parents, who gave me rock-solid support throughout my study and my late young brother Kufachikati Makamure.

## ABSTRACT

The problem investigated in this study relates to the socio-economic outcomes that the Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) produced. The study focused on the voices of the newly resettled farmers because the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP have been analyzed at a high level (government, NGOs and international organisations), thus ignoring the voice of the people at the grassroots. For example, scholars like Moyo (2004) asserted that the land question has generated a lot of emotional debate and there is a general consensus that it represents the dimension to the crisis the country is going through. On the other hand according to Mukamuri (2000) land is a very crucial factor in the eradication of insecurity and rural poverty.

The study focused on the socio-economic outcomes of the Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme, Masvingo province, Zimbabwe. The research employed qualitative research methods which were descriptive. The population of the study was constituted by the beneficiaries of the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. Data collection in this study was done through the use of focus group discussions and secondary data was collected from government (Zimbabwean Government, 2003 and 2005), NGOs (FAO, 2003), international organisations (Oxfam International, 2002 and 2003) and literature from various scholars.

The population comprised of all the newly resettled farmers of the Kippure-Iram Resettlement scheme. Thirty (30) out of forty (40) respondents were interviewed and the researcher made use of non-probability sampling, which was purposive. Ten (10) of the farmers were not interviewed because they were not true representation of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP because they were not active in the programme.

The researcher divided the participants into five groups. Each group had six participants. Each group of participants was interviewed on three different sessions; each session had its own thematic question. Totally, fifteen sessions were conducted during the focus group discussions. The discussions were carried out at Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2010. Each session of the interviews lasted for two hours. The researcher made use of pseudo names during the interviews, a way of protecting the identity of the participants. Analysis of data in this study was carried out through the use of content analysis.

Seventy-six percent (76%) of the participants observed that the FTLRP's outcomes in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme were positive to a larger extent, mainly because they can now practise various farming projects to earn a living on their new land and the programme has managed to distribute land to its rightful owners. On the other hand, twenty-four per-cent (24%) of the participants indicated that the results of the FTLRP were negative because after the FTLRP they were left unemployed.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The success of this study was made possible because of the tireless efforts of my supervisors, Prof S. L. Sithole, Dr A. V. Dhlwayo and Prof P. M. Mokhahlane. Most importantly I would like to thank God for the strength which He gave me to overcome all the challenges which I faced in this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### CHAPTER 1: GENERAL ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Background of the Study	3
1.2.1	The Fast-Track “Land Reform Process”	9
1.3	Statement of the Problem	10
1.4	Motivation for the Study	12
1.5	Significance of the Study	12
1.6	Aim	13
1.6.1	Objectives	13
1.7	Research Questions	15
1.7.1	Main Research Question	15
1.7.2	Subsidiary Questions	15
1.8	Operational Definitions	15

## **CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE OUTCOMES OF LAND REFORM**

2.1	Introduction	21
2.2	The FTLRP Process	22
2.3	Brief Land Reform Experiences in other Countries	22
2.3.1	Land Reform in South Africa	23
2.3.2	Land Reform in Namibia	23
2.4	The FTLRP's Influence on Media and Promotion of Propaganda	24
2.5	The Effects of Land Reform on Cattle Farming: Market to Sell Them, Exportation, Diseases and Supply	25
2.6	Land Reform and Peasant Livelihoods	25
2.7	The FTLRP and Employment Creation in Zimbabwe	26
2.8	The FTLRP and Specialized Land Uses in Masvingo Province	28
2.9	The FTLRP's Impact on Food Security in Zimbabwe	29
2.10	The Socio-Economic Impacts of the FTLRP	30
2.11	The FTLRP and Farming Production	33
2.12	The FTLRP and the Rule of Law	34
2.13	The Social Reproduction of Peasant Households and Nature	36
2.14	Democracy and Land Reform in Zimbabwe	36
2.15	What Lessons does the FTLRP offer to Southern Africa?	37

2.16	The FTLRP as the First Major Reform	38
2.17	Land Reform and Development	39
2.18	The Structure of the Land Occupation Movement	40
2.19	Types of Farm Models of the Land Reform in Zimbabwe	41
2.19.1	The Family Farm Model (Model A)	41
2.19.2	The Co-operative Farming Model (Model B)	41
2.19.3	The Out Growers Farmers' Model (Model C)	42
2.19.4	Schemes for Group Livestock Grazing Model (Model D)	42
2.20	Theoretical Framework	43
2.20.1	Afrocentric Theory	44
2.20.2	Marxism	48
 <b>CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY</b>		
3.1	Introduction	52
3.2	Research Design	52
3.3	Population and Sampling Methods	53
3.4	Methods of Data Collection	54
3.4.1	Primary Data	54
3.4.1	Secondary Data Sources	55
3.5	Method of Data Analysis	56

3.6	Ethical Considerations	56
3.6.1	The Quality of the Research	56
3.6.2	Informed Consent	57
3.6.3	Confidentiality and Anonymity	57
3.7	Justification of Research Methods	57
3.8	Research Limitations	58

**CHAPTER 4: DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND  
INTERPRETATION OF THE EMPIRICAL FINDINGS OBTAINED  
FROM THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE FAST-TRACK LAND  
REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME (FTLRP) ON THE  
SOCIO-ECONOMIC OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAMME**

4.1	Introduction	60
4.2	Demographic Information of the Participants	62
4.3	The Economic Effects of the FTLRP to the Beneficiaries	65
4.3.1	The Positive/Negative Effects of the FTLRP	67
4.3.2	The Negative/Positive Effects of the FTLRP on the Environment	70
4.3.3	The number of Cattle and Goats of the FTLPR Beneficiaries Before and after the FTLRP	72
4.3.4	The Types of Farming Projects which were initiated on the Beneficiaries' New Land	73
4.3.5	The Reasons for Improved Agricultural Output	76

4.3.6	The Significance of the Increased Agricultural Output	78
4.3.7	The Beneficiaries' ability to send their Children to Boarding Schools before the FTLRP	79
4.3.8	Elaboration on how the FTLRP Advantages Outweigh the Disadvantages	80
4.4	The Effects of the FTLRP on the Beneficiaries' Livelihoods	82
4.4.1	The Means of Surviving which the FTLRP has Created for the Beneficiaries	83
4.4.2	The Land's Capability to Provide for the Beneficiaries	85
4.4.3	The Kinds of food which the Beneficiaries has Managed to Produce from their Land	86
4.4.4	The Types of Agricultural Projects Engaged in	87
4.4.5	Opportunities Opened by the FTLRP for the Beneficiaries	88
4.4.6	The Agro-Based Projects being Practised	89
4.4.7	Land as a Means of Survival	90
4.4.8	Farming Projects and Sustainability	91

4.5	The Effects of the FTLRP on the Beneficiaries' Social Reproduction	93
4.5.1	Agro-Based African Cultural Economic Activities	94
4.5.2	The FTLRP and Gender Equality	95
4.5.3	The Importance of Taking Back the Land which was taken away from the Beneficiaries' Forefathers	97
4.5.4	The Feelings after Acquiring Land	100
4.5.5	Kaguvi and Nehanda	101
4.5.6	The FTLRP Beneficiaries and Accomplishment of One of the Objectives which Kaguvi and Nehanda died for	102
4.5.7	The FTLRP and Injustice of Colonialism in Regard to Land Allocation	103
4.5.8	Land as the Key to Survival	106
4.5.9	Natural Resources Accessed from the Land	107
4.5.10	The FTLRP and the Restoration of Shona Cultural Practices	107
4.5.11	Praising of Ancestors after Harvesting from Sacred Areas	109
4.5.12	The FTLRP and Cultural Relocation of African People	110
4.5.13	<i>Nhimbe</i>	110
4.5.14	Land and Survival	112

4.5.15	The FTLRP's Effect on Living in a Real African Shona Culture	113
4.5.16	Positive Social Effects of the FTLRP	116

## **CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	Summary	118
5.2	Conclusion	120
5.3	Recommendations	120

	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>122</b>
--	-------------------	------------

## **LIST OF TABLES, GRAPHS AND CHARTS**

Table 1:	Unemployment caused by the FTLRP	22
Table 2:	Gender Distribution of the Sample	58
Table 3:	Age Distribution of the Sample	59
Table 4:	Household Distribution of the Sample	60

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Focus Group Interview Schedule	130
APPENDIX 2: Request for Permission to Conduct Research	133
APPENDIX 3: Confirmation of Research carried out at Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme	134
APPENDIX 4: Confirmation Letter from English Language Editor	135

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FTLRP	Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
CFU	Commercial Farmers' Union
CSC	Cold Storage Commission
GMB	Grain Marketing Body
EU	European Union
IMF	International Monetary Fund
WB	World Bank
SADC	Southern African Development Community
ZANU PF	Zimbabwe African National Unity Patriotic Front
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change

# CHAPTER ONE

## GENERAL ORIENTATION TO THE STUDY

### 1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the orientation to the study. The present researcher introduces the land reform issue in Zimbabwe and defines what Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) is, giving the background of the land reform in the country. The chapter traces land reform in Zimbabwe from the time when it started and how it was implemented by both the Rhodesian and Zimbabwean governments. Further, it also covers the statement of the problem, motivation of the study, significance of the study, aim and objectives and research questions.

The study investigated the socio-economic outcomes of the Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme in Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe. The FTLRP refers to a speed-up delivery of land to the people that aims to buttress the principle of the sovereignty of the people of Zimbabwe (Ministry of Land and Agriculture, 1999). Moyo (2004) argues that in the Zimbabwean context, the concept of land reform has focused on the legal acquisition of rural freehold land for its redistribution to black farmers based in communal areas. Between 1980 and 1992, this was done through market-based purchases on a willing-seller/willing-buyer basis (Moyo & Yeros, 2005). More recently, land acquisition has been broadened to include “designated lands”, purchased through administrative price-setting, irrespective of the willingness of sellers (Moyo, 2004).

The significance of land availability for peasant households in the absence of alternative infrastructure and services provision in communal areas has been identified by Moyo (2004) as entailing the following:

- Land as a storehouse of nature for the reproduction of future generations;
- Land as an agricultural production tool for subsistence food and exchange incomes to meet broader subsistence needs and for re-investment;
- Land as a receptacle of direct household utility needs, for example, water, wood fuel, organic fertiliser, medicine, shade, fruit, housing and home, game meat, and others;
- Land as a potential investment in water development for irrigation, tourist development, woodlands enterprises, trading specific natural resources as commodities;
- Land as a social-political territory of governance and community reproduction, and
- Land as security or collateral in financial transactions.

Moyo (2004) states that land reform in Zimbabwe officially began in 1980 after the signing of the Lancaster House Agreement, an effort to more equitably distribute land between the historically disenfranchised blacks and the minority-whites, who ruled Zimbabwe from 1890 to 1979. He asserts that the government's land distribution is perhaps the most crucial and the most bitterly contested political issue surrounding Zimbabwe today. He argues that land distribution in Zimbabwe can be divided into two periods: from 1979 to 2000 the principle of willing buyer, willing seller was applied with economic help from Great Britain and secondly, starting from 2000, the FTLRP was adopted. The willing buyer, willing seller principle was by choice for anyone to decide whether to sell or not sell land. The present study focuses on the second phase, which started in 2000 to the present.

## 1.2 Background to the Study

Zimbabwe's land problems started with the advent of the Pioneer White Column. The Pioneer Column was a group of white settlers. When the Pioneer Column of the white settlers arrived in Mashonaland in 1890, their main hope was to find gold (Meredith, 2005). Each settler was awarded fifteen mining claims, the number of claims rose from 7,000 in 1891 to 160,000 in 1898 (Meredith, 2005). But the gold rush soon proved disappointing and the small white community subsequently turned to the next available treasure, which was land (Vambe, 2000).

Varier (2000) argues that a host of fortune-hunters-quasi-aristocrats, military men, and speculators followed in their wake, thus grabbing land at every opportunity. He further states that the company's administrator, Leander Starr Jameson, encouraged them to take whatever land they wanted. Major Sir John Willoughby, who had been seconded from the Royal Horse Guards to act as Chief Staff Officer to the Pioneer Column, was granted 600,000 acres in Mashonaland and bought up a large number of other land rights from pioneers who went off in search of gold. His company, Willoughby's Consolidated Company, eventually accumulated 1.3 million acres. Rhodes' surveyor-general, upon taking up his post, was "awarded" 640,000 acres.

Missionaries were active too, acquiring almost a third of a million acres, with Catholics taking half of that. The bulk of the land was taken up by speculative companies (Vambe, 2000). Within ten years of the arrival of the Pioneer Column, nearly 16 million acres - one-sixth of the entire land area of 96 million acres, had been seized by whites (Vambe, 2000).

Meredith (2005) observes that the land they took was mainly in the highveld of Mashonaland and Matabeleland, and included much of the most fertile land in the country. He states that the uprising of 1896 brought the entire enterprise to a halt. He indicates that, first, the Ndebele people and then later, Shona speakers rose against the

white rule in one of the most violent, sustained, and highly organized episodes of resistance of the colonial era in Africa.

On this, Stoneman (2003) comments that the British government later on acknowledged defeat and Rhodesia was established by right of conquest. Memories of the 1896–1897 revolt or Chimurenga, as it was called by the Shona people, lingered long enough for African nationalists to draw inspiration from it sixty years later (Stoneman, 2003). Meredith (2005) states that six years later the Shona people started organising themselves to get their land back through demonstrations.

Lionel and Stoneman (2003) state that in the wake of the revolt, white officials recognised that there was an urgent need to assign land for African use before any more land was taken by the white settlers. Subsequently, native reserves were set aside for “traditional” communal occupation. The intention was to use them as a temporary measure, but they soon became an established part of the pattern of land ownership. In Mashonaland, the reserves in 1910 totalled about 17 million acres, amounting to 37 percent of the total area of the province. About two-thirds of the Shona population found themselves living there (Lionel & Stoneman, 2003).

Stoneman (2003) states that in Matabeleland, no more than 7.7 million acres were set aside; a mere sixteen per cent of the total area of the province and, of this, 5.3 million acres comprised three waterless and largely uninhabited areas. Furthermore, in the Bulawayo district which was once the heart of the Ndebele homeland, no reserves could be assigned because all the land had been taken by white settlers. Only one-third of the Ndebele population lived within the area established for the reserves (Stoneman, 2003).

Martin and Phyllis (2002) claim that as the population grew, the reserves became overcrowded. They postulate that the division of land between Whites and Blacks was formalised in 1931 with the introduction of the Land Apportionment Act, Act No. 3 of 1931. Palmer (2001) states that the white areas of Rhodesia were extended from 31 million to 48 million acres, although at the time some 7 million acres of the white land, most of it within thirty–five miles of the line of railway, lay unoccupied and wholly undeveloped.

He continues to state that for the next forty years, white farmers never used more than 36 million acres of the land assigned to them. Palmer further argues that the white farming areas included most of the best highveld land in the country, spreading north and south of the main road and railway between Bulawayo and Harare and between Harare and Mutare in the east, as well as swathes of ranching land in the semi-arid south and west.

The Land Apportionment Act, Act No. 3 of 1931 stipulated that no African was entitled to hold or occupy land in the white areas (Meredith, 2005). Thus, half of the land area became the preserve of the white farmers. Numbering no more than 2,500 in 1931, this elite group was given every encouragement and incentive by the government to develop and prosper (Meredith, 2005).

Varier (2000) comments that the land area assigned for native reserves was reduced from 25 million acres in 1910 to 21,6 million acres, even though there were already signs of land degradation setting in. He notes further that some 7, 5 million acres were set aside as Native Purchase Areas for the use of master-farmers with the intention to create a group of prosperous middle-class farmers who would act as a bulwark against radical elements.

The consequence of the Land Apportionment Act, Act No. 3 of 1931, which remained in force for nearly forty years was that the black population, which numbered one million in 1931, was allocated 29 million acres, whereas the white population, numbering 40,000, of whom only 11,000 were settled on the land, were awarded 48 million acres. An area of 18 million acres of the state land, which included forests and national parks, was left unassigned (Sithole, 1999).

Mukiwa (1996) asserts that in the baby-boom years that followed the end of the Second World War, white farmers benefited increasingly from technological advances made with improved machinery, new crop strains, and the use of fertilisers, herbicides, and pesticides. He says that by switching to Virginia tobacco production, they found a reliable and highly profitable cash crop that had eluded them for forty years. An influx of immigrants raised the number of White farmers from 4,700 in 1945 to 8,600 in 1960. With more land needed for production, thousands of Africans were evicted from white farm areas and were forced into reserves that were already overcrowded (Mukiwa, 1996).

Meredith (2005) argues that African grievances over land eventually swelled into nationalist protest. Facing rural unrest, the government of the day suggested that it might be necessary to remove the Land Apportionment Act, Act No, 3 of 1931 to help defuse the nationalist tide, but white farmers rejected that proposal. In the 1962 election, when Ian Smith's Rhodes Front promised to keep the Land Apportionment Act intact, they voted for the Front, thus helping to propel it to victory (Meredith, 2005).

Martin and Phyllis (2002) point out that in 1969; Smith introduced the Land Tenure Act, Act No. 6 of 1969 intending to entrench the division of land "for all time." Smith went on to arrange that in what he purported to be an equitable solution, the White area henceforth comprised 45 million acres, the African area also comprised 45 million acres, and the remaining 6 million acres included national parks and game reserves.

Sithole (1999) notes that during the colonial period, thousands of Africans continued to be evicted from the white farming areas. However, most evictions passed unnoticed. But one defiant stand taken by Chief Rekayi Tangwena in the eastern highlands in 1969 caught international attention (Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, Legal Resources Foundation, 1997). Chief Rekayi Tangwena famously led the people to protest against land evictions because he felt that the land belonged to the African people (Sithole, 1999). The guerrilla war of the 1970s which was called *Chimurenga* in Shona was fought principally to overthrow the white rule and gain power. The idea of winning back “lost lands” provided much of the rhetoric and motivation behind it (Sithole, 1999).

Moyo (2004) mentions that after an apparent lull in the public domain on the land reform during the late 1980s, there was renewed interest in Zimbabwe’s land reform starting from 1990. The Land Acquisition Act, Act No. 20 of 1992 and the inception of a Tenant Farmer Scheme, which began to allocate acquired land to the black farmers, provoked acrimonious policy debate on the land reform at various levels (Moyo, 2004).

Moyo (2004) argues that at independence, equitable land redistribution emerged as one of the major challenges which the new majority government made a strong commitment to resolve. He added that addressing this imbalance was complex in that large scale commercial agriculture, from where the land was to be acquired, formed the backbone of the country’s colonial economy. He further argues that the problem, according to the majority of the populace, is not only to get the land for resettlement, but also the methodology of acquisition of the land and resettling the beneficiaries without significantly weakening the economy. This dilemma partly explains why it has taken the government more than twenty years to resolve the land issue.

According to Vambe (2000) many legal writers and commentators agree that the land reform in Zimbabwe during the first decade of independence was manifestly difficult. He argues that this was necessitated by prohibitive provisions entrenched in the Lancaster House Constitution. The scenario was generally referred to as “Willing – buyer willing seller”, meaning that compulsory acquisition had no recognition (Buckle, 2000). Land reform was only to be initiated on the willing buyer willing seller basis principle. Subsequently, the progress was very insignificant since the issue was still debatable some twenty-two years after independence (Martin and Phyllis, 2002). The constitutional constraints impeded so much the process of land reform while the government seemed content with the prevailing phenomenon (Stoneman, 2003).

Moyo (2004) argues that notwithstanding any attempts by the government to redistribute land, the land reform between 1980 and 1990, solely initiated by the government can best be described as unsuccessful. For instance, of the target of 162 000 families, only 55 000 were resettled. He mentions that the reasons are numerous, among which excessive compensation, lack of adequate funds and misappropriation of the little funding from Britain available. Buckle (2002) notes that generally taking positivist theory of law, it can be safely said that land reform between 1980 and 1990 was legal. He argues that the invasions by zealous peasants in the early 1980s cannot be totally discarded.

### **1.2.1 The Fast-Track Land “Reform Process”**

It is a speed-up delivery of land to the people that aims to buttress the principle of the sovereignty of the people of Zimbabwe (Ministry of Land and Agriculture, 1999). Moyo (2004), pinpoints that the FTLRP carried out in Zimbabwe, between 2000 and 2002 is considered to be a radical effort at pro-poor distribution of land. Arguably, the programme is said to have addressed, to some extent, the country’s “worrisome legacy of historic injustice, social, racial inequities and broadened the base of economic participation” (Ibid).

Meredith (2005) mentions that the fast-track land “reform process” was formally introduced by the Zimbabwean government in July 2000, announcing that it would acquire more than 3,000 farms for redistribution. He adds that this followed largely state induced and assisted “invasion” of farms owned by commercial farmers led by war veterans, especially the Chairman-Chenjerei Hunzvi (now deceased). This was in the aftermath of the Government’s defeat in the February 2000 Constitutional Referendum (ibid).

Martin and Phyllis (2002) debate that in the same line of thought, it can be concluded that, the “fast track land reform process”, is an illegal process and violation of property rights. In the period covering June 2000 to February 2001, a total of 2,706 farms were gazetted for compulsory acquisition (Meredith, 2004). Commercial farmers in Zimbabwe stated that more than 1,600 commercial farms were occupied by war veterans and government supporters in the course of 2000 (Stoneman, 2003).

Buckle (2002) states that the government increased the land to be acquired from the 5 million hectares stated, to not less than 8.3 million hectares from the large-scale commercial farming sector, in April 2001. He mentions that in October 2001, it announced its intention to hold 4,558 farms (8, 8 million hectares) for acquisition.

Ghatak and Roy (2007) notes that at the end of 2001, about 250 of CFU's total membership of 3,500 was displaced from their properties. The Ministry of Lands announced that 114,830 households had settled and occupied 4, 37 million hectares. In January 2002, up to 6,481 farms were cited for acquisition with 918 being removed from the list as they were counted twice and 689 after mitigation and negotiation (ibid).

To get the land, applications had to be made to the Ministry of Lands at local level, through filling application forms which in theory were obtainable from official structures, a district administrator, a rural district councillor, or civil servants, or in practice from the commander of the war veteran's militia and ZANU (PF) party functionaries, evading the occupation of the relevant farm (Commercial Famers' Union, 2003). In some instances, land occupiers would simply pick a card from a hat, in a process conducted by war veterans and party officials of the ruling party (ibid).

According to Mabugu and Chigiya (2008), the official criteria used or considered to redistribute land is that, the land must be directly underutilized, owned by a multiple farm owned by an absentee landlord, or contiguous to communal areas. They go on to point out that the process of the FTLRP was such that farms were haphazardly occupied with a lot of political victimisation of white farm owners.

### **1.3 Statement of the Problem**

The problem investigated in this study relates to the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP. There are conflicting ideas concerning the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP. For example, according to Mukamuri (2000) the FTLRP was very significant because land is important for the social reproduction of households in Zimbabwe's communal areas. Matondi and Moyo (2003) also argue that the land occupation in Zimbabwe has achieved the first major reform. On the other hand, Ghimire (2001) claims that the outcomes of the FTLRP have been disastrous for the economy of Zimbabwe.

The Commercial Farmers Union (CFU) (2003) also asserts that the FTLRP has led to a sharp decrease in total farm output. A lot has been said and so many organisations, institutions and people have emerged to respond to the FTLRP. For example, Mukamuri (2000) argues that land is important for the social reproduction of households in Zimbabwe's communal areas.

According to the World Bank and Independent Observers (2006), the overall economy of Zimbabwe has been shrinking since the implementation of the FTLRP. The study focuses on the voices of the newly resettled farmers because their voices have not been heard. However, the Zimbabwean government, international organisations, non-governmental organisations and scholars, have all given their points of view. For example Buckle (2002) argues that the FTLRP resulted in the massive displacement of workers who were traditionally drawn from migrant labour. Oxfam International (2005) asserts that in Masvingo Province, like any other province in Zimbabwe, there are problems of former farm workers who remain on the farms though unemployed by the new settlers.

Over the past decade, Zimbabwe's socio-economic conditions have become increasingly unbearable to many of its citizens. The cost of living has become too high, the unemployment rate has increased, raw materials have become scarce, and there is high food insecurity and the country has lost its political and economic stability. Some people and organisations believe to be the outcomes of the FTLRP (Ghimire, 2001). For example, Stoneman (2003) pinpointed that there are strong 'rationalist' arguments that the revolution is 'chaotic' and 'unsustainable' and that far from being a development project to promote poverty alleviation; the FTLRP is just essentially a political gimmick that is destroying the national economy. The Department of International Development (2003) asserts that the industry is collapsing because the agricultural sector can no longer produce adequate raw materials.

The present study investigates socio-economic outcomes in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme, located in the east of Masvingo town. The Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme is a rural area and little of this place is known through research. The researcher addressed socio-economic issues directly related to the FTLRP.

It cannot be established yet whether the FTLRP has reduced or accelerated socio-economic development in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme, hence the present study seeks to investigate the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP in the area. Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. For example, most international organisations argue that the FTLRP destroyed the backbone of the Zimbabwean economy, but the Zimbabwean government thinks that the FTLRP is a sign of revolution because it has accelerated the indigenisation of the Zimbabwean economy.

#### **1.4 Motivation for the study**

The study was motivated by the desire to gain insight into the state of the socio-economic conditions in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme after the FTLRP. The outcomes of the FTLRP led different people and organisations to have conflicting claims about the socio-economic effects of the FTLRP. For instance Moyo and Yeros (2003) argue that the land occupation in Zimbabwe has achieved the first major reform but on the other side Jacobs (2005) argues that the land reform (FTLRP) was not a resounding success because of the way the process was managed. This study is an exploration of the dynamics of socio-economic changes in the area.

#### **1.5 Significance of the study**

The study is useful to development agencies and other stakeholders involved in development because it scrutinizes the outcomes of the FTLRP. The study will assist government, development agencies and other stakeholders to plan and manage the FTLRP. For example, development agencies and other stakeholders will be able to estimate the financial budget and other resources required for sustainable development

in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. The study provided an insight into alternative land reform methods in the face of the realities of the socio-economic problems taking place in Zimbabwe. This will increase the government of Zimbabwe's ability to amend land reform policies.

The research is very significant to the body of knowledge because it provides new dimensions of perceiving the FTLRP and increases knowledge. It increases knowledge concerning the economic, social reproduction and livelihoods effects of the FTLRP in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme.

## **1.6 Aim**

The study describes the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme.

### **1.6.1 Objectives**

The following objectives were pursued:

**Objective 1:** To analyse the FTLRP's economic effects

With the above objective in mind, the researcher focussed on finding out the economic outcomes of the FTLRP to its beneficiaries in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. According to the Collins English Dictionary (2009) economic refers to production, consumption and transfer of wealth. The researcher assessed the FTLRP in order to find out whether the FTLRP's outcomes were economically positive or negative to its beneficiaries in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. The researcher paid attention to a number of economic indicators such as agricultural production, employment creation and others to be able to determine the economic outcomes of the FTLRP to its beneficiaries in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme.

**Objective 2:** To describe the results produced by the FTLRP in relation to social reproduction

To achieve this objective the researcher attended to the social reproduction outcomes of the FTLRP to the beneficiaries of Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. Social reproduction can be defined as the capability of a programme to provide sustainability, re-generation of the society and humanity, and community survival on cultural basis (Moyo, 2004).

This objective was important to achieve because it provides answers to the question: What kind (positive or negative) of social reproduction outcomes did the FTLRP produced? The researcher focused on whether the FTLRP managed to influence sustainability, re-generation of society and humanity, and community survival on cultural basis positively or negatively from a social point of view. For example, the researcher attended to whether the FTLRP has provided a fertile ground for the restoration and sustainability of the African cultural practices.

**Objective 3:** To analyse how the FTLRP has affected livelihoods

The importance of this objective is for the researcher to be able to analyse the outcomes of the FTLRP on the livelihoods of its beneficiaries, whether positive or negative. A livelihood refers to means of earning or obtaining the necessities of life (Collins English Dictionary, 2009). The objective informs the researcher whether the FTLRP has provided its beneficiaries with means of surviving for example, whether the land which was allocated to the beneficiaries is important to them (beneficiaries) in terms of production. For instance, are they (beneficiaries) able to produce for their families and for commercial purposes?

## **1.7 Research Questions**

The following questions were formulated to guide the study:

### **1.7.1 Main Research Question**

How did the FTLRP affect the socio-economic development in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement scheme?

### **1.7.2 Subsidiary Questions**

The study pursued the following subsidiary questions:

- What are the economic effects of the FTLRP?
- What are the effects of the FTLRP on social reproduction?
- How did the FTLRP affect rural livelihoods?

## **1.8 Operational Definitions**

### **Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP)**

It is a speed-up delivery of land to the people that aims to buttress the principle of the sovereignty of the people of Zimbabwe (Ministry of Land and Agriculture, 1999). Moyo (2004), pinpoints that the FTLRP carried out in Zimbabwe, between 2000 and 2002 is considered to be a radical effort at pro-poor distribution of land. Arguably, the programme is said to have addressed, to some extent, the country's "worrisome legacy of historic injustice, social, racial inequities and broadened the base of economic participation" (Ibid).

## **Land Reform**

According to Moyo (2004), land reform simply means restitution of land to Africans without precondition. He says that land reform is a change in the legal or customary institution of property rights and duties, which define those who own or use agricultural land.

Land reform can also be explained as any programme, especially when undertaken by a national government, involving the redistribution of agricultural land among the landless (Zimbabwean Government, 2005). In the context of this study the FTLRP allocated land to landless black people.

## **Socio-Economic**

Socio-economics also known as social economics is the social science that studies how economic activity affects social processes (Fulcher & Scott, 2007). In general it analyses how societies progress, stagnate or regress because of their local or regional economy or the global economy (Ibid). The FTLRP is the economic activity under investigation to find out whether it has led the Kippure-Iram society to progress or regress

According to Bouding (2000), socio-economics may refer broadly to the use of economics in the study of society hence the Collins English Dictionary (2009) defines socio-economic as the combination or interaction of social and economic factors.

## **Social Reproduction**

In the context of the FTLRP, social reproduction can be defined as the capability of a programme to provide sustainability, re-generation of the society and humanity, and community survival on cultural basis (Moyo, 2004).

On the other hand according to Doob (2013), social reproduction refers to the emphasis on the structures and activities that transmit social inequality from one generation to the next. In this case the FTLRP can be regarded as a structure and activity which affects inequality from one generation to another as it was implemented to resolve inequality of land ownership. There are four types of capital that contributes to social reproduction in society (Ibid). They are financial, cultural, human and social capital (Ibid)

.

## **Livelihoods**

According to Blaikie (2004), a person's livelihood refers to their "means of securing the basic necessities -food, water, shelter and clothing- of life". Livelihood is defined as a set of activities, involving securing water, food, fodder, medicine, shelter, clothing and the capacity to acquire above necessities working either individually or as a group by using endowments (both human and material) for meeting the requirements of the self and his/her household on a sustainable basis with dignity (Ibid). For instance, a farmer's livelihood depends on the availability and accessibility of land.

A livelihood is often conceptualized as "incomes in cash and in kind: as well as the social institutions (kin, family, compound, village) gender relations, property rights required to support and sustain a given standard of living" (Ellis, 1998). In this case land has provided the beneficiaries of the FTLRP with incomes to support and sustain a standard of living.

## **Economic**

Aspects concerning producing, distributing and consuming goods and services, including the combinations of various institutions, agencies, consumers and entities that comprise the economic structure of a given society or community (Bantjes, 2006)

The Collins English Dictionary (2009) defines economic as the branch of knowledge concerned with the production, consumption and transfer of wealth.

## **Redistribution**

Moving close to equality in sharing socio-economic resources and services (Moyo, 2004). In this study, it refers to equal sharing of land which is the reason why land was being distributed to black people because they were previously dispossessed of their land, so the FTLRP was meant to restore equality concerning land ownership.

Redistribution can also be defined as measures, such as the division of large land portions into smaller ones that are taken to bring about a more equitable apportionment of agricultural land (Jacobs, 2005). In this study large commercial farms owned by one owner were seized and redistributed or allocated to multiple owners as they were divided into small portions of 45 hectares each plot.

## **Restitution**

Giving back what rightfully belongs to someone or to a community (Moyo, 2004). For example in this case, giving back land to the Africans or compensate for the loss sustained. The land originally belonged to black people but their forefathers were dispossessed of it during the colonial era.

The purpose of restitution programme is to provide equitable redress to victims of racially motivated land dispossession (Collins, 2000). It is an act of restoring or condition of being restored (Ibid).

## **Outcomes**

Outcomes can be referred to as impacts, effects and results (Fulcher & Scott 2007). For the purpose of this study, it is conceived as both progressive and retrogressive changes in the living conditions of the African people which came as a result of the FTLRP.

An outcome can be something that follows from an action, dispute, and situation (Varier, 2000). It is a final product, result, effect and a consequence (Ibid). This study sought to realise the effect, result and consequence of the FTLRP to its beneficiaries.

## **Subsistence Farming**

Growth of crops and rearing of animals predominantly for consumption by family rather than for the wider economy (Moyo, 2004). This means that subsistence farming is not for commercial purposes hence production is at a small scale because it is only meant for the family and not at a large scale.

Subsistence farming can also be defined as a form of farming in which nearly all of the crops or livestock raised are used to maintain the farmer and the farmer's family, living little, if any, surplus for sale or trade (Kerdachi, 2006). Preindustrial agricultural peoples throughout the world have traditionally practiced subsistence farming (Ibid).

## **Commercial Agriculture**

It is farming which is performed on a large scale, with the help of machines like threshers, harvesters and tractors (Palmer, 2003). Extensive commercial farming started with the advent of green revolution (Ibid). Commercial farming involves farming for profit. The farmer will be growing crops or rearing animals to sell for as much money as possible (Kerdachi, 2006). The farms can be arable which is just for growing crops, pastoral which is just for rearing animals or mixed which is both arable and pastoral. According to Moyo (2004) commercial agriculture is production of animals and crops for sale to the wider local and global consumers.

## CHAPTER TWO

### LITERATURE REVIEW ON THE OUTCOMES OF LAND REFORM

#### 2.1 Introduction

Land ownership, control and reform have been some of the most contentious issues in contemporary Zimbabwe. Moyo (2004) asserts that the land question has generated a lot of emotional debate and there is a general consensus that it represents dimension to the crisis the country is going through. He argues that various reasons can be advanced to explain why the land reform in Zimbabwe was not a resounding success in reducing poverty and ushering in sustainable development.

Most of the literature on land reform lacks the views of the people on the ground who are directly affected by land reform (Muchena, 2003). Instead, most of the literature is formulated from ideas emanating from government, international organisations, scholars and NGOs (Muchena, 2003). This led the present researcher to investigate the views of the voiceless beneficiaries of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. The purpose of this chapter is to identify and explain literature on land reform, establish a theoretical framework for the FTLRP, and define key terms, and terminology.

According to Palmer 2003, redistributive land reform is a recurring theme of contemporary development discourse in Southern Africa. In Namibia, South Africa, and (until recently) Zimbabwe highly unequal land distribution exists alongside growing poverty and land shortage (Palmer, 2003). Unjust land distribution is a legacy of colonial “settler” policies that saw large-scale alienation of land and other natural resources from indigenous groups (Palmer, 2003). At independence, these states inherited distorted rural space economies in which a minority of white settler commercial farmers had, among other economic privileges, access to land of better agro-ecological

potential while the majority (mainly black) smallholders had to do with agriculturally marginal land (Ibid).

The focus of land reforms has therefore been on redistributing land from mainly white commercial farmers to black “smallholders” (Ellis & Biggs, 2001). Smallholders refer to small scale farmers. Redistribution has been justified, not only by considerations of social justice, but also by noting the inverse relationship between farm size and productivity (Ibid). If smallholders are potentially more efficient producers then giving them more land can achieve both equity and efficiency goals (Deininger & May, 2000).

## **2.2 The FTLRP Process**

There are several arguments that arise in relation to the impact of the FTLRP and socio-economic development. The first relates to the conditions under which land redistribution took place (Zimbabwe Government, 2003). In contrast to the pre-fast track land reform, land allocation took place with little or no planning and the provision of support infrastructure has been minimal (Zimbabwe Government, 2005). The potential to use land to generate income to improve socio-economic conditions by the new beneficiaries has, therefore, been constrained from the beginning.

## **2.3 Brief Land Reform Experiences in other Countries**

The empirical evidence on the benefits of redistributive land reform is mixed. Researchers, such as Birdsall and Londono (2002) as well as Deininger and Squire (2003), argue that redistributive land reform can improve growth. Chatak and Roy (2007) on the other hand found an overall negative impact of land reform on agricultural productivity in their study in India, although some state-specific effects suggest heterogeneity in the impact of land reform across states. They mentioned that land reform in South Korea is found to have increased agricultural production by enhancing economic incentives.

### **2.3.1 Land Reform in South Africa**

Lionel and Stoneman (2003) observe that the newly-elected South African government began in 1994 to make laws and implement a programme for land reform. They argued that the South African land reform consisted of three dimensions: redistribution (transferring white-owned commercial farm land to African users); restitution (settling claims for land lost under apartheid measures by restoration of holdings or compensation); and land tenure reform (to provide more secure access to land in the former bantustans). Only a few restitution claims have been so far resolved (Department for International Development in South Africa, 2003).

The South African way of implementing land reform is different from the Zimbabwean FTLRP because the FTLRP managed to speed up redistribution of land and the South African scheme is very slow. Within a short period the FTLRP has managed to distribute land to a large number of indigenous people and the South African land reform has not reached its target after so many years (Moyo, 2003). They are also different because various scholars such as Makumbe (2003) have deemed the FTLRP to be disastrous to the Zimbabwean economy.

### **2.3.2 Land Reform in Namibia**

Land reform is an important political and economic topic in Namibia. According to Khan (2004) land reform in Namibia consists of two different strategies: resettlement, and transfer of commercially viable agricultural land. He adds that resettlement is aimed at improving the lives of displaced or dispossessed and previously disadvantaged Namibians. Farms obtained by government for resettlement purposes are usually split into several sections, and dozens of families are being resettled on what had previously been one farm (Elich, 1998).

Elich (1998) also argued that transfer of commercial agricultural land in Namibia is not directly conducted by government. He asserts that those who would-be farmers with a previously disadvantaged background obtain farms privately or through affirmative action. In both cases, the "Willing buyer, willing seller" principle applies (Khan, 2004). The "Willing buyer, willing seller" principle is a process for acquiring land for redistribution by states only if those in possession of land are willing to sell their land to the state.

The Namibian land reform shares similarities with the FTLRP in the sense that both programmes intended to have equitable redistribution of land so that the previously disadvantaged can also have access to land. Both programmes are also common to each other because they all intend to alleviate poverty. However, the implementation of the Namibian land reform and the FTLRP are different in the sense that the FTLRP is an accelerated land redistribution of land which managed to deliver land to more than 1 000 people within a period of two years only (Moyo, 2003). On the other hand, the Namibian land reform is a slow process because it is based on the "willing buyer, willing seller" principle, which has been unsuccessful because only a few people managed to acquire land through that process.

#### **2.4 The FTLRP's Influence on Media and Promotion of Propaganda**

Khan (2004) states that after the Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme there has been an emergence of a new patriotic historiography. He maintains that the ruling party intellectuals are in control of virtually all the media including television, radio and newspapers. As such, they have control over the major news sources active in producing new historical interpretations, thus privileging some voice whilst silencing others. In sum, this reduces the struggle for liberation to the land issue while ignoring many of its other dimensions.

## **2.5 The Effects of Land Reform on Cattle Farming: Market to Sell Them, Exportation, Diseases and Supply in Masvingo Province.**

Bouiding (2000) argues that while the entire formal economy is in danger and the inflation is rising, the rural economy in the province of Masvingo has collapsed. He asserts that the radical change in the agriculture structure has altered chains, and the value chain of beef is a good example. In the past there was a strong dependence on a few suppliers whereas today, in providing a wide range of sources of cattle, many new players are involved (Bouiding, 2000). He concludes by saying that the involvement of many new players has led to a number of problems, for example, foot-and-mouth disease, livestock theft and the collapse of the export market.

The collapse of the export market due to the foot-and-mouth disease led to the focus on local sales and market connections (Marongwe, 2003). As such, there have been significant supply problems as new farmers build their herds and avoid selling which led to meat no longer being sold in town supermarkets but rather through small butcheries and slaughter pole branches in rural areas and communities (Marongwe, 2003).

Most of the newly resettled farmers lack capacity to stock many numbers of cattle because they do not have adequate financial resources. As much as this can be considered to be a valid point from the point of view of different scholars there is still need to balance views from both sides and find out what the beneficiaries of the FTLRP say concerning the same issue (effects of land reform on cattle farming).

## **2.6 Land Reform and Peasant Livelihoods**

According to Ghimire (2001) there is a wide consensus about the need for reforming land tenure systems and relations in order to reduce rural poverty and hunger in developing countries. He postulates that this is agreed upon by national and international bodies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the academic community, and scores of other actors. Lastly, he argues that however they differ in

their approaches to land reform: some may propose radical land reform measures involving a sweeping appropriation of large holdings and their redistribution to the landless; whereas others want to see restitution of land rights previously taken by powerful groups. The FTLRP adopted a radical approach because of the failure of the “willing buyer, willing seller” approach. It (FTLRP) was implemented without consensus with international bodies, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the academic community and scores of other actors.

Makumbe (2002) claims that the justifications for promoting land reform are many and some are compelling. In many developing countries, the vast majority of the population consists of near-landless, the landless and rural workers. It is observed that in the mid-1980s there were as many as 817 million smallholder and landless rural labourers in Asia, Africa and Latin America (FAO, 2003). According to another source, during the same period, there were 180 million landless people in India, 24 million in Pakistan, 12 million in the Philippines, 8 million in Brazil, and over 24 million in only 64 developing countries (Jazairy, 2004). The above points shows that there is strong need for equal land redistribution. Though there is a strong need to implement land reform, the way it is executed should not harm the means of production.

## **2.7 The FTLRP and Employment Creation in Zimbabwe**

Oxfam International (2005) asserts that in Masvingo Province, like any other province in Zimbabwe, there are problems of former farm workers who remain on the farms though unemployed by the new settlers. The organisation states that there are problems arising from the land occupiers, most of whom are described as having settled on the farms at the onset of the year 2000. This shows how the FTLRP has led to high unemployment. This is what authorities say, but the voice of the common people has not been heard, hence this study.

The overall situation in the province is illustrated in the table below:

**Table 1: Unemployment caused by the FTLRP**

<b>District</b>	<b>No of farmers to ex-farm workers</b>	<b>Total no. of ex-farm workers</b>	<b>No. of farms with land occupiers</b>	<b>Total no. of land occupiers</b>
<b>Chiredzi</b>	5	31	16	121
<b>Gutu</b>	0	0	1	10
<b>Masvingo</b>	0	0	4	90
<b>Mwenezi</b>	4	26	15	214
<b>Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>435</b>

Source: Oxfam International, 2005.

It is understood that in the Masvingo district alone, six farms owned by the indigenous farmers were negatively affected by the land occupiers (Oxfam International, 2002). Sundowns Farm had the least number of occupiers with 25 of them, the whole Magwenzi River Ranch had the highest with 125 families (Oxfam International, 2002). The uncertainty of such settlements and its implications on the livelihoods of the land occupiers can only be speculated upon.

Buckle (2002) asserts that there were about 300 000 labourers and half of the total number worked on a part-time basis. He argues that the FTLRP resulted in the massive displacement of these workers who were traditionally drawn from migrant labour. He also indicates that nearly a fifth came from the neighbouring countries and was regarded with suspicion by peasants in the communal areas. Even in the case of those who had been born locally, they were often seen as foreigners and were denied citizenship rights. Migrants and women were the weakest links in the rural mobilisation of the land reform.

Lionel and Stoneman (2003) point out that some of the 150 000 full-time farm workers threw in their lot with the occupiers, though usually not on the farms where they had been working. They also state that about 90 000 kept their jobs on sugar and tea estates and on new and established tobacco and horticulture farms. Eight thousand were granted land but most were denied it on the grounds that they or their elders had come from foreign countries though some were given citizenship. In conclusion, they claim that many went from steady employment to contract or casual work; many others were forced to supplement their meagre incomes through fishing, petty trading, theft and prostitution.

## **2.8 The FTLRP and Specialized Land Uses in Masvingo Province**

Muchena (2003) mentions that Masvingo Province is traditionally home to specialised land uses that include sugar-cane, citrus, and wildlife. According to him many of the farms involved in this category were also acquired and settled upon under the FTLRP. He argues that some of these farms are facing viability problems, a typical example being that of sugar-cane farmers. He indicated that, apparently, reports have been made that some beneficiaries have introduced livestock on the sugar-cane plots, a move that has created serious conflicts among the farmers themselves. The situation shows how the newly resettled farmers lack good farming knowledge.

Kanyeze (2003) claims that the high costs of producing sugar-cane have been reportedly hampering production on the A2 farms. A2 farms are co-operative farms which were implemented by the Zimbabwean government in various provinces of the country. She says that the costs of farming inputs (fertilisers and chemicals) and transportation of the harvested cane to the mill were highly prohibitive to the new farmers. She also states that the problem is that many of the new A2 farmers were not receiving financial assistance from the banks. As a result, their farming operations remain constrained. These arguments are not all inclusive because the beneficiaries were not consulted.

## **2.9 The FTLRP's Impact on Food Security in Zimbabwe**

Matowanyika and Marongwe (2004) assert that Zimbabwe was once a food surplus country, but today it is deficient in both foreign exchange and food. They mention that in the years 2002 and 2003, half the population depended on food aid. The situation was worsened by the fact that it was a drought period. In following up the food crisis in Zimbabwe, they argue that the situation of the ex-farm workers was pathetic, principally because they had lost their incomes through the FTLRP. The Department of International Development (2003) reported that there was widespread hunger and malnutrition. The Zimbabwean government thought that it was fighting inequality not knowing that it was, as a matter of fact, fighting the means of production.

According to Mukamuri (2000) land is a very crucial factor in the eradication of insecurity and rural poverty. He asserts that developing countries cannot achieve the objective of poverty alleviation unless they undertake progressive land reforms and achieve growth with equity. He argues that there are two approaches for sustainable and equitable growth, that is, land reform and export led growth.

Moyo (2004) points out that the FTLRP was a great programme for a third world country such as Zimbabwe to embark on. However, the scheme was planned too quickly without consideration for the huge amount of development support that would be required. The parcelling out of land to people who did not have access to it means that there is a huge potential being opened up by the programme, so the FTLRP has great potential for a third world country like Zimbabwe, but the poor farm workers became poorer than before. These arguments lack contribution from the beneficiaries of the FTLRP.

## **2.10 The Socio-Economic Impacts of the FTLRP**

Bouiding (2000) makes a strong case that the hope for economic growth and poverty reduction in the rural context of sub-Saharan Africa remains rooted in the land. He argues that almost three decades of the land reform in Zimbabwe have not produced clear results on land reform and poverty alleviation. He also states that this raises fundamental questions on policy and research: What is going wrong and what needs to be changed? What is the vision of the land reform and, are the existing mechanisms the correct ones in terms of poverty alleviation? For the land reform to be successful the Zimbabwean government should have the capacity to be able to subsidise the newly resettled farmers so that they are able to produce large quantities.

Richardson (2004) argues that increasing access to land through land reform programmes is confronted with the economist view that the eradication of poverty can come only from development, not from redistribution. Furthermore, economists argue that redistribution wastes resources instead of making everyone richer. He further notes that among the range of policies being discussed to alleviate poverty, there is now a growing literature recommending improved access to land for the rural poor.

Moyo (2004) holds the view that the primary motivation of land reform is to alleviate poverty by reducing economic inequality; in other words, improved social justice. He adds that the poor distribution of productive resources in general, and land in particular, has been identified as one of the root causes of social and economic stagnation in many developing countries. Ghimire (2001) asserts that access to land leads to access to shelter, food, poverty, and that it can also increase social welfare.

Lionel and Stoneman (2003) point out that empirical study in a variety of economies have identified a positive association between access to land and income and consumption. They argue that effective control over productive resources, especially land by the rural poor is very important to their autonomy and capacity to construct a rural livelihood and overcome poverty.

In many agrarian societies significant portion of the income of the rural poor still comes from farming and hence access to land is strongly related to the ability to escape poverty (Ghimire, 2001). In addition to land being an economic resource, it also has significant political, cultural and social dimensions (Mararike, 2003). Therefore, lack of access to or loss of land can foster social exclusion and diminution of human capabilities, and result in violence and conflict.

According to Matowanyika and Makarau (2000) some of the A2 farmers were reportedly doing well while others were failing to maintain the production infrastructure. They argue that as has been the case nationwide, FTLRP has resulted in the under-utilization and in some cases vandalising of production infrastructure. For example, much irrigation infrastructure has particularly been affected.

Zimbabwe's historic economy has become a shell of its former self. Tobacco production has plummeted, and maize production has been dramatically reduced (Department of International Development, 2003). This shows that most of the newly resettled farmers are practising subsistence farming instead of commercial farming.

The industry linked to agriculture has almost disappeared and fuel shortages (i.e., diesel, gasoline and kerosene) have become legion while tourism has suffered from what the government described as "negative publicity" (Department of International Development, 2003).

The industry is collapsing because the agricultural sector can no longer produce adequate raw materials. The decline in agricultural production has also led to fuel shortages because agricultural exports have decreased and as a result hence the government no longer has enough foreign currency to import fuel. The violence associated with the FTLRP has led many tourists to think that Zimbabwe is a country where they should stay away from because of its apparent lack of security.

According to the World Bank and Independent Observers (2006), the overall economy of Zimbabwe was shrinking. They claim that the estimates vary and it is difficult to actually provide accurate figures due to high levels of inflation. Even the hyperinflation characterising the current economy of Zimbabwe continues to push the cost of living beyond the reach of most households.

Micro-evidence indicates that the FTLRP was accompanied by a contraction of the economy. In particular, agricultural production plummeted in 2000 (Oxfarm International, 2005). In fact, by 2004, it dropped by 30% (Richardson, 2004). Richardson also argues that given the importance of agricultural output and the viability of the manufacturing sector, the manufacturing sector also experienced a contraction and the whole economy had shrunk by 15% by 2003 (ibid). This is of concern, especially given that prior to the FTLRP; the agricultural sector employed more than 70% of the labour force and accounted for between 9% and 15% of the GDP and between 20% and 33% of export earnings (Chigiya & Mabugu, 2008). There is need to hear the beneficiaries' position concerning this same issue to be able to establish the truth.

## 2.11 The FTLRP and Farming Production

Ghimire (2001) claims that the government's land redistribution programme is perhaps the most crucial and the most bitterly contested political issue surrounding Zimbabwe today. He argues that the results of the post-2000 land reform have been disastrous for the economy of Zimbabwe. Soon after the implementation of the FTLRP the Zimbabwean economy was affected negatively because all elements of the economy are declining. To show the limitation of the FTLRP he argues that prior to the land redistribution, land-owning farmers, mostly white, had large tracks of land and utilised economies of scale to raise capital, borrow money when necessary and purchase modern mechanised farm equipment to increase production on the land. But the newly resettled farmers lacked all those opportunities.

The Commercial Farmers Union (CFU) (2003) argues that the primary beneficiaries of the land reform were members of the government and their families most had no experience in running a farm. This led to a sharp decrease in total farm output. The union elaborated that Zimbabwe was the world's largest producer of tobacco in 1997, but in 2001 it produced the lowest amount in 50 years. What is not in dispute is that a country once so rich in agricultural production that it was even dubbed the "breadbasket" of Southern Africa is now struggling to feed its own population with a staggering 45 per cent of the population considered malnourished (ibid).

The negative macro-impact of the FTLRP on agricultural production could be attributed to a number of factors. The programme has undermined land equality by taking land from private ownership and transferring it to newly resettled farmers who have to lease the land from the government. To be able to reach well balanced findings it is always necessary to consult the people who are directly involved in the FTLRP.

## 2.12 The FTLRP and the Rule of Law

Jacobs (2005) argues that the land reform in Zimbabwe was not a resounding success because of the way the process was managed. She says that the land reform process was not carried out according to the rule of law. She claims that the process of the FTLRP was largely illegal, shrouded in illegal uncertainty, and the conduct of justice sector institutions was open to political manipulation. There is a wide range of data that can be used to support the assertion that the land reform process was neither transparent nor participatory.

Using the socio-economic analysis of the political situation in Zimbabwe, there is a large demonstration that the land reform in Zimbabwe was a failure (Department for International Development, 2002). Although other factors could have affected the outcome of the land reform, its failure can be attributed to the governance of the process. The FTLRP was indeed a failure, because there was no clear plan and strategic management for the programme.

One of the rallying crises of the FTLRP was that since Zimbabwe's economy was agriculturally based, it was necessary that the land be made available to the majority to spur economic growth and that, in turn, would improve the living conditions of most people (Mararike, 2003). This is the reason why people in high government positions blame the FTLRP for the economic problems that followed after the FTLRP.

The new farmers were allocated land and after occupation no title deeds were issued to them (Muchena, 2003). There has been no attempt whatsoever to have their 'rights' registered and publicised in the deeds registries office (Stoneman, 2003). These people cannot prove ownership, their title is highly vulnerable and they are dangerously susceptible to loss of their right (ibid). The beneficiaries of the FTLRP's rights are not published either. Their occupation however, denies the allocated owner user rights transfer rights, exclusion and inclusion right as well as enforcement rights, in respect of

the occupied point of the property and as a consequence, the allocated owner experiences a lack of certainty and security of tenure.

Vambe (2000) mentions that the land occupiers have been issued with temporary occupation licenses which are to be converted in time into leases. He adds that they were told not to build permanent shelters by the government. He states that the newly resettled farmers lack registered real rights, which are a means of proving acquisition of a registered real right in private property. He concludes that the stipulation by the government, barring them construction of permanent structure, makes it reasonable for one to conclude that their rights are not in place in terms of ownership.

Meredith states that in respect of this state of affairs, a glance at the UNDP (United Nations Development Fund) report would provide an informed opinion. He continues to say the UNDP states that multi-dimensional problems arise from lack of land tenure security, that, for any leasehold grant under A1 scheme to satisfy the requirement of land tenure security, that for any leasehold grant under the A1 scheme to satisfy the requirements of the law, the farms to which it relates will need to be subdivided, surveyed, certified by the surveyor general's office, require precise triangulations and satisfying of registration requirements, which may take up to five years.

Matowanyika and Marongwe (2004) mention that in respect of the A2 model, the UNDP report suggests that the programmed offer applied in the model, appears to offer very little security for settlers, as the lease maybe cancelled by the minister at any time, since he can exercise his discretion. They add that this is an alarming prospect, if considered in the context that the minister has discretion to review that condition governing the exercise of an option from time to time. Muchena (2003) asserts that the current political regime governing the acquisition of land has created unrivalled chaos, uncertainty and unrest in respect of land ownership to those registered real rights. He states that their use, excision and inclusion rights have been severely compromised. They cannot vindicate the portion of their land, which has been occupied, even where the land has not been designated (ibid).

### **2.13 The Social Reproduction of Peasant Households and Nature**

According to Mukamuri (2000) land is important for the social reproduction of households in Zimbabwe's communal areas. He says the concept of social reproduction is founded on the analysis of community survival and reproduction based on households as the lowest level of economic disaggregation. Such analysis explores ways by which households maintain and enhance their sustainability through subsistence, income generation and other forms of direct consumption activities. He claims that the FTLRP left an environment that is not conducive for social reproduction. But what do the beneficiaries of the FTLRP say?

### **2.14 Democracy and Land Reform in Zimbabwe**

According to Makumbe (2002) land reform is fundamental to both economic and political security in Zimbabwe. He asserts that the significance of land lies both in its economic value and its political importance as the resource over which struggles have been waged in the colonial and independence eras. Obadina (2008) claims that despite the renewed interest in the land reform, little empirical micro evidence on its impact exists.

To use Zimbabwe to inform about the benefits of land reform may seem ironic, especially in the light of the country's current land reform efforts, which appear to be motivated more by political considerations and less by arguments regarding poverty reduction or economic efficiency. It seems ironic because certain scholars have come to a conclusion in their studies that the FTLRP is the cause of the Zimbabwe's economic crisis. For instance Ghimire (2001) claims that the results of the post-2000 FTLRP have been disastrous for the economy of Zimbabwe.

Sachikonye and Makumbe (2000) state that since 2000 there has been a 'retro' revolution in land redistribution. 'Retro' revolution in land redistribution refers to changes of land ownership which resulted from an initiative of a style from the past (Struggle for land ownership). Though it was politically motivated, it is a genuine revolution. They continue to claim that the State, like its predecessor, has passed a barrage of laws formalising what is already a grassroots *fait accompli*, namely, the invasions and seizure of white commercial farmland, initially by peasants and 'war veterans', but now open to all non-whites. They close their argument by saying this is a revolution, first of all, because of race; the white employer, especially the farmer, has traditionally been the 'big man' of Rhodesian and Zimbabwean society. Now things have to change for the benefit of those who were previously discriminated against.

Nevertheless, some argue that it is undeniable that there has been a revolution, but the methodology is contentious. Stoneman (2003) asserts that there are strong 'rationalist' arguments that the revolution is 'chaotic' and 'unsustainable' and that far from being a development project to promote poverty alleviation; the land revolution is essentially a political gimmick that is destroying the national economy. There are counter arguments that the land revolution and 'Third Chimurenga' is essentially a revolution of agrarian empowerment, not agrarian 'rationalism' and, as such, it is successful (ibid).

### **2.15 What Lessons does the FTLRP offer to Southern Africa?**

Marongwe (2003) states that Zimbabwe's FTLRP has generated significant attention in Southern Africa and beyond, due to its speed, scale and forced displacement of land owners and farm workers. He further argues that less attention, however, has been paid to the broader framework that has been used to support this rapid and often careless transformation of rural Zimbabwe. He acknowledges that while arguments for the land reform have been well articulated, including resisting globalisation and Western domination, the national government and the ruling party of Zimbabwe have not directly expressed their views on what Zimbabwe should be like following its land reform.

The experience of the land reform in Zimbabwe has set alarm bells ringing in South Africa and the world in places where land shortage is still an issue (Ghimire, 2001). In South Africa, especially, the upheaval and bitterness felt in Zimbabwe seems to suggest that the 'Malaysian path' to peaceful land redistribution and development is not inevitable (ibid). The 'Malaysian path' of land reform was implemented on a "willing buyer, willing seller" basis.

## **2.16 The FTLRP as the First Major Reform**

Moyo (2004:140) mentions that Mugabe declared thus:

Without doubt, our heroes are happy that a crucial part of this new phase of our struggle has been completed. The land has been freed and today all our heroes live on the soil that is theirs. Their spirits are unbound free to roam on the land that was once conquered, thanks to the 'Third Chimurenga'. Gone are the days when Africa used to produce tragic revolutions. We have to defend our policies and pursue them unhindered. Africa for Africans.

Matondi and Moyo (2003) argue that the land occupation in Zimbabwe has achieved the first major reform. They view it as a programme that has also been the most important challenge to the neo-colonial state in Africa under structural adjustment, and, if judged by its effectiveness in acquiring land, it has also been the most notable of rural movements in the world today. The reason why one can argue that the FTLRP in Zimbabwe achieved the first major reform might be because of its success to deliver land to the Africans of Zimbabwe at a fast pace.

Moyo and Yeros (2005) highlight that the land reform in Zimbabwe has proved an intellectual challenge and a matter of political ambivalence. They further argue that on the other hand, the land reform has raised fundamental analytical questions regarding peripheral capitalism, the state and nationalism. On the other hand, neither academia nor progressive political forces have risen to the task. Most have readily denounced the

land reform process as 'destructive' of the state. Others have gone the other way, celebrating the land reform as the culmination of 'black empowerment' or 'economic indigenisation' (ibid).

## **2.17 Land Reform and Development**

Moyo (2004) argues that the Zimbabwean case for land reform is situated within the wider development debate and policy perspectives on agrarian development on the economically marginalised African continent. He maintained that the land tenure and agrarian change processes remain pivotal concerns for African policy development, given the present poor economic performance of its predominantly agricultural economies. He further claims that the inadequate understanding of these two processes, particularly the social relations underpinning land use, tends to contribute to food policy management experiences of the last two decades and the growing environmental stress on the continent. He acknowledges that land reform is at the centre of the changing agrarian demands of the variety of unfolding social classes and forces of the 1990s.

Moyo and Yeros (2005) mention concerns in contemporary land research in Africa as including: the distribution and access to land; its ownership and use patterns; policy incentives for optimising sustainable land use; legal and institutional frameworks and processes that govern land administration; the impact of markets on land use; and changing rural labour processes and relationships to land. They state that it has been argued that the institutional and policy capacities to deal with these issues need to be strengthened if Africa's agrarian problems are to be resolved. Moreover, growing political conflict on the continent is plausibly associated with the failure of land and agrarian economies to deliver basic survival (Moyo, 2004).

## **2.18 The Structure of the Land Occupation Movement**

Buckle (2002) asserts that the land occupations in Zimbabwe unfolded in a complex way, driven by local and regional peculiarities, but they shared a common social base, that of the rural semi-proletariat, across gender and ethno-regional cleavages. He argues that the strengths of the land occupation movement are to be found precisely in this social base and, moreover, in its militant commitment to land repossession. He further declares that over time, this social base expanded to include urban poor and petty-bourgeois elements who were also co-opted into the FTLRP.

Richardson (2004) emphasises that the movement was strengthened in its momentum by the endorsement of the process by the Black capitalist lobby and ultimately by the stitching together through the war veterans' association of a tense but resolute cross-class nationalist alliance on land. In this case, too, the Black capitalist lobby would not yet threaten the working-class content of the movement (Meredith, 2005). In all this, cross-class nationalist alliance was opposed to the cross-class 'post-national' (or 'civic national') alliance of civic society including the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), trade unions, non-governmental organisations and White farmers (Palmer, 2001).

Meredith (2005) notes that the land occupational movement was organised and led by the War Veterans' Association. He argues that this was also a profound source of strength, combining militancy on the land question with an organisational structure permeating state and society. He further mentions that the war veterans activated their organisational roofs as much in rural districts through the local branches of the association as in all levels of the state apparatus, including local and central government, the police, the military, the Central Intelligence Organization (CIO), the state media and the ruling party. This pervasive web-like structure would contain the unique potential to mobilise both the rural areas and the state apparatus behind the land cause (Buckle, 2002).

## **2.19 Types of Farm Models of the Land Reform in Zimbabwe**

### **2.19.1 The Family Farm Model (Model A)**

The Ministry of Land and Agriculture (Report of 1999 to 2001) of Zimbabwe noted that the majority of Zimbabwe's small-scale farmers, about 90%, were settled under this model. The ministry stated that five hectares would be allocated to a household for crop production and an additional one hectare for the homestead and vegetable/fruit garden. The ministry also mentioned that communal grazing of about 5 to 20 livestock is also allowed and settlers do not receive title deeds but the government on a permit system allocates land.

This is generally accepted as the most successful model applied by the Zimbabwean government (Ministry of Land and Agriculture, 1999 to 2001). However, most farmers involved in this model do not produce for commercial purposes but for their own subsistence. Model A farmers are also limited by lack of resources and their fields are rather small.

### **2.19.2 The Co-operative Farming Model (Model B)**

Moyo (2004) states that with the Co-operative Farming model, the Zimbabwe government issues a single permit to a group of 20 to 30 families to continue farming on a previous commercial farming unit. This is usually a dairy or irrigation farm unit. This model encountered a number of problems that of the unwillingness of the participants to co-operate fully in commercial farming ventures. This model is presently the least successful model applied by the Zimbabwean government (ibid).

### **2.19.3 The Out Growers Farmers' Model (Model C)**

The National Land Policy of Zimbabwe (2002) stipulates that the Out Growers Farmer's model is linked to an existing commercial estate normally tea, coffee or tobacco farming. Twenty to thirty farmers are allocated land in one estate and they are offered farming training by the state.

The National Land Policy of Zimbabwe states that this model has limited application but shows potential for further adaptation and development since these farmers obtain leases and support services from the state. The main challenge for this farming model is high labour demand.

### **2.19.4 Schemes for Group Livestock Grazing Model (Model D)**

Model D provides schemes for group livestock grazing by using state land for providing relief grazing to surrounding villages in the communal areas, though it has limited application and possibilities (National Land Policy of Zimbabwe, 2002). The above mentioned scheme is very helpful to the farmers because it provides them with prepared nutritious grazing land. It allows easy management of livestock because the grazing areas are normally fenced. However, there are so many livestock theft cases taking place in this scheme.

Various scholars reported different results on the outcomes of the FTLRP (Marongwe, 2003). There are some who assert that the FTLRP's outcomes were positive and on the other hand some believe that they (outcomes) were negative. For example, scholars such as Moyo and Yeros (2005) describe the FTLRP as a sign of democratic revolution if handled correctly. They argue that the land occupation process in Zimbabwe has achieved the first major reform. They view it as a programme that has also been the most important challenge to the neo-colonial state in Africa under

structural adjustment and if judged by its effectiveness in acquiring land, it has also been the most notable of rural movements in the world today.

According to Moyo and Yeros (2005) the FTLRP is a sign of a democratic revolution if handled correctly. They mention that recently there have been many discussions about how to move forward from what are now termed the “facts on the ground”. These refer to the large numbers of new settlers and new owners on the former commercial farms. This is the question raised by Moyo and Yeros (2005) who argue that fast-track land reform can result in a successful national democratic revolution.

On the other hand, scholars like Ghimire (2001) claims that the government’s land redistribution programme is perhaps the most crucial. He argues that the results of the post 2000 land reform have been disastrous for the economy of Zimbabwe. The various views reported by a number of scholars will give the researcher an insight of the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP. This will help the researcher to be able to identify research gaps in land and agrarian issues.

Most of the information provided by different scholars in the literature was discussed at a higher level, for example organisations such as United Nations (UN), European Union (EU) and others, intellectuals such as Moyo were on the centre of such discussions.

## **2.20 Theoretical Framework**

There are many theories that can be used to support or criticise the approaches to the processes and programmes of land reform in relation to socio-economic development, but this proposed study will be informed by Afrocentricity and Marxism. The two theories will be used for a broader understanding of the results of FTLRP. This will help the investigation to have a comprehensive approach so that the results can be of high quality.

### **2.20.1 Afrocentric Theory**

Asante (2000) states that the Afrocentric paradigm is a revolutionary shift in thinking proposed as a constructural adjustment to black disorientation, decentredness, and lack of urgency. He argues that the Afrocentrist approach asks the question, "What would African people do if there were no white people?" In other words, what natural responses would occur in the relationships, attitudes toward the environment, kinship patterns, preferences for colours, type of religion, and historical referent points for African people if there had not been any intervention of colonialism or enslavement? Afrocentricity answers this question by asserting the central role of the African subject within the context of African history, thereby removing Europe from the centre of the African reality. In this way, Afrocentricity becomes a revolutionary idea in studying land and agrarian issues because it studies ideas, concepts, events, and personalities, political and economic processes from a standpoint of black people as subjects and not as objects, basing all knowledge on the authentic interrogation of location.

According to Mazama (2003) one of the key assumptions of the Afrocentrist theory is that all relationships are based on centres and margins and the distances from either the centre or the margin. He debates that when black people view themselves as centred and central in their own history then they see themselves as agents, actors, and participants rather than as marginal on the periphery of political or economic experience. He says that using this paradigm, human beings have discovered that all phenomena are expressed in the fundamental categories of space and time. He concludes that it is then understood that relationships develop and knowledge increases to the extent we are able to appreciate the issues of space and time.

The Afrocentric scholar or practitioner knows that one way to express Afrocentricity is called marking (Asante, 1998). Whenever a person delineates a cultural boundary around a particular cultural space in human time, this is called marking (Mazama, 2003). It might be done with the announcement of a certain symbol, the creation of a special bonding, or the sighting of personal heroes of African history and culture (Asante, 2000). Beyond citing the revolutionary thinkers in our history, that is, beyond Amilcar Cabral, Frantz Fanon, Malcolm X and Nkrumah, we must be prepared to act upon our interpretation of what is in the best interest of black people, that is, black people as a historically oppressed population (Mazama, 2003). This is the fundamental necessity for advancing the political process.

Asante (1998) asserts that Afrocentricity is the substance of our regeneration because it is in line with what contemporary philosophers such as Haki Madhubuti and Maulana Karenga among others have articulated as in the best image and interest of African people. What is any better than operating and acting out of our own collective interest? What is any greater than seeing the world through our eyes? What resonates more with people than understanding that we are central to our history, not someone else's? If we can, in the process of materialising our consciousness, claim space as agents of progressive change, then we can change our condition and change the world.

Reviere (2001) asserts that the principal advantage of an Afrocentric approach is that it compels a researcher to challenge the use of the traditional Eurocentric approach objectivity and reliability in the enquiry process. Using this theory, the researcher will try to analyse the land issue in an African approach. According to Asante (2000) African issues need to be approached using African lenses/glasses rather than using other theories which were designed to solve issues completely different from African problems.

Asante wrote a lot about Afrocentrism as the best approach ever in solving African issues, though he shuts himself from the worldview. Asante is supported by Collins (1990) who asserts that African phenomena are best understood through the use of African methods of analysis. The African methods of analysis are ways of looking at African matters which analyse them (African matters) within the African context. Asante (2000) argues that Afrocentricity seeks to relocate the African person as an agent in human history in an effort to eliminate the illusion of the fringes.

According to Asante (2000) Afrocentricity draws its concept from and bases itself on the culture of the African and totality of African experience. He explains that Afrocentricity has five main characteristics:

- Protection of African cultural elements in the context of art, music and literature and of the Pan Africanist cultural elements as based on responses to situation, environment and conditions.
- A devotion to finding the subject place of African in social, political and religious phenomenon with implications to questions of sex, gender and class.
- A concern in psychological relocation as determined by ritual, symbols and signals.
- A devotion to lexical refinement to avoid gender and sex pejoratives of any other person including Africans and also celebration of centeredness and agency.

Keto (1989) argues that the African centred perspective rests on the premise that it is valid to position Africa as a geographical and cultural starting base in the study of peoples of African descent. He mentions that the objective therefore is to view the world from the perspective of the people studied. He asserts that the Afro-centric comprehensive model for the teaching and learning of knowledge about African peoples makes possible an understanding of, and appreciation for the social, institutional, cultural and intellectual patterns of African people.

The Afro-centric approach was used in this study because it is holistic and centred on the African worldview. At the centre of this study are the African people, their culture, identity, values and economic activities, experiences with regards to their history and belief system in relation to their land.

The African methods of analysis are very important in this study because they will help the researcher to understand the land issue within the African context. For example, the researcher will be able to understand the land problem in Africa, why land is important to the African people and why is it necessary to have land reform programmes in Africa.

Looking at the different arguments which different scholars have advanced concerning the Afrocentric approach one can argue that the central theme of the ideology is to regenerate African people. The regeneration of the African people should take place in all aspects of their lives; for example culture, socio-economic factors to mention but a few. The main idea of the theory regarding the regeneration of the African people will help the researcher to assess and evaluate the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP, given that the main aim of the FTLRP was to improve the Zimbabwean African people.

The above arguments are of crucial importance and need to be highlighted in this study. This theory helped the researcher in assessing the outcomes of FTLRP in an African context. What are the views and values of the people concerning the land issue? The Afro-centric ideology is of paramount importance to this study because of its notions which suggests that when dealing with African issues there is need to regenerate African people and their methods because they are the best in solving such their own problems and also because of the theory's consideration of *ubuntu*. According to the Ubuntu Community (2002) *ubuntu* refers to an African concept of 'humanity towards others'. It is a belief in a universal bond of sharing that connects all humanity.

The ideas of the African perspectives are inseparable with the way how the FTLRP considers the African people first. Tracing back to the beginning of the FTLRP, the steering committee of the FTLRP even broadcast some advertisements on the national television which were showing the spirit of *ubuntu* by saying “soil to the African people”. Such kind of initiation is fully supported by the Afro-centric paradigm because it regenerates the African people and their methods of operating.

### **2.20.2 Marxism**

Fulcher and Scott (2007) mention that Marx argued that a state should retain all the authority as far as the allocation of resources is concerned. They say Marx held that a State should make sure that all the people are recognised, well covered and given access to as many necessary resources as possible. This approach is fair and it is being practised in many states/economies. However, there are problems associated with this kind of thinking, principally because ordinary people are removed from the vicinity, and put at the receiving end. The state can use its state apparatus to clear any resistance from the grassroots, the army or police in order to enforce its views on people. In summary, the state is the best to lead all the national programmes if it is to lead transparently, casting its eyes towards improving socio-economic conditions.

Giddens (2004) states that, according to Karl Marx, the father of conflict theory, individuals and groups (social classes) within society have differing amounts of material and non-material resources (the wealthy versus the poor) and that the more powerful groups use their power in order to exploit the groups with less power. He mentions that the Marxist approach was used by Runnel who argues that ‘the history of humanity is all about this conflict, a result of the strong rich exploiting the poor weak’. This theory is the most widely used approach that divides the society into two, namely, the rich (with much access to resources) and the poor (with limited or no access to the resources for survival except their labour).

According to Ritzer and Goodman (2004) this theory is much more realistic though it forgets the middle class and social movements that will later occur in a society. They pinpoint that Marx concluded his theory by asserting that there is a never-ending tug-of-war in different societies today between the “haves” and the “have nots” those with land and those without. This theory will help the present researcher to master the operating relations in the society in assessing the results of land reform on socio-economic development in Zimbabwe.

This theory is mostly applied to explain conflict between social classes, proletariat versus bourgeoisie, and in ideologies such as capitalism and socialism. While conflict theory describes successfully instances where conflict occurs between groups of people, for various reasons, it is questionable whether this represents the ideal human society. I think it is impossible to have a society without conflicts because people will never be the same, which means society will always have different classes.

Marx argued that the existence of private property divides people into social classes. These are categories of people with a specific position in the division of labour, a particular standard of living, and a distinct way of life. The basic class division is that between property-owners and property less workers. Classes, he argued, are involved in relations of exploitation. The property owning class benefits at the expense of the property less and this leads the classes to struggle over the distribution of economic resources.

Conflict theory is a very important theory in explaining the conflict between those who own land and those who do not own land. The inequality of land ownership in Zimbabwe led to the implementation of FTLRP which was named the ‘Third Chimurenga’ which means the third war. The violent approach which was used by the war veterans to redistribute land is the same approach which Marxism prescribed in order to achieve equity.

Karl Marx prescribed a radical approach for change to be achieved. He believed that revolution can only be achieved through struggle (Ritzer and Goodman, 2004). The way Marxism put emphasis on emancipating the poor from the bond of poverty goes hand in hand with the way the FTLRP intended to give land to black people so that they can be able to change themselves socially and economically.

The Marxist ideology believes that society should not have divisions or classification of people, the ideology wants to see a classless society which can only be attained by not having private ownership of property. Looking at the FTLRP one can suggest that the Zimbabwean government was trying to destroy private ownership of land when it introduced the programme. This is the reason why the land which was redistributed belongs to the state though it was leased to the newly resettled farmers for 99 years.

The main idea of Marxism is to have equal distribution of resources in societies. This idea (equal redistribution of resources) will be very significant in assessing and evaluating the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP because the FTLRP's main aim is to achieve equal distribution of land between different races of people which are blacks and whites.

Given the views held by different people and organisations, both sides are at war as far as allocation of resources is concerned. This theory evaluates the views of people from different classes, which make up the society, which means that this theory is much more inclusive and realistic. The on-going conflict is about the unequal access to resources. Other groups (ethnic, race, uneducated, poor, gender wise and age) are marginalised and segregated in the process of resource allocation. The researcher will use this theory in order to better understand the land reform socio-economic outcomes in the world in general and Zimbabwe in particular.

Marxism is a very important perspective for this research because it explains why it is important to have equal distribution of land in our society. The theory shows that if there is equal distribution of land in Zimbabwe people will be at the same level and there will be no social classes, therefore an equal society will be formed. If there are no social classes it means the society will not suffer from class conflicts which means we will have a peaceful society. The Marxist ideology also shows that if land is equally distributed in Zimbabwe, the poor people will be able to acquire a means of surviving in the name of land and the poor will be able to improve their lives and cease to depend on the rich members of the society, who are the white people in this case.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to explain the methodology of the research. The chapter indicates the methods of sampling, data collection and data analysis which were used in the study as well as ethical considerations, justifications of the methods and limitations of the study.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

Research design is the strategy, plan and structure of conducting a research (Leedy and Ormrod, 1997). The research design is therefore, a general plan of how the research in question has been set and will be answered. Research design provides a framework for the collection and analysis of data (Neuman, 1997).

The researcher used qualitative research methods which were descriptive. A qualitative approach was deemed appropriate because of its fundamental characteristics of observing events, actions and values from the perspective of the people who are being studied. Qualitative methods are often described as being the most efficient research instruments because their data collection depends on personal involvement, which may include interviews and observation in the setting (Bobbie, 2008). The researcher made use of a qualitative research design because of its ability to produce descriptive information appropriate in the analysis of individual and collective social actions, thoughts and arguments.

### **3.3 Population and Sampling Methods**

The population comprised all the newly resettled farmers of the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. The Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme is located 45 kilometres away from Masvingo town on the east side. The Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme has a total number of 40 newly resettled farmers. The researcher used non-probability sampling, which was purposive sampling. A sample simply refers to the element of the population considered for actual inclusion in a study, or it can be viewed as a subset of measurements drawn from a population in which the researcher is interested (Tashakkori & Teddle, 2005).

Neuman (1997) argues that purposive sampling is an acceptable kind of sampling for special situations. He claims that, in purposive sampling, a particular case is chosen because it illustrates some features or processes that are of interest for a particular study. This type of sampling (i.e., purposive sampling) is based entirely on the judgment of the researcher, in that a sample is composed of elements that contain most characteristics representative or having typical attributes of the target population (Singleton, 2004). The selection in purposive sampling might also be made with the view of choosing information-rich cases (ibid).

The researcher identified available farmers from which he selected a sample of thirty (30) out of forty (40). The researcher selected farmers who were fully engaged in the FTLRP activities for example farming projects. Ten of the available farmers were not interviewed because they were not a true representation of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP because they were not active in the programme. For example they were not utilising their land as the FTLRP expected. The sample comprised elements rich with information of the situation prevailing at the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme, representative to typical attributes of the population of the newly resettled farmers.

### **3.4 Methods of Data Collection**

#### **3.4.1 Primary Data**

Primary data for this proposed study was collected through the use of focus group discussions. Krueger (1998) views a focus group discussions as a carefully planned discussion designed to obtain perceptions on a defined area of interest in a permissive and non-threatening environment. He argues that such discussion often enables the participants to discuss issues they consider important. This approach can also be used to explore where little is known or views of a certain sample, such as particular culture, age group or gender, need to be obtained (Neuman, 1997). Focus group discussions generally comprise of four to eight research participants whose participation is voluntary and who are homogeneous in some respects (Krueger, 1998).

The total number of participant beneficiaries of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme included in the focus group discussions was thirty (30) out of forty (40). The reason why the other ten beneficiaries were excluded is because they were not true representatives of the FTLRP because they were not actively involved in the programme. For example they were not engaged in any farming activities. The participants consisted of six females and twenty four males. Women were so underrepresented because the Zimbabwean society still believes that land should be given to men because they are the heads of the households.

The researcher divided the participants into five groups. Each group had six participants. Participants were grouped in the same group because they were sharing same qualities to make the discussions productive and faster. There were six participants in each group to make the groups to be easily manageable. Each group of participants was interviewed on three different sessions; each session had its own thematic question. Totally, fifteen sessions were conducted during the focus group discussions. The discussions were carried out at Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2010. Each session of the interviews lasted for two

hours. The researcher made use of pseudo names during the interviews, a way of protecting the identity of the participants.

The following were the three themes which were treated in the focus group discussions:

- The economic impact of the FTLRP on the beneficiaries;
- The impact of FTLRP on the beneficiaries' livelihoods, and
- The FTLRP effect on the beneficiaries' social reproduction

The researcher made use of pseudo names during the interviews to protect their (participants) identity as would be required in a study like this.

At the beginning of each session the researcher briefed the participants about the theme of the session through explaining and defining key terms and what was expected of them. The discussions were conducted in Shona. All the sessions were recorded through the use of a tape recorder and then transcribed into English. At first the participants were not comfortable to be recorded, but the researcher explained to them that their real names would not be mentioned or appear anywhere in the final document.

### **3.4.2 Secondary Data Sources**

Secondary information was obtained from the Zimbabwean Government, Oxfam International, World Bank, United Nations AIDS, Zimbabwe Ministry of Lands documents and research literature on land reform, restitution, poverty, and rural development and from various writers and scholars.

It was difficult to get documents from the Zimbabwean Government offices and Zimbabwe Ministry of Lands office. The researcher had to wait for the government workers with authority to clear him so that he can be granted permission to photocopy the documents. From other organisations mentioned above it was easy to get the documents because when the researcher went to their offices he was told to be free to

make use of any document, and some of them even gave the researcher original copies of their documents.

### **3.5 Method of Data Analysis**

Data collected in this study was analysed through the use of content analysis. The researcher analysed the content or key words of the data that were collected from group interviews. Content analysis is a widely used qualitative research technique. Shanon (2004) articulates that rather than being a single method, current applications of content analysis show three distinct approaches, namely: conventional, directed, or summative. She argues that all of the three approaches are used to interpret meaning from the content of text data and as such adhere to the naturalistic paradigm. She also points out that the major differences among the approaches are coding schemes, origins of codes, and threats to trustworthiness. In conventional content analysis, coding categories are derived directly from the text data (Shanon, 2004).

With a directed approach, analysis starts with a theory or relevant research findings as guidance for initial codes (Cohen, 2001). A summative content analysis involves counting and comparisons, usually of keywords or content, followed by the interpretation of the underlying context (Cohen, 2001). Through the use of this type of data analysis, the researcher will deduce meaning from the content of text data.

### **3.6 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

#### **3.6.1 The Quality of the Research**

The envisaged study was conducted for academic purposes and the researcher demonstrated accountability and the ability of executing the research process by adhering to the highest possible standards of research planning, implementation, evaluation and reporting of research. The quality of the research was ensured by writing a research proposal and obtaining ethical clearance to conduct the envisaged

study from the Research Ethics Committee of the University of Limpopo. The researcher also asked for permission from the Ministry of Lands in Zimbabwe.

### **3.6.2 Informed Consent**

The researcher explained the purpose of the envisaged study to all participants. Permission to write down field notes and tape record interviews was obtained from the participants. The researcher also informed participants that participation in the envisaged study is voluntary and that those who would like to withdraw during the course of the envisaged study would not be victimized in any way.

### **3.6.3 Confidentiality and Anonymity**

Participants were assured that their names would not be used in the envisaged study. The participants' identity, privacy and dignity would be protected by ensuring that no connection between the participants and the data could be made. The researcher informed the participants that all the data collected would be destroyed after analysis and synthesis.

## **3.7 Justification of Research Methods**

As has been stated already, this study used qualitative research methods. The first advantage of qualitative methods is that data typically comes from the fieldwork and the researcher makes first-hand observations of both the activities and interactions being measured. This suited very well with this study because it was possible to collect first-hand information on the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP. Qualitative research methods were also used because the purpose of interviewing was to find out what is in and on someone's mind. For instance, the research sought to investigate the views of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP on the economic, livelihoods and social reproduction outcomes of the FTLRP. The qualitative approach was adopted to explain some

phenomena which cannot be quantified, for example, the explanations on how the FTLRP affected the beneficiaries' economic situation.

### **3.8 The following are limitations of the study:**

- Due to time constraints the researcher could not exhaust information from the FTLRP beneficiaries. Most of the newly resettled farmers had too many commitments and some did not stay permanently in their plots so at some point they had to ask for closure of the group meeting. The researcher tried to utilise all the sessions effectively by focussing on the agenda of each theme strictly. This could have impacted the data collected because some of the contributions made by the participants were brief.
- The land issue is a political issue in Zimbabwe and it is easy to be accused of inciting violence by openly highlighting the flaws of the programme. This is a well-motivated programme with all the right intentions but in trying to bring out the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP it was important to keep it non-offensive as a result not all the possible information was gathered. For example, information on how the FTLRP paralysed the economy of the country which has been published by certain scholars and organisations. To deal with this the researcher tried to be neutral by all means possible.
- It was difficult to collect quantitative information because most of the newly resettled farmers are not good in keeping records. The researcher advised the newly resettled farmers to make estimations.
- Most of the beneficiaries did not want to hear negative opinions of the outcomes of the FTLRP. Since the land issue in Zimbabwe is a political issue and most of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP are ZANU-PF members, they were not comfortable to discuss negative opinions of the FTLRP. The researcher had to listen to the participants' contributions to avoid heated arguments.

- The major problem with qualitative methods was that the researcher was too instrumental and central in the research and the validity depended on the skills, competence and rigour of the person doing the fieldwork. Thus, the element of human fatigue could have possibly obscured the attainment of high quality data, especially in the interviews, though however, the impact might not have been too significant.

However, in summation, despite the above mentioned weaknesses, the research method used made it possible to collect sufficient and relevant information for the study.

**CHAPTER FOUR**  
**DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF THE EMPIRICAL**  
**FINDINGS OBTAINED FROM THE BENEFICIARIES OF THE FAST-TRACK LAND**  
**REDISTRIBUTION PROGRAMME (FTLRP) ON THE SOCIO-ECONOMIC**  
**OUTCOMES OF THE PROGRAMME**

**4.1 Introduction**

The focus of this chapter is the presentation, analysis and interpretation of data from the focus group interviews with the newly resettled farmers of the Fast Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. The problem investigated in this study was the socio-economic outcomes that the FTLRP produced. The study employed qualitative research methods which were descriptive. Data collection in this study was done through the use of focus group discussions.

The chapter shows and discusses the main findings, the extent to which the aim and objectives of the study have been achieved. The total number of participant beneficiaries of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme included in the focus group discussions was thirty out of forty. The reason why the other ten beneficiaries were not interviewed is that they were not true representatives of the FTLRP because they were not actively involved in the programme. They were not true representatives of the FTLRP because they were not doing anything on the land which was allocated to them. Each beneficiary had 45 hectares of land allocated to him or her.

The researcher divided the participants into five groups. Each group had six participants. Each group of participants was interviewed on three different sessions; each session had its own thematic question. Totally, fifteen sessions were conducted during the focus group discussions. The discussions were carried out at Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> of December 2010. Each session of the

interviews lasted for two hours. The researcher made use of pseudo names during the interviews, a way of protecting the identity of the participants.

What follows is the presentation and analysis of data from the newly resettled farmers of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme that were included in the discussions on different sessions to find out the socio-economic results of the FTLRP:

The main topics which follow were used as themes:

➤ The economic effects of the FTLRP on the beneficiaries:

Before discussing this theme the researcher told each and every group of participants that their discussion would be based on the economic outcomes of the FTLRP, whether negative or positive. The researcher also defined the term economic as the branch of knowledge concerned with the production, consumption and transfer of wealth (Collins English Dictionary, 2009) to each and every group.

➤ The effects of the FTLRP on the beneficiaries' livelihoods:

Before discussing this theme the researcher explained to each and every group of participants that the term livelihoods refers to means of earning or obtaining the necessities to life (Oxford English Dictionary, 2004). According to Blaikie (2004), a person's livelihood refers to their "means of securing the basic necessities -food, water, shelter and clothing- of life". Livelihood is defined as a set of activities, involving securing water, food, fodder, medicine, shelter, clothing and the capacity to acquire above necessities working either individually or as a group by using endowments (both human and material) for meeting the requirements of the self and his/her household on a sustainable basis with dignity (Ibid). For instance, a farmer's livelihood depends on the availability and accessibility of land. Therefore the session sought to find out how did the FTLRP affected their means of earning necessities to life.

- The FTLRP effects on the beneficiaries' social reproduction:  
 Before discussing this theme the researcher explained to each and every group of participants that the term social reproduction refers to the capability of a programme to provide sustainability, regeneration of the society and humanity, and community survival on cultural basis (Moyo, 2004). Therefore this session sought to find out how the FTLRP affected the beneficiaries of the FTLRP on the basis of the above mentioned aspects.

The FTLRP, which the Government of Zimbabwe embarked on, has both positive and negative effects as indicated by the majority of the respondents interviewed in the study. The discussions generated different and contrasting views on the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP as highlighted in the sessions below:

## 4.2 Demographic Information of the Participants

### 4.2.1 Description of the Sample

#### 4.2.1. 1 Gender Distribution of the Sample

**Table 2: Gender Distribution of the Sample of the Beneficiaries of the FTLRP**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Male	24	80
Female	6	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

The imbalance shown in the table above might have been caused by the Shona cultural beliefs, that men are more superior to women and therefore women cannot own land. This is very unfair and it is the reason why Marx (1848) wrote about the conflict theory which explains the unequal distribution of resources between different groups of people.

Marx (1848) wrote that people should not be discriminated because of their gender hence the FTLRP made some effort to be all inclusive though the redistribution of land was not equal.

The gendered and unequal distribution of land is against one of the main tenets of Afrocentricity which Asante (2000) argues that it is a devotion to avoid gender and sex pejoratives of any other person. Gaidzanwa (1995) and Goebel (2005) confirm this by asserting that most programmes are not gender sensitive. This reality was disproved in the wake of the FTLRP by the findings which were obtained from Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme which indicated that women were also given land.

Despite some effort to have fairness exercised in the FTLRP, patriarchal approaches are refusing to die out completely, principally because more men had much access to land as compared to a small fraction of women. This kind of approach militates against poverty alleviation which results in poverty being gendered in most economies especially in Third World economies.

#### 4.2.1. 2 Age Distribution of the Sample

**Table 3: Age Distribution of the Sample**

<b>Age Range</b>	<b>Responses</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
30-39	2	6.6
40-49	8	26.6
50-59	15	50
60+	5	16.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

There were many participants between the ages of 50 and 59 because most of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP are war veterans and most of them were in the age range of 50 to 59 hence Meredith (2005) asserts that the land occupational movement was

organised by the War Veterans' Association. This is also because war veterans were on the forefront of the FTLRP since it is one of the major reasons why they joined the liberation struggle in the 1970s to get back land. There were few participants between the ages of 40 and 49 because most Zimbabweans between these ages are interested in town life hence acquiring land for farming is not important to them (Vambe, 2000). The reason could be that they are more interested in projects with quick returns like selling foreign currency unlike farming which has a long process for one to realise profit (Vambe, 2000).

There were also a few participants between the age of 30 and 39 because most of the citizens between these ages are not interested in farming. They are not interested in farming because most of them are still working in various industries and they do not yet have financial resources to fund agricultural projects, since they do not have a long time working, hence they do not have investments (Stoneman, 2003). People who are sixty years and above find it difficult to be involved in labour intensive activities which is the reason why there were few participants who were sixty years and above because farming is labour intensive.

#### 4.2.1.3 Household Distribution of the Sample

**Table 4: Household Distribution of the Sample**

Household Size	Responses	Percentage
1-5	20	66.6
6-10	10	33.3
11+	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100</b>

The majority (sixty-six per cent) of the participants' households consisted of one to five people because many people no longer have huge numbers of household members because of economic hardships prevailing in the country (Matowanyika and Marongwe, 2004). The Department of International Development confirmed this by saying

Zimbabwe's historic economy has become a shell of its former self. The minority (thirty-three per-cent) of the respondents' households consisted of six to ten people because Shona people believe that one should have a big family in order to extend the family name.

Regardless of the economic crisis in the country, there are few people who still want huge households because Shona culture encourages big families. This supports Asante (1998)'s concept of Afrocentricity as the substance of African culture regeneration. There was no household with eleven and above members because considering the economic hardships prevalent in Zimbabwe it is difficult to cater for such a household with so many people. It is a positive outcome for the FTLRP to be able to support all the above mentioned households because it promotes poverty alleviation. Bouding (2000) confirms this when he asserts that the hope for economic growth and poverty reduction in the rural context of sub-Saharan Africa remains rooted in the land.

#### **4.3 The Economic Effects of the FTLRP on the Beneficiaries**

The following are some of the opinions which were made by the participants:

##### ***Chamaona***

*I used to work for a white farmer. He used to provide us with food, shelter and there was a school on the farm which my children attended. After we were removed from the farm and resettled here we are facing a number of problems. The secondary school is 6 km away and my children have to walk 5 km to get to the closest primary school. This has left us with an enormous task of sending our children to boarding schools, which most resettled farmers cannot afford.*

##### ***Chanaka***

*We are very happy to inform you that the FTLRP has provided us with a new way of employing ourselves. This land which was provided to us has been producing for us*

*and our families through agricultural products. There is no any better employment than this.*

### **Matewe**

*As we were rapidly removed from the white farmer's farm where we were employed, we left some of our belongings and now we have to start all over again. I have also lost my job on the farm which was my only source of income and now I have no other source of income. Yes, it is true that I have to work productively on the land that I was given, but how can I if I do not have the necessary agricultural equipment and inputs to work productively? I have to rely on other people's cattle to plough the land. This is very difficult because I have to wait for them to finish their plots first before they can give me their cattle.*

*This results in some of us missing the planting dates for many crops resulting in low yields. It is thus very difficult for people who were working for the white farmers to start farming productively because of the problems that I have highlighted above. Unless the government addresses these maladies, we will continue to suffer and we will become worse off than we were on the white farms.*

### **Discussion**

Seventy-nine per cent of the participants indicated that the FTLRP has provided them with a new highly paying form of employment in the name of land. On the other hand twenty-one per cent showed that since the inception of the FTLRP they have lost their jobs. Seventy-nine per cent of the participants were not former farm workers and twenty-one per cent were former farm workers.

The participants pointed out that they lost their jobs with the advent of the FTLRP. This affected their buying power. Eighty per-cent of the former farm workers' lives were impacted in a negative way economically because they had to start afresh to look for a way of survival. Their source of income was gone overnight, and they were forced to compromise in many ways. They (former farm workers) no longer have

decent food and shelter which the white commercial farmer used to provide to them. The former farm workers left their belongings as they were hurriedly removed from their places of work. This means that they were to start from scratch. The twenty per cent of the participants who are former farm workers have engaged themselves into agricultural activities though they are unable to copy very well because they do not have enough capital to adequately fund their projects. The government has tried to provide seeds and fertilizer though it is far less than what is expected.

This supports Oxfam International (2005)'s claim when it asserts that in Masvingo Province, there are problems of former farm workers who remain on the farms though unemployed by the new settlers. On the other hand, some of the respondents secured jobs from the newly resettled farmers which boosted their financial base though to a limited scope.

Seventy-nine per cent of the respondents felt that land on its own provided them with a form of employment. The land is their means of production because their survival and their families depend on the land. This reiterates Birdsall and Londono (2002)'s argument that redistributive land reform can improve growth.

#### **4.3.1 The Positive/Negative Effects of the FTLRP**

The following are some of the views which were made by the participants:

##### ***Chiri***

*The FTLRP has affected us positively because from this land we are able to produce food which our families need and we will be also able to sell some if there are extra products so that we can get money. Money is required for purchasing goods which we are not able to produce on our own.*

##### ***Matewe***

*I think it has negatively affected us because we have been dislocated in the sense that we are far away from everything (shops, schools and hospitals) which we need to*

*keep on going as a community. The fact that we are far away from shops affects us negatively because we waste a lot of time and energy walking to the shops. Being far away from schools forces us to send our children to boarding schools where the school fees are expensive and the long distance from our place to farms requires us to pay high bus fares for us to be able to reach the hospital. It has also affected us negatively because our government has not been able to support us with capital and equipment for us to be able to produce at a high level.*

## **Discussion**

Majority (seventy-six per cent) of the participants indicated that the FTLRP has affected them positively. Minority (twenty-four per cent) of the respondents indicated that the FTLRP has affected them negatively.

The FTLRP affected the majority of the participants in a positive way because they are now able to produce food for their families which is very important to family members their nutritional requirements and healthy living. This means that the FTLRP has managed to positively affect subsistence farming in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. It is also essential because it reduces poverty in families because food is one of the basic requirements by human beings and if it is not available then there is poverty. This defies Ghimire (2001)'s claim that the results of the post-2000 land reform have been disastrous for the economy of Zimbabwe.

This kind of setup (difficult access to services such as shops) in the resettlement scheme affected minority of the respondents in a negative way. Their social and economic lives were brought to a halt. The shops are far away from the settlement which means that they have to walk for a long distance and also spend some money on transport. Much time was spent on these journeys instead of being spent on the farming activities in order to improve their productivity. This supports the claim which the Department of the international development in Zimbabwe (2003) made, that Zimbabwe's economy has become a shell of its former self.

## **Mudadi**

*The land reform has indeed helped us in a number of ways. When we came here we never had problems of building materials as there are a lot of trees which we could use to build our houses, fencing our yards and fields and livestock structures. There is no problem of firewood as compared to where we came from. To earn extra income we sell firewood to people in Masvingo town because they have a problem of electricity.*

*We also had no problems with food as there were a lot of wild animals in the bushes but now they have disappeared. I think they have migrated to our neighbouring white owned farms.*

*This area as you might know is rich with gold, and our children are earning a lot of money through gold panning to an extent that most of them are no longer interested in farming. The land here is very fertile and there is no need to apply artificial fertiliser.*

## **Discussion**

Seventy per cent were pro-FTLRP, citing the advantages that emerged with the parcelling out of land to the landless, ordinary, and poor majority as a way of empowering them. This was done by the Ministry of Lands through provincial and district offices (Martin and Phyllis, 2002). They (beneficiaries) noted that their land provided them with cheap building material in the form of trees which they used to construct their houses, fencing their yards, fields and livestock structures. Since most of the rural households do not have electricity, firewood was the source of fuel since it was readily available. Besides all the advantages mentioned above, the land in the resettlement area is very 'fertile' which means that high yields were guaranteed as long as the season had good rainfall. This rejects Richardson (2004)'s argument that redistribution wastes resources.

The argument adds to Bouding (2000)'s view, when he debates that the hope for economic growth and poverty reduction in the rural context of the sub-Saharan Africa remains rooted in the land. This supports Marx's (1848) idea that resources should be equally distributed.

Access to minerals such as gold will improve the economic status of the beneficiaries because they will be able to acquire large sums of money after selling the precious mineral. This can be also important for black economic empowerment which most African countries want to achieve because black people were previously disadvantaged. So this will create a balance in achieving equal distribution of resources which will lead to a classless society which was emphasised by Karl Marx (1848) when he argued that, society should not have divisions or classifications of people on the basis of their material possessions.

#### **4.3.2 The Negative/Positive Effects of the FTLRP on the Environment**

The following are some of the points which were made by the participants:

##### ***Runesu***

*I think the FTLRP has negative effects to the environment because it has destroyed vegetation and ecosystem. I say so, because people have cut down a number of trees to use them as building materials and there is also massive hunting of wild animals taking place because people want to eat meat regularly.*

##### ***Mudadi***

*You might be right but after all what is important is people's lives and not wild animals. You should consider that God created these wild animals for us, and therefore, it is our right to utilise them for survival so one should prioritise people's survival instead of the environment and the ecosystem.*

## **Discussion**

The respondents indicated mixed feelings about the effects of the FTLRP on the environment. Minority (twenty-one per cent) of the respondents viewed the FTLRP as having negative effects to the environment. On the other side majority (seventy-nine per cent) indicated that it was positive because they think that human life is more important than anything else.

Development programmes consider people first which is the reason why it is people centred. This is the reason why majority of the beneficiaries were happy with the benefits of the FTLRP because their needs were considered first instead of the environment.

On the other hand the minority of the participants were not happy because the FTLRP has negative effects to the environment and wildlife because for development to be sustainable the environment should be in a good state and if it not in a good state development will ultimately fail because it depends on the environment. For example if there is a lot of deforestation, domestic and wild animals will not have plants to graze. This adds to Moyo (2004)'s claim when he debated that the primary motivation of land reform is to alleviate poverty. It is the reason why most of the participants did not care about destruction of vegetation but human life.

### **4.3.3 The Number of Cattle and Goats of the FTLRP Beneficiaries before and after the FTLRP**

The following are some of the facts which were raised by the participants:

#### ***Tererai***

*The land has given us opportunities in as far as pastures for our livestock is concerned. We never used to have enough land for our goats and cows to be able to graze freely without grazing on people's plants. You can even see how our animals are healthy because there is enough pastures for them. We are assured that if we are to sell them we will not struggle because they are looking healthy.*

#### ***Tendai***

*Before the FTLRP I had twenty goats and twelve cattle. After the FTLRP I managed to accumulate fifteen more goats and seven more cattle. The main reason for the increase is that in this area there is enough land and pastures which allows our animals to graze a variety of pastures with different nutrients which speed up their reproduction system.*

#### **Discussion**

Seventy-eight per-cent (seventy-eight per cent) mentioned that the FTLRP has led to an increase in the number of their cattle and goats. On the other hand twenty-two per cent mentioned that they do not have cattle and goats.

The FTLRP has provided the newly resettled farmers with adequate land as mentioned by one of the participants called Tendai. The availability of adequate land is attributed to the high production in livestock because it provides enough grazing land with a variety of nutritious grass and plants. Nutritious grass and plants are very vital for livestock's health hence they produce highly. This confirms Lionel and Stoneman (2003)'s assertion that an empirical study in a variety of economies have identified a positive association between access to land, income and consumption.

The reason for the twenty per cent of the participants not to have cattle and goats is because some of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP are from a poor background since they were former labourers on the farms. Farm labourers in Zimbabwe are regarded as the least paid employees hence they are poor (Ghimire, 2001)

#### **4.3.4 The Types of Farming Projects which were initiated on the Beneficiaries' New Land**

The following are some of the opinions made by the respondents:

##### **Garikai**

*We have managed to engage into chicken, maize, sweet potatoes, peanuts, vegetables, cattle and goat farming and others. I am very happy because for the past seven years the projects have been doing well and I have managed to provide for myself and my family from the income which I receive from selling the products.*

## **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries of the FTLRP indicated that they are engaged in various projects which include chicken, maize, sweet potatoes, peanuts, cattle and goat farming. The FTLRP brought more advantages than disadvantages in the sense that the people had increased access to land which they did not have before.

The swathes of land allow the farmers to practice more farming activities which range from vegetable and grain cultivation to cattle, sheep, goat and chicken rearing. Diversification helps by spreading the risks associated with the production of one crop or the rearing of same animals. Having different farming projects could be advantageous because if one project do not do well the one might do well and compensate for loss. This fulfils the Afrocentric paradigm by Asante (2000) that the Afrocentric paradigm is a revolutionary shift in thinking proposed as a structural adjustment to black disorientation and decentredness, because land is very important for the African rural economy.

### **Gundani**

*I am so grateful to the government of Zimbabwe for resettling us. The fact that the government has distributed land has made me so happy. I came from Chivi where we were crowded in rocky and sandy semi-arid areas. These areas were inhospitable and not fit for human settlement. Now we have enough hectares of land and fertile soils. I am sure you are aware that the white colonialists wanted to push all Africans into semi-arid areas so that they could occupy the prime land. Now, we have reclaimed our land, and I can now afford to send my children to school with the money that I get from the surplus maize that I sell to Grain Marketing Board (GMB). However, I have a plea to the government to increase the buying price of maize and also to ensure that we get our cheques from the sale of our farm products on time.*

## **Discussion**

The above finding shows that the FTLRP has impacted the beneficiaries positively because they now have fertile land which they were deprived of previously. With this fertile land available to the beneficiaries it means that if they can make use of it they will be able to improve their yields to greater quantities. Considering what the fertile land can bring to the newly resettled farmers, one can say the FTLRP has improved the beneficiaries' economic status though some of them have lost their jobs but being an entrepreneur is far much better than being a farm worker. This is because farm workers are considered to be the lowest paid employees globally (Ghimire, 2001). The finding defies Bounding (2000)'s argument, that the rural economy in the province of Masvingo has collapsed.

Livestock and crop products were the immediate economic products which were realised by the farmers who accessed the land. The most unanimously agreed point by most participants was that the FTLRP brought land which is an economic resource. The products are sold, especially cattle, goats and maize which generate cash for family upkeep. Besides selling the products, this can also be considered by the family there by saving money resources which will be used for food purchases.

The point above rejects Bouding's (2000) argument that almost three decades of land redistribution in Zimbabwe have not produced clear results on land redistribution and poverty alleviation. This fulfils the Marxist idea, to see people having equal distribution of resources in societies. Giddens (2004) states that according to Karl Marx, the father of conflict theory, individuals and groups (social classes) within society have differing amounts of material and non-material resources (the wealthy versus the poor) and that the more powerful groups use their power in order to exploit the groups with less power.

### ***Mudamburi Cephas***

*As a beneficiary of the FTLRP, I have positive feelings with regards to my economic and financial status. Basically let me point out from the onset that economic impact can only be looked at through comparisons of indicators which existed before we came here with our current situation. One area of great improvement is agricultural yield. In this regard I will compare my output before I came here to the current output. Before the FTLRP I used to produce five bags of maize which was only for me and my family, but after the FTLRP I started producing three tonnes per season. Looking at the statistics it is crystal clear that the agricultural yield has effectively improved.*

### **Discussion**

This shows that the FTLRP has impacted agricultural output positively, because the beneficiaries are now producing more than what they used to produce before the programme. The finding goes hand in hand with Karl Marx (1848)'s emphasis on equal distribution of means of production to emancipate the poor from the bond of poverty. It also adds to Bouding (2000)'s claim, that the hope for economic growth and poverty reduction in the rural context of the Sub-Saharan Africa remains rooted in the land.

#### **4.3.5 The Reasons for Improved Agricultural Output**

The following are the responses made by the participants on improved agricultural output:

### ***Mudamburi Cephas***

*The maize crop is doing well partly because the soil is still new and partly because of improved farming methods. The soil here has not yet been exhausted as compared to*

*the nutrient stripped soil in Shurugwi which is exhausted as a result of overuse through a series of generations.*

*Our cattle herd has increased noticeably because there is plenty of grazing land. In contrast, Shurugwi was so populated that any increase in the number of cattle would destroy the vegetation. I think the limited pasture land acted as a natural check on livestock.*

### **Masango**

*Our capability to work hard has led to improved agricultural output. For example we grew up practicing subsistence farming which has improved our farming skills.*

### **Discussion**

Seventy-five per cent of the participants noted that the improved agricultural productivity can be attributed to the availability of fertile soil which is a result of having adequate land. Twenty-five per cent attributed the improvement in agricultural output to their hardworking.

The availability of land to the newly resettled farmers has impacted their productivity positively though there was need for other complimenting factors of production like water inputs and equipment. Before the FTLRP the newly resettled farmers could not produce highly because the land was not enough and at the end of the day it ended up becoming impoverished because of being overused. Now that the land is enough the newly resettled farmers are not overusing their land which has led to availability of conducive land for high productivity in their farming projects. This can be equated to Lionel and Stoneman (2003)'s point when they say empirical studies in a variety of economies have identified a positive association between access to land, income and consumption. The finding fulfils the Afrocentricity approach's main idea which is regeneration of African people which Asante (1998) pointed out.

Availability to adequate land alone cannot guarantee improved agricultural output but only if it is accompanied by hardworking. The availability of adequate land to the beneficiaries of Kippure-Iram resettlement scheme and the ability of the beneficiaries to work hard has led to high agricultural output as well as other factors of production like water, capital and equipment.

#### **4.3.6 The Significance of the Increased Agricultural Output**

The following are some of the statements made by the participants:

##### ***Mudamburi Cephas***

*The improved agricultural output means that I have been empowered financially because it means more profit for me. For example if I used to produce three tonnes of sugar beans and get USD3000 after improved production it means I will make more than USD3000. In Shurugwi I only had five hectares of farming land and only three huts at my homestead. However, as I speak I now have 45 hectares of farming land and I managed to build an eight roomed asbestos house. All my five children are attending boarding schools. I can afford to pay their school fees for the year because of the income which I am receiving from the farming projects.*

#### **Discussion**

All the respondents indicated that improved agricultural productivity brought positive changes to them. Increased agricultural output allows the farmers to sell more of their products which mean that more cash can be realized for the better of the family. The money can be used for paying school fees thereby increasing the quality and standard of life for many families. Increased output is not only a sign of wealth in most rural setups but also earns people some form of respect and honour. This defies the

assertion made by the Department of the International Development (2003) that there is widespread hunger and mal-nutrition in Zimbabwe.

#### **4.3.7 The beneficiaries' ability to send their Children to Boarding Schools before the FTLRP**

##### ***Mudamburi Cephas***

*We were not able to do so because we did not have enough money.*

#### **Discussion**

Sixty per cent of the respondents indicated that they were able to send their children to boarding schools. Forty per cent mentioned that their children have already finished their studies. Boarding schools are regarded to be more expensive schools than day schools so this implies that the beneficiaries' earnings high enough to afford them to send their children to more expensive schools.

The reason for the majority (sixty per cent) of the respondents to be able to send their children to boarding schools is because they now have high income. This high income is a return from selling their agricultural products which they are cultivating from the land provided to them by the FTLRP. This reinforces Makumbe (2002)'s idea that land reform is fundamental to economic security in Zimbabwe.

#### **4.3.8 Elaboration on how the FTLRP Advantages Outweigh the Disadvantages**

The following are some of the opinions made by the respondents:

##### ***Muzozviwona***

*It is a great honour to host you discussing our situation here. I would like to thank our beloved government for the FTLRP even though it had been long overdue. However, we always say that it is better late than never. I am saying this because I really believe that the advantages or benefits of this programme outweigh their disadvantages if ever there are any.*

##### ***Kudzai***

*The benefits are all on the wall for everyone to see. If you look around me all the material needs I have accumulated is evidence of how the land reform programme has radically changed our lives. I grew up in the reserves and to be honest life was a living hell. We did not have enough pasture for our cattle and remember that here in Zimbabwe cattle are the backbone of rural wealth. It was not easy for us since we could not afford to raise a reasonable head that could sustain us.*

*When I arrived here in the year 2000, I only had 5 cattle but right now my herd has risen to 27 cattle. If you have cattle you have something worthier than money. It is a source of income because you can change them into cash anytime if you have something to purchase. Before the FTLRP we could not afford to acquire these tractors that you see. We used cattle to cultivate our plots as well as to pull our carts around. Of course now we are keeping these animals for commercial purposes only even though now and then we can slaughter for meat. You cannot survive on these green vegetables only when you have a pen full of cattle. So you can see how land reform has uplifted our lives in this regard.*

## **Tichaona**

*I can now manage to buy my own equipment such as tractors, something that was oblivious in my mind years back. It was a pipe dream to imagine having or owning a tractor one day, but with the FTLRP I am now a proud owner of modern farm equipment which makes farm work easy and efficient. I have also learnt a lot of things regarding farming. In the reserves we could only cultivate for our families but now we are at a level where very soon we will be able to feed Zimbabwe. In other words, I have enough land to grow whatever I want.*

*I can now grow a variety of crops something that I could not do back in the reserves. However, some farmers are specialising in certain crops and that is a good idea because they can produce at a large scale and help reduce market prices thereby improving our economy.*

## **Discussion**

All the respondents agreed that the advantages of the FTLRP outweigh the disadvantages. They attributed the advantages to accumulation of wealth in form of cattle, tractors and money as well. The FTLRP has positive results to them also because they are now starting to produce large quantities in their farming projects which is very important in agriculture and food security. This is a sharp contrast to Matowanyika and Marongwe (2004)'s assertion that Zimbabwe was once a food surplus country but today it is deficient in food.

#### **4.4 The Effects of the FTLRP on the Beneficiaries' Livelihoods**

The following are the facts which were made by the participants:

##### ***Nhamo***

*The FTLRP was very fruitful for our livelihoods because a lot of us were unemployed before the programme, but after it was implemented we started owning land. The land which I now own has created many means of surviving.*

##### ***Taonga***

*The FTLRP has disadvantaged me a lot because I used to work for a white commercial farmer who used to pay me and my children's school fees and provide me with shelter.*

#### **Discussion**

Seventy-six per cent of the respondents indicated that the FTLRP has impacted their livelihoods positively. On the other side twenty-four per-cent mentioned that the FTLRP has affected their livelihoods negatively.

Generally the FTLRP was successful because seventy-five per cent of the participants were unemployed and after the FTLRP they acquired a new way of surviving in agriculture. The FTLRP was not successful right through. Twenty-one per cent of the beneficiaries lost their jobs because they were employed by the white commercial farmers. There were those who managed to find a stable livelihood in the form of land which was provided to them. In other words the FTLRP generated mixed feelings and perspectives from different interested parties. This can be emphasised by the different views propounded by scholars about the livelihoods of the newly resettled farmers.

For example Makumbe (2002) claims that justifications for promoting land reform are many and some are compelling. This implies that there are vast reasons why land reform is important for example employment creation. On the other hand Buckle (2002) asserts that the FTLRP has resulted in the massive displacement of many farm workers. After the implementation of the FTLRP many of the farm workers had nowhere to go since their employers had to leave.

#### **4.4.1 The Means of surviving which the FTLRP has created for the Beneficiaries**

The following are some of the opinions made by the respondents:

##### ***Nhamo***

*Last year I managed to produce six tonnes of maize, vegetables, groundnuts, beans and I sold five cows. After selling all those products I managed to feed my family and send my children to school. If it was not because of the land which I now own, I was not going to be able to produce all these farm products which have given me stability in terms of looking after my family.*

##### ***Chamunorwa***

*As Africans our land is our prosperity, therefore I think the FTLRP has affected our livelihoods positively to a larger extent. Most of our people used to stay in crowded areas because there was land shortage, for example the people who used to stay in Chivi south. Those people could not implement a number of farming projects because the land in their area was not adequate. For example, they could not rear domestic animals, plant beans and sorghum. If I look at those people now I realize that there is a significant change because those people can now implement a number of farming projects on a large scale because the land in the resettlement area is enough for them.*

## ***Muchapiwa***

*I also want to support Chamunorwa's claim that as Africans our land is our prosperity because truly speaking in our culture for you to be able to prosper you must have land because the land produces everything for us.*

## **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries of the FTLRP indicated a number of ways in which how the FTLRP can serve as a means of living to them. Since the implementation of the FTLRP the beneficiaries have managed to practise a number of farming projects for them to be able to boost their means of production such as maize, vegetables, groundnuts, beans and cattle farming. This was impossible before the FTLRP therefore the FTLRP has positively affected the newly resettled farmers' livelihoods. This can be supported by Ghimire (2001) when he asserts that there is wide consensus about the need for reforming land tenure systems and relations in order to reduce rural poverty and hunger in developing countries.

The findings mentioned above means that land is the root of means of production to rural Africans hence there is a strong relationship between livelihoods and land. Therefore if there is lack of land it means that African means of surviving will suffer negatively. This can be understood as realisation of the Marxist ideology to have equal distribution of resources.

#### **4.4.2 The Land's Capability to Provide for the Beneficiaries**

The following are some of the views made by the participants:

##### ***Muchapiwa***

*Land is our means of production because we plough the land, our domestic animals graze on the land, we build our houses on the land and we use boreholes which are drilled on the land and we fish from rivers which are on the land. If we are not able to get all the requirements which I mentioned above we will not be able to survive because that is where our rural means of surviving activities are centred.*

##### ***Mutongi***

*The land which I acquired during the FTLRP has allowed me to be able to produce food for my family. I managed to produce ten tonnes of maize, five bags of rice, three tonnes of sugar beans and two bags of groundnuts which I have been consuming with my family since last year. These products have saved me a lot of money because I no longer buy food that often.*

##### ***Tinos***

*On this land which the government has allocated to me I have managed to produce enough food for my family which I was not able to do before acquiring this land.*

#### **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries indicated that the land has produced for them in a number of ways. The findings show that the beneficiaries' livelihood activities are centred on their land. For example, crop and animal farming, as well as fishing cannot be separated from their land. This means that land is a backbone of the livelihoods of the beneficiaries and if it

is to be taken away from them all their livelihoods activities will be paralysed. This reinforces Makumbe (2002)'s assertion that land reform is a fundamental livelihood security in Zimbabwe. It also reiterates Asante (1998)'s idea that Afrocentricity is the substance of regeneration of African people.

The FTLRP has allowed the beneficiaries to produce for their families which means that the FTLRP has ensured food security. The agricultural products which the beneficiaries are producing can also be sold to obtain money which can be used to pay school fees, buy clothes, groceries and other household requirements. This contradicts Stoneman (2003)'s assertion that the FTLRP is essentially a political gimmick that is destroying the national economy.

#### **4.4.3 The Kinds of Food which the Beneficiaries have managed to produce from their Land**

The following are some of the arguments made by the participants:

##### ***Tinos***

*I have managed to produce mealie-meal from the maize which I grew last year, bread from the wheat which I harvested, vegetables from my garden, goat meat, chicken and beef and peanut butter.*

##### ***Amos***

*I have managed to initiate a number of projects on this land, for example pig and chicken projects. These two projects are absolutely the main source of my income. With the pig project I am supplying CSC (Cold Storage Commission) with pigs and with the chicken project I am supplying a number of boarding schools and food outlets.*

## **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries indicated that they have managed to produce a range of types of food from their land. They have also initiated a number of farming projects which are giving them a lot of income.

On the basis of the above findings one can say the FTLRP was a successful programme. Because the beneficiaries have managed to produce mealie-meal from their maize, bread from their wheat, vegetables from their gardens, peanut butter from their peanuts, meat from their goat, chicken and cattle projects. This means that the FTLRP is very instrumental for high and diversified production hence sustainable means of production. This can be validated by Marx (1848)'s view that increasing the access to the means of production to the poor people will definitely reduce their poverty.

Furthermore the initiation of pig and chicken projects is very important for the beneficiaries' households, because after selling them (pigs and chicken) they are getting a lot of money. Money is very important to households because it enables them to budget for various household requirements. This emphasises Makumbe (2002)'s claim that the justifications for promoting land reform are many.

### **4.4.4 The Types of Agricultural Projects Engaged in**

The following are some of the responses made by the participants:

#### ***Taurai***

*The FTLRP has affected me in a positive way because before the programme I did not have any land which I could use for agricultural purposes to make a living. We are now growing maize, sugar beans, breeding chickens, goats and cattle.*

## **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries indicated that they are growing maize, sugar beans, breeding chickens, goats and cattle. These agricultural activities are very important for their survival because they can provide food and income to their families. Each and every household needs food and income for sustainable development. This defies Oxfam International (2005)'s claim that the FTLRP has led to high unemployment rate.

### **4.4.5 Opportunities Opened by the FTLRP for the Beneficiaries**

The following are some of the comments made by the respondents:

#### ***Zhakata***

*I would like to thank the government for providing us with a means of surviving. This land has made a significant positive effect on our livelihoods. It has opened so many opportunities for us. This land has allowed us to initiate a number of agro-based projects which are providing us with food and income.*

## **Discussion**

All beneficiaries of the FTLRP indicated a number of agro-based activities which they are practising. The availability of food and income to the beneficiaries' households ensures stability in their families. Income is a very important resource to people for them to be able to access basic human needs. The basic human needs which can be acquired through the use of money are shelter, education, health, clothes and grocery. Food is very important to human beings because it is the fuel which their bodies need for them to survive.

Considering the above two benefits which came with the implementation of the FTLRP one can argue that the FTLRP has achieved positive results. This is in sharp contrast to Bounding (2000)'s argument that the rural economy in the Masvingo Province has collapsed. On the other hand it goes hand in hand with Marx (1848)'s claim that fair distribution of resources can emancipate the poor from the bond of poverty.

#### **4.4.6 The Agro-Based Projects being Practised**

The following are some of the views made by the participants:

##### ***Zhakata***

*We are involved in maize, sweet potatoes, chickens, goats, cattle and vegetable farming. The food which we produce is enough for us and our extended families.*

##### **Discussion**

All the respondents mentioned that they have found a number of livelihoods in agro-based activities. Maize, sweet potatoes, chickens, goats, cattle and vegetable farming are very important projects in providing households with a means of surviving.

These farming projects can provide households with food and income. This can be supported by Ghimire (2001)'s argument that there is wide consensus about the need for reforming land tenure systems and relations in order to reduce rural poverty and hunger in developing countries.

#### **4.4.7 Land as a Means of Survival**

The following are some of the assertions made by the respondents:

##### ***Jokoniya***

*The land has opened opportunities for us to practise farming projects which we could not practise in the past because we did not have access to land. If you listened to previous speakers they also mentioned how this land has allowed them to initiate projects such as maize, cattle, sugar beans, sweet potatoes, pig, goat and wheat farming.*

##### **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries indicated that the FTLRP with no doubt has opened a number of opportunities for them. The FTLRP led to many farmers starting a number of agro-based projects which provide the owners with food and a source of income. Given the fact that a number of projects were running, more cash was generated which turns to be advantageous for many households despite the fact that the income was seasonal as alluded before. Hence Mukamuri (2000) claims that developing countries cannot achieve the objective of poverty alleviation unless they undertake progressive land reforms and achieve growth with equity. People from different places emerged in the resettlement areas which increased the market for the agricultural products (maize, groundnuts, round nuts, sweet potatoes, sorghum, millet, beef, and milk).

#### **4.4.8 Farming Projects and Sustainability**

The following are some of the facts raised by the participants:

##### ***Jokoniya***

*I think my farming projects will be sustainable because I have already established myself in the sense that I have managed to acquire equipment which is necessary for sustainability, for example a tractor, irrigation borehole, hoes and a combine harvester.*

##### ***Farai***

*I will make it a point that I succeed in maintaining my projects, though it can be difficult or impossible in times of drought.*

##### ***Mudadi***

*I think it will be difficult for me to be able to sustain my projects because of lack of man power, financial resources, equipment and a market to sell the products.*

##### ***Tinaye***

*I think it will be easy for me to be able to sustain my projects because I have established myself in terms of reliable market to sell my products which pays me very well each and every time I supply them with products.*

##### ***Chikwanda***

*It will be difficult because we do not have collateral security for us to be able to get loan from banks so that we can produce at large scale.*

## **Discussion**

Ninety per cent of the respondents indicated that they would be able to sustain their farming projects for various reasons. Ten per cent indicated that it would be difficult for them which is represented by some of the participants below.

Natural disasters like frequent droughts in the Southern African Development Community (SADC) were a cause for worry as far as the sustainability of the farming projects were concerned (chicken, beef, goat, maize and many more projects) which mushroomed with the advent of the FTLRP. Given the fact that the newly resettled farmers have a weak financial base, their desire to own modernised machinery and expertise becomes a nightmare which automatically jeopardises the sustainability of most of the projects.

The farmers lack irrigation equipment and knowledge which means that the sustainability of the agricultural projects was highly questionable. The increased resource depletion like trees, wetlands, high levels of erosion, and siltation of water sources raises alarms as far as the sustainability of the projects is concerned. This also threatens the environment.

As mentioned above, the major constraint in peasant agriculture is lack of collateral security in order to access bank loans. The respondents acknowledged that banks reject their applications for funding. Others indicated that they need not to stress themselves since they know that they will never be considered for any financial assistance.

On the other hand, some of the projects are sustainable given the fact that some farmers are diversifying which means that the projects and farming activities can support each other for the good of the owner and the family. The World Bank (2008)

asserts that the developing world needs to be taught how to deal with environmental problems and also how to diversify in order to remain relevant in the changing world.

#### **4.5 The Effects of the FTLRP on the Beneficiaries' Social Reproduction**

The following are some of the points which were raised by the participants:

##### ***Tawanda***

*The FTLRP brought a great achievement in our lives because we had no access to land. We had no means of production, but after acquiring land we started using it as our means of production. FTLRP has a positive effect on our social reproduction because in our African culture land is very important since our cultural activities are agro-based.*

##### **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries generally agreed that the FTLRP affected their social reproduction positively. Most of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP indicated that land reform enabled them to produce more as compared to their time in the communal areas. This view is supported by Matowaniyka and Marongwe (2004) who claim that land reform positively changed the lives of many people. Access to the means of production influences alleviation of poverty, especially among the poor of the poorest, principally because land is the shrine of black people.

The view above is supported by Karl Marx (1848) since he was of the view that the poor are in a state of poverty principally because their access to the means of production is limited by those who have access. To support the above mentioned points, Asante (2003) asserts that land does not only spell the livelihoods of black people but it is the way of life concurrently a means for survival.

A human being's wealth is defined with his/her access to land as is the case in India. The same applies to the beneficiaries of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme; their social reproduction was positively impacted.

#### **4.5.1 The Agro-Based African Cultural Economic Activities**

*The following are some the claims which were made by the respondents:*

##### ***Tawanda***

*We are involved in a number of activities which include rearing domestic animals such as cattle, goats, sheep, farming maize, sweet potatoes, peanuts, groundnuts and vegetables.*

#### **Discussion**

All the newly resettled farmers indicated that they embarked on different activities that are rearing of animals and production of crops on a small scale though. Subsistence farming has always been an African traditional way of survival, hence Afrocentricity argues for the restoration of the African people's culture, identity, values and economic activities (Asante, 2000). This allows farmers to spread their risks in times of droughts. Given the swathes of land, these activities are being implemented well which means that their future looks very promising.

The critiques of the Zimbabwean land reform maintain that the FTLRP destroyed the economy completely citing reasons of unproductive peasant agriculture. They do not have animals which is why they depend on their social networks for draught power (animals to use for farming) and other necessities. This means that there are respondents who are asset poor but promising to climb the ranks of social hierarchies.

#### **4.5.2 The FTLRP and Gender Equality**

The following are some of the ideas which were brought forward by the participants:

##### ***Tanyaradzwa***

*As a young woman in Africa and in this part of the continent where gender issues are part of current issues, I have been waiting for this day and it has come. I have finally been recognized and have been given my rightful inheritance. I feel that I have been dignified and respected by my government by being given that which I am entitled to, which is my land.*

##### ***Tichayeva***

*The FTLRP has managed to bring gender sensitiveness because it is all inclusive. As women we never used to own land because African culture believes that land should be owned by men because they are the main representatives of families.*

#### **Discussion**

All the females who acquired land expressed happiness because it was new for them to own land in their own names. Given the advent of the FTLRP, land access has shown some change though not enough across genders as compared to the communal areas where men only could access land at the expense of women. In this new arrangement, there are some clear-cut changes where women can own land in their rightful names. The well-established norm is that women should benefit from any programme alongside men. This is substantiated by the Marxist approach which wants to see fair distribution of resources among people (Marx, 1884).

Gaidzanwa (1995) and Goebel (2005) support this by asserting that most programmes are not gender sensitive. This myth was disproved in the wake of the FTLRP. Despite some effort expended in the land reform programme, patriarchal approaches are resistant, principally because more men had much access to land as compared to a small fraction of women. This kind of approach militates against poverty alleviation which results in poverty being gendered in most economies especially in Third World economies.

All female beneficiaries of the FTLRP indicated that they were satisfied with the new approach of distributing land for it gave them a share on which to cultivate crops of their own choice though the fairness was not sufficient to quench male domination in the whole programme. Problems associated with women's access to land can be broadly divided into structural restrictions linked to the organisation of society which has bias towards men since colonial times.

The social and legal obstacles affecting women in particular has added to the exclusion and oppression of women. The national land reform programme has formally identified many of the social problems associated with land access including those facing women today. This can be equated to Ritzer and Goodman (2004)'s view when they argue that the main idea of Marxism is to have equal distribution of resources in societies amongst people.

### **4.5.3 The Importance of Taking Back the Land which was Taken Away from the Beneficiaries' forefathers**

The following are some of the assertions which were made by the participants:

#### ***Tinos***

*It is important for people to understand that we are here and we are proud of our human dignity. It is also important for, especially the Western countries to realise that as a "poor continent" according to technological advancement and development in economics and infrastructure, the only wealth we have indigenously own is our land and that which grows in that soil, which is agricultural products.*

#### ***George***

*I would like to say with the FTLRP our pride as Africans lie in our soil, in our land. It was especially unbearable for me, my president and other people who share the same passion I have for our country and our land to see this land, the only wealth, our only source of pride and dignity in the hands of those that came and forcefully took from our forefathers.*

#### ***George***

*It is important because it appeases our forefathers and we feel connected to them when we are staying on the land which used to be theirs.*

### **Farai**

*It is some form of emancipation to us because we have received the land which was forcefully grabbed from our ancestors by cruel aliens (whites). The other reason why we also feel it is some form of emancipation for us is that we are the rightful owners of this land. Truly speaking, there was not a single European who came here with a piece of land. Therefore, this process makes us feel like dignified human beings.*

### **Garikai**

*We have benefited from this programme not only in the economic sense, but we have benefited by having that feeling of pride and of being respected by our people through the FTLRP.*

### **Chiri**

*It is important because our great grandfathers were buried on this land.*

### **Chamunorwa**

*Land is a gift given to us as Africans by God. The fact that we have been dispossessed of our God-given gift was a serious problem for our dignity to an extent that we felt inferior.*

### **Discussion**

All the participants indicated that the land belongs to them, and therefore getting it back was a natural human right. The land was taken without the issue of courts so it must be returned without legal and impediments. As indicated before, land spells the livelihoods of most poor people to an extent that depriving them of such an important means of

survival is nothing but leading them into poverty. This affirms Ritzer and Goodman (2004)'s assertion that Marxism is an approach which focuses on emancipating the poor from the bond of poverty.

The participants argued that it was of paramount importance to get land for it allows them to produce enough food for their ever-growing families. Given the fact that most Zimbabwean households are agro based, automatically land becomes very important in the African culture. This adds to the idea of Afrocentricity, to return African people to their roots.

Despite the fact that land was needed for farming and residential purposes, the respondents cited reasons such as the graves of their ancestors as very important since they cannot be separated from the land. The other advantage of getting land back, which the respondents cited, was the significant contribution to the alleviation of poverty, social and economic injustices caused by the past colonial regime's policies in both rural and urban areas.

Reforming tenure systems and relations in order to reduce rural poverty and hunger in developing countries, was agreed locally, nationally and internationally by those in need of land as asserted by Moyo (1995), Makumbe (2003), and Hall (2001). Moyo (1995) in particular maintains that land reform is the sole medicine to the cure of poverty. There are advantages that come with getting land, but accessing capital asset alone can achieve little if not supported by other sectors in achieving the goal of poverty alleviation. Marongwe (2003) argues that land reform alone can do very little in solving the chronic and abject poverty developing economies are faced with.

#### **4.5.4 The Feelings after Acquiring Land**

The following are some of the statements which were made by the respondents:

##### ***Chamunorwa***

*Personally I felt proud and important because of being able to recover my God-given gift. Today we are full of joy, happiness and dignity because we have managed to repossess our gift.*

##### ***Tichaona***

*It is my full belief that acquiring land is a great success. It makes peace between us and the liberation fighters who died fighting for land and democracy because their spirits will be happy or at rest to see us taking back the land. The spirit of liberation fighters who died fighting for land was not happy seeing us doing nothing about taking back the land which they were supposed to inherit; therefore, they will regard us as useless people. Now that we have acquired back the land which they were fighting for, their spirits are feeling proud of us and they now begin to see us as responsible children.*

##### ***Zvinoreva***

*Wars were fought, lives were lost and blood was shed for this land and it would be wrong for those lives and that blood to have been shed in vain. Our ancestors were humiliated, stripped of the one thing that makes a man or a woman, which is dignity. Today no one can smile and say it was not in vain, that I have Mbuya Nehanda's dignity in my land and that I wear Sekuru Kaguvi's pride on my sleeve.*

## **Discussion**

All the respondents indicated that they are happy that they have acquired land. Getting land was met with a wild jubilation among the farmers. All of the respondents asserted that they felt recognised by the government.

The spirit of success was felt by most of the participants. The respondents felt rewarded through getting land, their status was improved and their poverty was reduced through access to land. The respondents also think by getting the land back they have appeased the freedom fighters who died fighting for land's spirits hence they are happy because they feel like responsible children. This supports Marx (1848)'s idea that change can only be achieved through a radical approach.

### **4.5.5 Kaguvi and Nehanda**

#### **Zvinoreva**

*Kaguvi was the first man to mobilize the Africans in Zimbabwe to fight for their land which they were dispossessed of and Nehanda was also the first woman to fight for her land back.*

#### **4.5.6 The FTLRP Beneficiaries and Accomplishment of One of the Objectives Which Kaguvi and Nehanda died for**

*The following are some of the accounts which were made by the participants:*

##### **Zvinoreva**

*I have appeased Kaguvi and Nehanda's spirits because upon their assassination by the colonial masters Nehanda prophesised that her bones shall rise to fight the colonial system and take back what belongs to her, which is land.*

##### **Chamaona**

*I feel like a dignified human being because my comrades and I now see ourselves as complete Zimbabweans who own land in their own country. Before the FTLRP we were like foreigners in our own country because we never used to own land, but our former colonial masters owned what rightfully belonged to us.*

##### **Discussion**

Ninety per cent of the respondents indicated that they were inspired by the Kaguvi and Nehanda spirit to fight for their land while ten per cent attributed their getting land to God. Kaguvi and Nehanda were the first Africans in Zimbabwe to fight for land, though they were later assassinated in 1894 because of their activism. The economic and social lives of the farmers were changed after acquiring land. The above points are supported by Bouiding (2000) who makes a strong case that the hope for economic growth and poverty reduction in the rural context of sub-Saharan Africa remains rooted in the land.

The respondents also cited that the job well-done by the people during the Kaguvi and Nehanda time was fulfilled by the FTLRP which increased access to land and other resources for economic, social, and political development. Hence, Asante (2000) argues that the centre of African people, their culture, identity, values and economic activities, experiences with regards to their history and belief system. In other words, the spirit of the spirit mediums mentioned above led to the general populace receiving land from the colonial masters, thereby increasing the chances of poverty alleviation.

#### **4.5.7 The FTLRP and the Injustice of Colonialism in Regard to Land Allocation**

The following are some of the positions which were taken by the respondents:

##### ***Chamaona***

*To a larger extent the FTLRP has managed to effect justice because the land which the white farmers were occupying was stolen by their forefathers from the African people, hence giving it back to Africans is significant in correcting the injustice which took place.*

##### ***Tinaye***

*I feel very glad to own this land because the main reason why we fought the white settlers was to get back the land which we were supposed to inherit from our forefathers. When you are fighting for something and you do not get what you fought for it does not make you happy, but when you achieve what you fought for you feel jubilant. This is why we are full of joy because we have acquired land which claimed all our energies during the liberation struggle.*

## **Amos**

*By having land it means we can now produce enough food that will be ours and our families. Still on that same land we can grow some cash crops and sell them to buy food and other commodities which is very positive for our social reproduction because our families will get what they need to survive. In our African culture land is the most important factor and the key to the future survival of every community.*

## **Discussion**

The FTLRP reduced the injustices, which came through colonialism. Hence, one of the Afrocentric approach's central idea is to study African people's experiences with regard to their history (Asante, 2000). The land which was owned by one white farmer before land reform, that particular asset is now owned by more than seventy families with a total of more than two hundred members. Matondi and Moyo (2003) asserted that land occupation in Zimbabwe was the first major reform. This is a clear indication that the inequalities were reduced.

Those who acquired land by looting it from the rightful owners lost it through the FTLRP, which means that there was some justice practised despite the worldwide outcry that the land reform in Zimbabwe was destructive and chaotic. Those who were robbed of their inheritance received it through the often called 'chaotic Zimbabwe land redistribution'. Eighty per cent of the newly resettled farmers indicated that the land was expensive for them to get through the "willing seller, willing buyer" clause so the advent of the FTRLRP in Zimbabwe increased land access to the poor.

Moyo (2004) argues that the most common political objective of land reform was to abolish feudal or colonial forms of land ownership, often by taking land away from large landowners and distributing it to the landless peasants. He describes land reform as a deliberate change in the way agricultural field is held or owned. Such transfer of ownership may be with or without consent or compensation.

The FTLRP was very crucial as agreed at a conference on land reform held in 1998 in Harare, Zimbabwe. Forty-eight countries and international organisations from the donor community unanimously endorsed the need for land reform as being very 'essential' for poverty reduction', economic growth and political stability.

Elich (1998) asserted that the intent of land reform in Zimbabwe is not only to redress the injustices of colonial theft, but also to reduce widespread poverty and raise the standard of living, not only for the resettled farmers, but also for the society as a whole. Elich's (1998) view is supported by Moyo (1995) who asserts that the primary focus of land reform is the historically disadvantaged; those who have been denied access to land and have been disinherited of their land rights. But this must be done with respect of property and human rights though very difficult under such circumstances.

Moyo (1995) is supported by Marongwe (2004) who further argues that landlessness breeds poverty, which engenders disease and squalor and that poor health leads to death. This means that the need for redressing the social and economic injustices should be taken as a priority and as a matter of urgency for most developing economies.

#### **4.5.8 Land as the Key to Survival**

The following are some of the arguments made by the newly resettled farmers:

##### ***Amos***

*We will be able to survive from generation to generation because we now own one of the most important means of production. Our community will be able to continue growing because all required natural resources for the well-being of the community will be provided by this land.*

##### ***Tapiwa***

*Now we have a stable source of income in the name of land which has helped us to be well dignified people who can afford their basic requirements. Generally, the socio-economic activities of villagers are determined by a number of varieties of resources needed for survival which are found on the land. The FTLRP is good for our social reproduction because we will now be able to access those natural resources which our economic activities require.*

#### **Discussion**

All the respondents indicated that the FTLRP has positively impacted their social reproduction. The fact that African social reproduction activities are centred on land means that the availability of land will ensure sustainability of the beneficiaries' social reproduction. In other words this implies that the social reproduction activities of African people in Zimbabwe depend on land. This fulfils Keto (1989)'s argument that the African centred perspective rests on the premise that it is valid to position Africa as a cultural starting base in the study of peoples of African descent.

#### **4.5.9 Natural Resources Accessed from the Land**

##### ***Manginde***

*Soil for farming, trees for firewood and construction, and grass for livestock.*

##### **Discussion**

All the respondents expressed gratitude of the natural resources which the FTLRP has made available to them. This means that the FTLRP has positively affected the beneficiaries' social reproduction. This explains Mukamuri (2000)'s claim that land is important for the social reproduction of households in Zimbabwe's communal areas.

#### **4.5.10 The FTLRP and the Restoration of Shona Cultural Practices**

The following are some of the facts which were raised by the participants:

##### ***Muneyi***

*The FTLRP is a pivotal programme in helping us to revisit our African cultural practices which no longer existed because of lack of land. Now that we have land, we will carry out all the cultural practices which used to take place on the land in the olden days.*

##### ***Nhamo***

*In our African culture families are supposed to have land which belongs to the family members. In such land all family members, including the extended family, must acquire a piece of land. The family will pass ownership of the land from generation to generation. If you walk around places in our rural areas people will tell you, for example,*

*that this area belongs to the Chimombes or any other family residing in that particular area.*

### **Mudadi**

*FTLRP is very important in restoring our African cultural practices because the African people do not see their land simply as property or merely as an economic asset. The land is intimately associated with the history of the chief and the ancestors of the chief who lived on it. The significance of the land is illustrated in the African culture in which Mwari, the high god, provides resources to men.*

### **Zhakata**

*Some of the places which are in this resettlement area used to be regarded as sacred places by our forefathers. Our forefathers used to respect those areas, but the white farmers never did the same to those places because they do not have significance for them. Now that we have acquired the land we will make use of that land with respect because it was considered sacred by our forefathers, which means we have to follow our elders' beliefs. For example, you are not allowed to say certain things which criticise the area if you are working in a sacred place. You have to be grateful or praise your ancestors after harvesting from that area.*

### **Discussion**

All the respondents claimed that the FTLRP is very important in restoring their Shona cultural practices which was attested by some of the respondents above. This means that the effects of the FTLRP are positive for the Shona cultural practices restoration. The FTLRP has influenced the resuscitation of land ownership by families, which is in Shona culture a norm that a certain area should be allocated to a certain family. This is the reason why Matondi and Moyo (2003) opined that the land occupation in Zimbabwe

has achieved the first major reform. This position is also supported by Asante (2000)'s idea that African people should be returned to their history.

#### **4.5.11 Praising of Ancestors after Harvesting from Sacred Areas**

The following are some of the points which were made by the respondents:

##### ***Zhakata***

*I prepare African beer and invite my neighbours to drink with me. During the gathering I will tell my neighbours that my ancestors are looking after me very well which is the reason why I have prepared this beer to praise them.*

##### ***Jokoniya***

*The FTLRP makes us feel like successful citizens and proud African people because we can now continue with our ancestral beliefs. The process helps us to relocate ourselves culturally as African people.*

#### **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries indicated that they brew beer for their ancestors after harvesting as a way of showing appreciation to them. Beer brewing has remained one of the overused channels through which ancestors can be praised and remembered in most communities, especially the African people. All the participants indicated that they have returned to their ways of praising the ancestors through organising big occasions/gatherings where ancestors were praised for the good harvest and good health. Hence, one of Afrocentricity's main idea is protection of African cultural elements (Asante, 2000).

#### **4.5.12 The FTLRP and Cultural Relocation of African People**

##### ***Jokoniya***

*The FTLRP has given me land where I am able to practise all the African cultural activities, for example rearing goats, cattle, indigenous chickens and farming, millet, rapoko, groundnuts and traditional vegetables which are not available in the shops. It has also helped me to practise farming activities such as nhimbe.*

#### **4.5.13 Nhimbe**

##### ***Jokoniya***

*Nhimbe refers to a gathering where the host prepares African beer so that people will come and help him to plough or cultivate his farming fields, and drinking the beer which he or she prepared.*

##### ***Zvaita***

*If we look back to who we are as Africans, we have always been an agricultural people. We have always survived through our land and the natural treasure on it.*

#### **Discussion**

All the respondents expressed a number of ways in which the FTLRP was crucial in relocating the African people to their culture. The respondents practised mixed agriculture which includes growing crops and rearing of animals. Most of the products which they farm are not even found on the shelves of many shops.

The traditional kinds of vegetables which define most African household food stuff were produced consistently for example muboora, gusha and others. There are some types of animals and crops which are specifically farmed by a certain race or tribe. For instance, Shona people cultivate maize and rear cattle. A good example is the rearing of goats and the production of some traditional crops such as millet, *rapoko*, and groundnuts.

These kinds of farming practices mentioned are very important for they correctly connect an individual to his or her roots which are the ancestors because their ancestors used to practice same farming activities. This is the kind of development which Afrocentricity wants to see taking place because it protects African cultural elements which Asante (2000) mentioned as one of the key ideas of Afrocentricity.

The term *nhimbe* refers to a situation where the farmers come together to help someone with either ploughing or harvesting from the fields. The pooling of the labour together makes it very crucial in times of work force scarcity. Besides the issue of pulling labour together, the *nhimbe* helps to build relationships among the farmers. At times this practice assists in rebuilding relationships which had weathered because of lack of land. *Nhimbe* is very important in Kippure-Iram resettlement scheme because it provides farmers with enough labour during ploughing and harvesting times. Such practice is an African way of doing things and therefore, conforms to the Afrocentric paradigm's idea of the substance of African regeneration (Asante, 1998).

#### **4.5.14 Land and Survival**

The following are some of the arguments made by the participants:

##### **Zvaita**

*I survive on this land through fishing in our rivers, gathering indigenous fruits and vegetables that grow naturally on the land, the animals that thrive on the land and those that we learnt to farm by ourselves. Therefore, land is our way of living and the soil has always been good to us.*

##### **Matewe**

*The land which we now own belonged to our fore-fathers and was taken away from them forcefully by colonial masters. The FTLRP has helped so much because it has made us the inheritors of our forefathers' land, which is the way it should be in an African culture.*

##### **Muchadei**

*In our customary practices each African ethnic group has its own territory (nyika) in which its chief (ishe) allocates land to ward heads (sadunhu) who in turn distribute land to the village heads (samusha). With the success of the FTLRP we will be able to revive our customary practices and at the end of the day we will be very happy because we will be completely living in our real African culture.*

## **Discussion**

All the respondents agreed that the FTLRP has ensured them with sustainability which was indicated by the above respondents. This implies that the FTLRP has brought a way of living to its beneficiaries.

The activities which the beneficiaries of the FTLRP are busy with on the land have provided them with sustainability concerning their social reproduction. Hence Mukamuri (2000) said land is important for social reproduction. The FTLRP has regenerated the African culture's survival by redistributing land back to the African people. This is supported by Asante (2000)'s idea that there is need to regenerate African people.

### **4.5.15 The FTLRP's Effect on Living in a Real African Shona Culture**

The following are some of the facts made by the respondents:

#### ***Muchadei***

*Before the FTLRP we did not live in a real African culture because there was shortage of land, since most of the vast land was owned by the whites, something which did not allow us to have territories for the various ethnic groups.*

#### ***Tasunungurwa***

*I feel more African when I am ploughing in my field with the hot African sun tanning my skin and in November during harvest time when I am harvesting maize, fresh from the field. In this land I was given back my cultural identity. I am in tune with my Africanism.*

### **Mutapi**

*Our forefathers used to get their meat from hunting with their dogs in some of the bushes found on this land. So now that we have land we can now go into the bushes and hunt so that we can get meat for our families, which is our Shona cultural way of providing for our families.*

### **Kudzai**

*At times when our forefathers had some health problems they used to go into the bush and find some roots or trees and herbs which are called muti in Shona to treat themselves. Now that we have land when we are sick we will go to some of our elders who are still alive so that they can show us relevant trees which can cure certain diseases in the traditional African way.*

### **Ruzive**

*In our customary practices of land occupancy and use of land, our approach used to be inclusive rather than exclusive. No one who needed land was supposed to go landless; groups or individuals had rights to land. In the majority of cases the village head or ward chief allocated land to people. In other cases individual villagers would allow a temporary resident to use their land if they had any to spare. Therefore, the historic process of acquiring land has been very influential for us to restore all those customary processes of land occupancy and use which will identify us with our real African culture.*

**David**

*We are very glad to have this land because even if we die today all our children are going to occupy this land and do all the economic activities to help them to support their social needs.*

**Muchapiwa**

*Land was inherited by having it passed to male members through the patriarchal line. This practice meant that men generally obtained land from families in which they grew up. So when we look at it today with the FTLRP taking place, this system is definitely bound to have an impact on our African cultural renaissance.*

**Fadzai**

*I feel that as a black African I can only identify myself by the rivers that run through this continent, the exorbitant wildlife that graze our forests, our indigenous trees, our rich minerals and the other vast wonders that are embedded in our land. Therefore this land is Africa. This land defines Africanism.*

**Taurai**

*I think the FTLRP has affected us in a positive way socially because kings have fought for ownership of this land, battles have been fought, lives have been lost and blood has been spilt for this land. And this blood has soaked into our soil and has flown down the rivers in the river battles. The spirits of our ancestors therefore lived in this soil and in our forests and in our rivers and our on mountains.*

## **Discussion**

The above findings which all the beneficiaries agreed upon can be understood in a way that availability of land has allowed the beneficiaries of the FTLRP to be able to live in a number of ways which represents the African Shona culture. For example the beneficiaries are able to hunt, farm crops and animals for their families which are African social reproduction means.

The beneficiaries are now able to look for traditional medicine from some special trees which are available in the resettlement area which their fore-fathers used for treatment. Land can now be passed from generation to generation of families because of availability of land which is a way of African people to ensure availability of land to people. This is supported by Asante (2000) when he debates that Afrocentricity draws its concept from the African culture and bases itself on the culture of the African experience.

### **4.5.16 Positive Social Effects of the FTLRP**

The following are some of the comments made by the respondents:

#### ***Taurai***

*The fact that we are staying here where our previous kings fought for this land and some people died connects us with their spirits which live in this land.*

## **Chisadza**

*My origins are from a royal family and history tells me that my great grandfather who was a chief was buried in this resettlement area. Occupying this land makes me feel connected to my ancestors. This connection will help me enjoy great harvests because my ancestors will be looking after me.*

## **Discussion**

All the beneficiaries of the FTLRP agreed upon the above mentioned findings. The FTLRP was socially positive in the sense that it brought a new society bound by one issue of land grabbing. The respondents indicated that they secured land which was socially separated from them for a long time through the deeds of the colonial regime which socially segregated the country on racial grounds. Getting the land made many farmers feel connected to their forefathers who fought for the land and some who were buried there before the eviction by white colonialists.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Summary**

The problem investigated in this study relates to the socio-economic outcomes that the Fast-Track Land Redistribution Programme (FTLRP) produced. The study focused on the voices of the newly resettled farmers as previously the problems had been analysed at the levels of government, NGOs and international organisations, thus ignoring the voice of the people at the grassroots. The study focused on Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme in Masvingo Province, Zimbabwe.

The Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme beneficiaries indicated that the FTLRP has positively affected them socio-economically to a larger extent. For example, seventy-five per-cent mentioned that they were not employed before the FTLRP and after acquiring land it became their source of income.

The research employed qualitative research methods which were descriptive. Data collection in this study was carried out through the use of focus group interviews and secondary data were collected from the Zimbabwean government, NGOs, international organisations and available literature.

The population comprised of all the newly resettled farmers of the Kippure-Iram Resettlement scheme. Thirty (30) out of forty (40) respondents were interviewed and the researcher made use of non-probability sampling, which was purposive. Ten of the farmers were not interviewed because they were not true representation of the beneficiaries of the FTLRP because they were not active in the programme. Analysis of data in this study was carried out through the use of content analysis.

The following is a summary of major findings:

- All of the FTLRP beneficiaries in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme indicated that the FTLRP had positive social benefits because acquiring land made them feel proud because they have retained what was taken away by force from their forefathers and they feel connected to their ancestors.
- The FTLRP benefited the people economically to a larger extent because sixty per cent of the Kipurre-Iram newly resettled farmers who were interviewed pointed out that since they acquired land they had made profit and that enable them to send their children to boarding schools, which they could not afford before the FTLRP.
- Seventy-six per cent of the beneficiaries who were interviewed also indicated that the FTLRP had improved their life because they now could provide for their families with food which they produce from their fields. This means they no longer buy certain types of food.
- To a lesser extend the FTLRP has negatively affected some people. Twenty-four per cent of the participants mentioned that they were employed by the former white commercial famers and after the implementation of the FTLRP they were left unemployed and their lives had gone from bad to worse.

In summary, one can say, generally, that the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme were positive, hence most (seventy-five per cent) of the beneficiaries provided positive answers and were happy because land had been made available to them.

## **5.2 Conclusion**

Considering the major findings and statistics of the study mentioned above, the researcher concludes that generally the FTLRP was a success. The researcher considers FTLRP to be a success to a larger extent because most of the participants in all the three themes which were discussed during the focus group interviews indicated that the FTLRP's socio-economic outcomes were positive in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme. However to a lesser extent the socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP were negative in Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme as indicated by few participants mentioned in the summary above.

## **5.3 Recommendations**

On the basis of the empirical findings from this study carried out in the Kippure-Iram Resettlement Scheme, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

- Land should be given to people who have the knowledge of how to farm and produce consistently for the benefit of the whole economy because most of the beneficiaries are not producing large quantities;
- The government should join hands with other private, non-governmental organisations and civil organisations in trying to bring about productive land redistribution because no form of partnership between government and other organisations exist;
- The newly resettled farmers need training for them to acquire modern skills so as to increase production locally and nationally, for example genetically modified organisms;
- The farmers need to be supported financially in order to meet the costs for inputs such as seed, machinery, and chemicals for plant and animal diseases;

- Cultural reforms should be effected in order to increase land access to all people. In this study 24 out of 30 of the beneficiaries were males which shows a very huge imbalance.
- In future other researchers should compare socio-economic outcomes of the FTLRP between two different resettlement schemes. This will show the extent of the benefits and other challenges faced by these emerging farmers.

## References

Asante, M. K. (2000). *The Afrocentric Approach to Issues*. New York: New York Press.

Bailey, K. D. (1997). *Methods of Social Science Research*. New York: Free Press

Banjties J. (2006). *Learner's Book: Business Economics*. Cape Town: Maskow Miller Longman.

Blaikie P. (2004) *At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability, and Disasters*. New York, NY: Routledge

Birdshall, P. and Londono, G. (2002). *Thoughts on the latest World Bank Policy, Discussion Paper*. London, Great Britain: Oxfam.

Bobbie, M. (2008). Handbook for Team-Based Qualitative Research:  
<http://books.google.co.za/books?id=nnwJbi52StwC&pg=PA119&lpg=PA119&dq=bobbie>  
Accessed on 24 August 2010.

Bouding, E. K. (2000). *Beyond Economics on Society: Essays on Society, Religion and Ethics*. Michigan: Michigan University.

Buckle, C. (2002). *African Tears: The Zimbabwe Land Invasions*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball.

Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, Legal Resources Foundation (1997).  
Catholic, Commission.

Chatak, G. & Roy, S. (2007). *Resettlement Revisited: Land Reform Results in Resource Poor Regions in Zimbabwe*. London: Heinemann.

Chigiya, K. & Mabugu, R. (2008). *The deepening economic crisis in Zimbabwe*. Paper prepared for the Ecumenical Support Services. Cape Town: PLAAS.

Cohen, L. (2001). *Analysis of qualitative data: Content analysis*. www.idrc.com. Accessed on 3 April 2010.

Collins, R. (2000). *The Quest to Gain Reality*. New York: Assops Books.

Commercial Farmers Union (2003). Information brochure: Harare, CFU.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London: Sage Publications.

Deininger, K., & May, J. (2000). *Is there scope for growth with Equity?* Available from <http://wbln008.WoldBank.org/networks/essd/icdb.nsf>.

Department for International Development, (2003). *Better livelihoods for poor people: The role of land policy*. London, Policy Paper.

Doob, C.B. (2013). *Social Inequality and Social Stratification in US Society*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Elich, B. (1998). *Land Reform in Southern Africa*. www.idrc.com. Accessed on 25 February 2011.

Ellis, F. (1998). *Household strategies and rural livelihood diversification*. *Journal of Development Studies*, 35(1), 1–38.

Ellis, F., & Biggs, S. (2001). *Evolving themes in rural development 1950s–2000s*. *Development Policy Review*, 19(4), 437–448.

Elich, J. (1998). *Land Reform Process*. www.idrc.com. Accessed on 23 April 2010.

FAO, (2003). *Better Access and secure rights for land: Occasional paper*: London: FAO.

Fulcher, J. & Scott, J. (2007). *Introduction to Sociology*, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. 1997. *In Practical Research Planning and Design*. Oxford: NewYork: Oxford University Press.

Gaidzwana, R. & Goebe, P. (2005). *Women and Access to Land*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe.

Ghimire, K. B. (2001). *Land Reform and Peasant Livelihoods: The Social Dynamics of Rural Poverty*. London: ITDG Publishers.

Giddens, A. (2004). *Sociology, 5th edition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

HIV/AIDS Zimbabwe 2002. *The Effects of HIV/AIDS*. Harare: HIV/AIDS Zimbabwe.

Jacobs, S. (2005). *Land reform and Agrarian change in Southern Africa. Occasional Paper Series*. Cape Town: PLAAS.

Jazairy, P. (2004). *Conflicts Over Land and Other Resources*. Cape Town: Plaas.

Kanyeze, G. (2003). *The economic crisis in Zimbabwe and the way forward. Paper prepared for crisis in Zimbabwe*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe.

Khan, M. H. (2004). *Power, property rights and the issue of land reform. Journal of Agrarian Change*, 4(1):17-23.

- Kerdarchi D. (2006). *Learner's Book: Economic and Management Sciences*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Krueger, R. A. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry growth: Data collection methods*. www.psychoma.co.za. Accessed on 20 February 2009.
- Lionel, C. & Stoneman, C. (2003). *Zimbabwe Politics, Economics and Society: Land Reform Effects*. London: Pinder.
- Makumbe, J. (2003) & Hall, R. (2001). In *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Sapes Books.
- Makumbe, J. (2002). *Zimbabwe's governance and land reform crisis. Occasional Paper*: Harare, University of Zimbabwe.
- Mararike ,C. G. (2003). *Survival Strategies in Rural Zimbabwe*. Harare: Mond Books.
- Marongwe, N. (2003). *Farm Occupations: Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business*. Harare, Weaver Press.
- Martin, D. & Phyllis, J. (2002). *The Struggle for Zimbabwe*. London: Faber.
- Matondi, P. & Moyo, S. (2003). *Experiences with market based land reform in Zimbabwe. In F. Barros, S. Sauer & S. Schwartzman (Eds.). The Negative Impacts of the World Bank Market Based Land Reform*. Brasilia: Rede Brasil.
- Matowanyika, J. & Marongwe, N. (2004). *Land and Sustainable Development in Southern Africa: An Exploration of Some Emerging Issues*. Harare: Zimbabwe Regional Environmental Organisation.
- Marx, K. (1848). *Historical materialism*. www.idrc.com. Accessed on 3 April 2010.

- Meredith, M. (2005). *A History of Independence: The fate of Africa*. New York: Public Affairs Publishers.
- Ministry of Lands and Agriculture. *Land Redistribution Effects (Report of 2010)*: Harare, Government of Zimbabwe.
- Ministry of Land and Agriculture. *Fast-Track Land Redistribution (Report of 1999 to 2001)*. Harare, Government of Zimbabwe.
- Moset, B. (1979). *Land and Agrarian*. www.idrc.com. Accessed on 5 June 2010.
- Moyo, S. (2004). *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Harare: Sapes Books.
- Moyo, S. & Yeros, P. (2005). *Reclaiming the Land*. New York: Zed Books.
- Moyo, S. & Hall, L. (1995). In *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Harare: SAPES.
- Muchena, D. (2003). *The deepening political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe: Context and perspective*. Paper prepared for the Ecumenical Support Services: Harare, University of Zimbabwe.
- Mukamuri, B. (2000). *Beyond Economics: Land Reform*. New York: UNDP.
- Mukiwa, G. P. (1996). *A White Boy in Africa*. London: Macmillan.
- Neuman, W. L. (1997). *Social Research Methods*. Pretoria: Viacom Publishers.
- Obadina, T. (2008). *Business Information Services*. London: Penguin Books.

- Oxfam International (2002). *Rural development through redistribution: Policy paper*. London: Oxfam.
- Oxfam International (2005). *Rural development through redistribution: Policy paper*. London: Oxfam.
- Palmer, R. (2001). *Land and Racial Discrimination in Zimbabwe*. London: Heinemann.
- Reviere, S. (2000). *Beliefs and Actions: Acted Reality*. Rome: Bravton Press.
- Richardson, A. (2004). *The Economy of Zimbabwe after FTLRP: Land Reform and Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sachikonye, R. & Makumbe, J. (2000). *Reclaiming The Land: Land Reform and Agricultural Development*. Harare: Sapes Books.
- Scones D, et al, (2004). *The Myths and Realities about the Land Reform in Zimbabwe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scoones, D. 1999. *Geography Themes and Perspectives*. New York. Oxford University
- Shanon, C. (2004). *Content Analysis*: [www.scoresonline.org.uk](http://www.scoresonline.org.uk). Accessed on 21 November 2008.
- Shanon, E.S. (2004). *Approaches to Qualitative Content Analysis*. [www.bmj.com](http://www.bmj.com) accessed on 4 June 2008
- Singleton, P. (2004). *Purposive Sampling*: [www.emerald.com/journals](http://www.emerald.com/journals) Accessed on 23 July 2009.
- Sithole, M. (1999). *Zimbabwe: Struggles Within the Struggle, 1957-1980*. Harare: Rujeko Publishers.

- Stoneman, C. (2003). *Issues of Race, Class, State and Capital in Southern Africa. Zimbabwe's Prospects*. London: Macmillan.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddle C. (2005). *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social Sciences and Behavioural Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Terre Blanche, M., Durrheim, K., & Painter, D. (2006). *Research In Practice: Applied methods for the Social Sciences (2<sup>nd</sup> ed)*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- The Collins Dictionary (2009)*. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/>. Accessed on 10 January 2010.
- UNAIDS, (2006). *HIV/AIDS in Africa*. Harare: UNAIDS.
- Vambe, L. (2000). *Rhodesia to Zimbabwe*. London: Heinemann.
- Varier, A. (2000). *The Road to Zimbabwe, 1890-1980*. London: CAPE.
- World Bank and Independent Observers, (2006). *World Development Report: Attacking Poverty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank, (2008). *Land Policy and Land Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition*: London: Sage Publications.
- Zimbabwean Government (2003). *Implementation Management System: A Manager's Guide, CARD Project*. Masvingo: Belmont Press.

Zimbabwean Government (2005). *FTLRP strategy and sustainability: A review three years after its inception. Discussion Paper. Masvingo: Belmont Press.*

## **APPENDIX 1: FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

### **Session 1**

What are the economic effects of the FTLRP?

- 1.1 What are the employment effects did the FTLRP led to?
- 1.3 What are the environmental effects of the FTLRP?
- 1.4 What are the effects of the FTLRP on wildlife?
- 1.5 How many cattle and goats did you own before and after FTLRP?
- 1.6 Did the FTLRP provide you with enough livestock pastures?
- 1.7 What kind of farming projects are you engaged in?
- 1.8 How much income do you make per annum from your farming projects?
- 1.9 How has the FTLRP affected agricultural productivity?
- 1.10 What have you managed to do with the income which you have made from your farming projects?
  - 1.10.1 Do you think the economic advantages of the FTLRP outweigh its disadvantages?
  - 1.10.2 Have you managed to purchase any modern farming equipment?

## **Session 2**

What are the livelihood effects of the FTLRP?

- 2.1 Has the FTLRP provided with any form of employment?
- 2.2 What means of surviving did the FTLRP provide?
- 2.3 Do you think the FTLRP has affected your livelihood positively or negatively?
- 2.4 Are you able to produce enough food for your families because of the FTLRP?
- 2.5 What kind of farming initiatives are you engaged in?
- 2.6 Did the FTLRP open opportunities for you?
- 2.7 Do you think the land which was allocated to you will be able to provide you with sustainable means of survival?

### **Session 3**

What are the social reproduction effects of the FTLRP?

- 3.1 Do you think the FTLRP has brought sustainable development in your community?
- 3.2 Has the FTLRP managed to generate income for your families?
- 3.3 What are the gender equality effects did the FTLRP led to?
- 3.4 What are the cultural effects of the FTLRP?
- 3.5 Did the FTLRP correct the injustices which were caused by colonialism?
- 3.6 How does the FTLRP affect your pride as Africans?
- 3.7 Do you think the FTLRP has helped you to appease your forefathers who used to own this land?