

February 5, 198

LAND AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN INDEPENDENT ZIMBABWE:
A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

John W. Harbeson
Office of Rural Development
and Development Administration
U.S. Agency for International Development

No more critical issue faces the newly independent government of Zimbabwe than who shall have access to land and on what terms. While the country's industrial and mining sectors are far more important to its economic and social progress than is the case in many less developed countries, nearly 70% of the population depend upon rural land for their livelihood, while agricultural and livestock production account for over 20% of gross domestic product. Customs concerning the allocation and enjoyment of land are central to the fabric of African rural social institutions. The economic and social importance of land to the peoples of Zimbabwe explains its high place on the political agendas of African nationalist movements over the last several decades, the new regime, and the European parties which have stood in opposition to them.

The central consideration is that land distribution, land tenure use policies, and land administration in Zimbabwe have promoted and sustained extreme, racially-based inequality for the past ninety years. Initially in search of gold and later hungry for land, European settlers used their uniquely unfettered political power to claim the best 50% of the land for a few thousand of their number while crowding the numerically predominant African peoples into reserves almost entirely on marginal or poor land. The settler administrations, enjoying internal self-government from 1923 onward, took a great many steps to insure a relatively high European standard of living at the expense of the host African peoples. The settlers supposed that by creating overcrowded reserves they would be able to obtain wage or tenant labor very inexpensively. Notwithstanding the ecological degradation of the so-called Tribal Trust lands (TTLs), resulting from overcrowding and hence

overcultivation and over grazing, the settler government prevented any serious soil conservation or agricultural extension work in these areas until the last twenty years. The settlers opposed soil conservation and agricultural extension work in the TTLs in order to discourage the competition of African smallholders. Marketing and credit policies were skewed to benefit very disproportionately the European commercial farming sector as were transportation and other infrastructural improvements. Over the years, knowledge, skills, programs, and resources of the government related overwhelmingly to the European farming sphere. This biased governmental capacity sharply limited the ability of the minority regime in its later years, when challenged by international economic sanctions, to broaden participation in rural development to include more Africans.

The critical importance of land issues to the future of Zimbabwe became apparent at the Lancaster House conference on the country's independence where agreement on a policy for redistributing rural land became a key to the resolution of broader issues standing in the way of a peaceful transition to majority rule. Agreement on a program of resettling landless and unemployed Africans on underutilized commercial farming land with compensation to the departing European farmers was, however, but the first of many hurdles established by land tenure problems that the Government of Zimbabwe must overcome if equitable rural development is to ensue. Land must be distributed in such a way that the production of commercial land areas is increased rather than simply resulting in the geographic expansion of TTL underdevelopment. The government's policies must preserve the viability of remaining commercial farming enterprises and be seen by their predominantly European proprietors to do so. Expansion of industrial, commercial, and mining sectors is perhaps even more important than resettlement to the task of reducing unemployment and overpopulation in the TTLs. The Government of Zimbabwe must reform its own administrative structures by acquiring better information about living conditions in the TTLs, rethinking inherited policies and programs with smallholder interests in mind, and increasing popular participation in development activities. Africanization of the civil service is an accepted concomitant of Zimbabwe's political independence, and this process must occur in such a fashion that the contributions to be made by existing career civil servants are not lost.

A crucial step to be taken by the independent government, while these processes of transition are still in full sway, is a set of land tenure determinations:

- (1) Whether and how customary land tenure practices are to be modified;
- (2) What long term forms of land tenure are to be permitted those resettled in the commercial farming areas;
- (3) What will be the respective rights of government and peasant farmers within the framework of new land tenure policies to shape the course of rural development; and
- (4) Whether to continue the tenure based distinctions between TTLs and commercial farming zones.

The purposes of this essay are (1) to describe and analyze the current status of land policies, practices, and programs; (2) to explore several categories of major issues that must be treated in defining new land policies; (3) to examine the strengths and weaknesses of alternative models of land reform; and (4) to propose some tentative and preliminary guidelines concerning the directions such policies might take. One of the compensations for long delayed independence is that Zimbabwe can draw upon the lessons and experiences of other African countries in dealing with these issues. Of the earlier generation of independent African states, Kenya's circumstances may have been the most similar to those now obtaining in Zimbabwe. Hence, that country's experiences with land reform will be drawn upon where pertinent in analyzing Zimbabwe's options.

I

Zimbabwe's Inheritance of Land Policy and Land Use

Four fundamental questions must be addressed concerning the evolution of land policy and land use in pre-independence Zimbabwe: (1) how have land use opportunities been apportioned; (2) what have been the rights and obligations associated with land tenure in the commercial farming and Tribal Trust Land compartments; (3) what strategies have been adopted to make better use of the land; and (4) what have been the responses of farmers to these initiatives?

It is one of the major symptoms of Zimbabwe's land problems that so little is known about land use patterns within the areas containing 60% or more of the country's population. As a consequence all the quantitative information and the analysis based thereon must be regarded as preliminary and indicative rather than definitive and precise. One of the country's most pressing tasks is to acquire the needed information concerning land use in the TTLs, normally requiring an extended period of investigation, within a very short time so that urgently required policies can be soundly based.

A. Distribution of Land Use Opportunities Rural land is today officially divided into areas reserved to African peoples and those which in theory are now open to settlement on a non-racial basis but which are in fact still monopolized by European farmers. A small portion of land has also been set aside for national parks and recreation areas. The amounts apportioned to Europeans and Africans has changed significantly over time as a result of political pressures exerted by the European settlers for more land and population pressures that have built up in areas reserved to Africans.

Table I
Historical Summary of Land Distribution in
Zimbabwe

<u>Year</u>	<u>White Controlled</u>	<u>Black Controlled</u>	<u>Non-Racial</u>	<u>Other</u>
1894	15.0%	2.2%	82.8%	
1910	23.4%	26.0%	50.6%	
1923	32.8%	22.0%	45.2%	
1931	50.8%	30.1%	18.5%	0.6%
1961	53.2%	43.5%		0.6%
1969	46.6%	46.6%		3.3%
1977		42.0%	51.2%	6.8%

Source: GOZ Data

The results of these allocations have been population densities in the TTLs approximately 100 times those in the Europeans controlled commercial farming areas. The ratio of population to land in the African Purchas Lands (APLs) was about 50 times that obtaining in the European areas. This disproportion has been even more significant given that the commercial farming areas have dominated the best land. The Government of Zimbabwe has defined five natural regions based on the extent and reliability of rainfall, providing a rough measure of the difficulty and likelihood of successful farming. Regions I and II are the most hospitable to agriculture, regions IV and V the least so.

Table 2
Land Apportionment and Population
Density by Race, 1977

<u>Category</u>	<u>Area ('000 ha)</u>	<u>Population ('000)</u>	<u>Density/Family (ha.)</u>
European Land	15769.5	34	2767.2
European Land	15769.5	1225 (European + Af)	77.4
African TTL	16279.4	3735	26.4
African APL	1416.1	170	49.8

Source: Whitsun Foundation, Data Bank No. 2 Peasant Sector, Families assumed to include six persons in all categories.

One can define a very rough but instructive measure of the allocation of land use potential between the races by treating the relative productive capacity of the natural regions as a function of the difference in the size of the standard landholding units for Africans in TTLs recommended by the Land Husbandry Act 1951 to achieve a given unit of income. If one then weights the amounts of land held by Europeans and Africans in each natural region, one can define an approximation of the relative agro-economic potential assigned each community.

Table 3
Relative Agro-Economic Potential
Assigned Europeans and Africans

<u>Natural Region</u>	<u>Standard Plot Size</u>	<u>Relative Production Potential</u>	<u>European Land ('000 ha.)</u>		<u>TTL Land ('000 ha.)</u>		<u>APL Land ('000 ha.)</u>	
			<u>Act.</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Act.</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Act.</u>	<u>Weight</u>
I	68	5.7	440.2	2509.1	128.3	731.5	7.1	41.6
II	68	5.7	4324.5	24649.7	1255.1	7154.1	252.1	1377.0
III	80	5.0	3240.6	16203.0	2814.7	14073.5	696.3	2680.5
IV	160	2.5	4025.8	10064.5	7307.3	8278.3	523.0	1307.5
V	390	1.0	3648.4	3648.4	4774.0	3774.0	97.6	97.6
			15679.5	57074.7	16279.4	45011.2	1416.1	5504.2
<u>Average quality of land</u>				3.64		2.14		3.88
<u>Ratios</u>				1.7		1.0		1.8

Source: Land Husbandry Act (1951)

Clearly, the aggregate weighted differences in land use potential between European, APL, and TTL farming zones were very considerable. Moreover, services and infrastructure to promote higher standards of living were correspondingly inequitably allocated. European farming was subsidized through cheap African labor and in many other ways, while extension and agricultural research activities were heavily concentrated on the European areas. European farmers enjoyed freehold tenure, while Africans were forced to rely on traditional customary guarantees which historically had proved none too strong against European intrusion. European life expectancy has remained about 50% higher than that for Africans while infant mortality for European babies has been only about 10% that for Africans. While virtually all European children entered school and continued through Form IV, much smaller percentages of African children enjoyed the same good fortune. Roads, marketing facilities, and water supplies as well as electrification were distributed on a similarly unequal basis. The ratio of extension agents to farmers in the European areas was about 1:40; in the African areas it was more like 1:700. Within the African communities, moreover, there were also inequalities particularly in the case of women upon whom much of the agricultural work in the TTLs has fallen but who have enjoyed far less access to educational facilities than men.

B. Bases of Land Tenure. In the European areas and in the African Purchase areas, land has been allocated on the basis of freehold tenure. Africans, to qualify for farms in the APLs, have been required to demonstrate skills in farming, motivation, and resources for developing these lands. European farmers have not been under any obligation in fact to occupy beneficially their holdings, and large parts of the commercial farming areas have been left underutilized or abandoned altogether, more so during the war. Until 1977 no African was eligible to purchase land in the commercial areas. In that year the Land Tenure Act was modified to integrate APLs and commercial areas and to permit purchase of such land on a freehold basis without regard to race. Abandonment of land throughout the enlarged commercial areas has increased greatly during the war years. Since independence, the government has made it clear that beneficial occupation of commercial land will become a condition of continued tenure.

It is impossible to do justice to the subject of African customary land tenure in Zimbabwe within the space of a few pages. There are a number of useful works on this subject, but further research is required to assess the impact of commercialization on the economy, the period of UDI, and the war years upon the evolution of land tenure practices. It would, moreover, be a mistake to presume that there are not significant differences within the country among the several African communities on this matter, even though there be considerable similarity between Shona and Ndebele practices (Palmer, 1977). The government has in fact contemplated the establishment of a commission of inquiry into land tenure practices in the TTLs, an exercise that might well prove to be a necessary precondition for any effective measures to bring development to those who continue to derive their livelihood from these areas. Subject to such reservations, one may hazard a few generalizations concerning traditional land tenure practices among the African peoples of Zimbabwe.

Land is a community asset for both the major ethnic families of Zimbabwe, the Shona and the Ndebele. The Shona, for example, "do not see their land simply as property, simply as an economic asset; the land is intimately associated with the history of a chiefdom." (Bourdillon, 1976, p. 85) "Ownership" of land is vested in the founder(s) of any given chiefdom, for whom the living chiefs exercise stewardship over their domain. Newcomers to a community must obtain the favor of the chief to obtain land and must propitiate the spirits of the ancestors in order to legitimize their tenure. While the responsibility for allocating land is vested in the chief, there has in practice been a measure of delegation to sub-chiefs or headmen at the village or ward level, particularly with respect to newcomers, and to male heads of families with respect to their offspring. Allocation of land in Zimbabwe has, therefore, traditionally been very decentralized by contrast to the practices of kingdoms elsewhere on the African continent such as, for example, that of the Baganda. This appears to have been the case even though, since the advent of the settler administration, various land tenure acts have asserted the authority of the colonial state over such land administration. See Tribal Trust Act of 1979.

Individuals have received the use of land from the chief rather than freehold rights in the western sense of that term. In practice, however, once land use has been granted, it has seldom been withdrawn though it has on occasion been subdivided as a consequence of population pressure. Tenure on land has conveyed proprietorship over crops and the right to evict trespassers. Some trees have been held sacred and, for that reason, have not fallen within the control of the tenants. Livestock have frequently been owned and managed as family herds, but individuals have been able to acquire ownership of cattle and other stock. Sale of animals has been common. Land has not been sold nor apparently sub-leased, in the western sense of the term. It has been heritable. Chiefs have, however, frequently received the equivalent of a "finder's fee" from those to whom land has been distributed. Inequalities in the size and value of land have occurred, particularly since enterprising individuals appear to have been able to add to the size of their holdings. Eligibility to receive land has been associated with passage to adulthood and entry into marriage and has not been restricted to the residents of any particular community. Those in particularly crowded communities have been free to canvas chiefs elsewhere in search of better holdings. It does not appear that distribution between "locals" and "expatriates" has retained great significance once the latter have received land allocations. While land use privileges have been vested in males, females have apparently exercised undistributed de facto household headship while their spouses have been employed elsewhere, and they have been accommodated as widows. Finally, there does not appear to have been much geographical dispersion of land fragments under the stewardship of single individuals, an important contrast to a former and perhaps recurrent tendency among the Kikuyu of Kenya.

While in a spiritual sense land has been considered community property, in practice the use of land has been individual. However, traditional African communities in Zimbabwe have not been without customs of cooperative activity. Working parties have assembled to help with major farming operations, participants being rewarded with helpings of millet beer. (Bourdillon, 1975) Occasionally two or more smallholders have pooled their resources for some agricultural purpose. In addition, livestock herds have been managed on a family basis. At the same time, however, there has been

considerable evidence of transactions between individuals on matters other than land. Weinrich (1975), for example, has detailed the considerable extent of wage labor in Karangaland. Ploughs and oxen have been leased for a consideration. Labor has been hired in addition to, or in place of family members. A significant though limited craft industry has existed in many rural communities. Finally, trade in agricultural commodities is an important part of the life of these communities.

C. Land Use and Development. Land use and development in Zimbabwe has historically been the product of interaction between government policies, on the one hand, and initiatives by farmers in European and African communities as well as responses to these policies, on the other hand. This, too, is an area where insufficient research has been conducted to permit authoritative statements or provide a sure foundation for current policy initiatives. To the considerable extent that land use policies historically have been paternal and have been linked to the perpetuation of racial inequality, there exists a particular need to dispel myths about the relative capabilities of different communities to contribute to rural development.

Land policies in Zimbabwe, historically, have focused on two objectives: (1) redistributing land between Europeans and Africans, and (2) improving the use of land in one or more areas. It is the latter category that is of most concern in this particular discussion. However, the two categories of policy have not been entirely distinct from one another, since adding to the size of lands apportioned to Africans has been one of the strategies for dealing with agro-economic problems resulting from high person-land ratios.

The first policies, in the 1890s and around the turn of the century, established reserves for the Shona and Ndebele. The 1923 Constitution, under which the country attained internal self-government from Britain, enshrined reserves as permanent fixtures, enlarged considerably from what they had been in 1890. (See Table 1) The European community was divided and ambivalent over the reserves policy, wanting both to keep them small so as to force the availability of cheap labor on their farms and yet recognizing the need to enlarge the reserves so as to reduce the likelihood of unwanted squatters.

The 1930 Land Apportionment Act was a milestone in the evolution of the country's rural development. Further enlarging both the European and African farming zones, the Act specifically barred the purchase of land by Europeans and Africans in each other's spheres. At the same time, African Purchase Areas were created under the Act within which African farmers could acquire freehold tenure which the European farmers enjoyed. Substantial sections of the European community vigorously opposed this measure, giving voice to fears less often expressed by settlers elsewhere on the continent that African farmers would provide them unwanted agricultural competition. Defenders of the plan argued that creation of the Purchase Areas was a necessary quid pro quo for the quashing of African rights to purchase land in the European areas that never previously had been legally and officially denied. They also believe continued racial segregation of the agricultural communities was the necessary price of providing opportunities in the rural areas for upwardly mobile peasant farmers. Entry into the APLs required proof of farming skill and possession of resources. In the light of the subsequent population growth, the 3.0 million hectares offered Africans in the APLs averaging about 50 hectares apiece has increasingly appeared as only a symbolic concession to African demands for more access to land. Given the accepted importance of European commercial farming to the country's economic well-being, the problems experienced in creating the APLs raised the question whether anything but symbolic gestures was possible in response to African claims to proprietorship of the land.

Resettlement is not a new idea in Zimbabwe. Particularly since the passage of the 1930 Land Apportionment Act, tens of thousands of Africans have been forcibly transferred to enlarged reserves from the European commercial farming zones. Squatters have continually been evicted from the commercial farms. During the recently concluded liberation war it has been estimated that more than 500,000 Africans were resettled in protected villages in order to isolate the guerillas. The guerillas themselves since the conclusion of the war have been settled in "assembly points," given monthly stipends and some encouragement to farm pending reintegration of the armies or other more permanent employment. Unfortunately, previous experience with settlement have been associated with hardship rather than opportunity. To an extent that is

open to speculation in the absence of inquiry, the independent Zimbabwe government, whose resettlement intentions are very different from those of its predecessors, may have to labor to overcome unfavorable popular remembrance of previous resettlement programs.

Between 1951 and 1962 the previous regime experimented unsuccessfully with direct attempts to improve the quality of agriculture in the Tribal Trust Lands. There have been two models, both of which appear to be viewed as legitimate in principle by the government even though the specific applications prior to independence were less than fully successful. One model was exemplified by the Land Husbandry Act of 1951 which sought "to provide for the control of the utilization and allocation of land occupied by natives and to ensure its efficient use for agricultural producers and to require natives to perform labor for conserving natural resources." Essentially, the Act envisaged (1) reorganization of land use areas to allocate arable, grazing and residential areas on the basis of land capability; (2) registration of larger and more viable individual holdings under the stewardship of farmers of proven competence; (3) encouragement of wage earners in these areas to seek alternative employment; (4) compulsory destocking and cattle care to reduce overgrazing and the spread of animal diseases; and (5) renewed enforcement of regulations promoting "beneficial occupation" of the land.

The impact of the measure was a function not only of its provisions but also the manner of their implementation. Weinrich (1975) argues that the land use planning and cattle care provisions were welcomed by the African peoples. Some have also asserted that where the new regulations were implemented with some patience and interest in the well-being of the African peoples, real development did occur. On the other hand, there was strong opposition to the land registration provisions because they seemed to threaten the association of land with the whole structure of local African societies and the ability of landholders to bequeath plots to their offspring. Insufficient opportunities were provided for those not designated to receive the standard plots to obtain employment as wage labor in the cities or elsewhere in the rural areas. Destocking of cattle was not implemented in a fashion that took due cognizance of the animals' importance to social status, honored customs, and the uniting of families through marriage. Recognizing the need to coopt as much support

among the African peoples as possible in the face of spreading nationalism in the country and throughout the continent, the government abandoned the act. The objectives of the Land Husbandry Act, however, have not been discarded. They appear for example to be reflected particularly in the proposed Integrated Rural Development Areas (IRDAs) with the difference that more effort is being devoted in these new plans to off-farm employment, and the question of individual land tenure has not been resolved.

The establishment of the Tribal Land Development Corporation (TILCOR) represented the second model of rural land development and conservation undertaken by the previous regimes. The basic strategy has been to enable a statutory body to exercise de facto powers resembling eminent domain in the TTLs. TILCOR effectively asserted jurisdiction over the inhabitants of a given Tribal Trust Land area, creating the inhabitants as its de facto tenants, in order to develop "growth points," promote small scale irrigation schemes, create off-farm employment, and improve the quality of cash crop farming under the watchful management of TILCOR managers. This model different from the Land Husbandry Act in the reliance upon a statutory body, creation of off-farm employment, and more explicit emphasis on inhabitants' legal position as tenants of the state rather than at the pleasure of the chiefs under customary rules.

TILCOR activities have remained controversial from its inception. Against the claim that production and employment generation potential have been successfully demonstrated and realized lie counterclaims that many of the cultivators have abandoned the holdings, increases in cash cropping have been marginal, the well-being of the cultivators has scarcely improved as a consequence of their more explicit tenancy at the will of the state, and the overall problem of high person-land ratios in the TTLs has not been significantly ameliorated. The TILCOR rejoinder has been that the organization has not been funded adequately enough to permit a full assessment of this development strategy. The devastation of the war years has also undermined much of its work.

The model of increased direction of smallholder agricultural activity found further expression in legislation placed on the books just before the transition to the independent government. The Tribal Trust Land Act of 1979 (specifically vested such lands in the Tribal Trust Land Act of 1979 specifically vested such lands in the President (pt. II, Sec. 7.3) while the Rural Land Act (cap. 155) of the same year provided the legal basis for the present intensive resettlement program. This act establishes the legal basis for awarding permits to the new African settlers that leave virtually all control over the settlement land in the hands of the government.

D. Evolving Land Use Patterns. Given these policy initiatives by the central government, what patterns of land use and development have occurred during the pre-independence years? There are three parts to this question: (1) what changes have occurred in land tenure patterns; (2) what has been the nature and extent of land utilization; and (3) what have been the patterns of agro-economic productivity?

D.1. Evolving Land Tenure Patterns. Historical treatments of land tenure practices are in short supply in Zimbabwe. Nevertheless a few generalizations may be offered in the form of hypotheses.

First, patterns of land tenure, insofar as they have changed markedly, appear to have evolved less in response to specific governmental policy initiatives than as a result of, and in conjunction with broader patterns of socio-economic change. The limited success of the Land Husbandry Act, for example, has already been noted. In the European areas, with the exception of the 1977 Amendment to the Land Tenure Act merging commercial and APL farming zones, there has been very little change in European land tenure.

Second, on the basis of very limited and preliminary evidence, several hypotheses may be offered concerning de facto changes in TTL land tenure parameters:

- (1) Population pressures have been of a magnitude to greatly reduce the availability of land in the TTLs, reducing correspondingly the size of individual holdings;
- (2) The significance of the role of chiefs in land management and allocation may have been greatly diminished because of the absence of land, reduction in shifting cultivation which limits the frequency of chiefs being called upon to allocate land;
- (3) The legitimacy of the chiefly institution itself has been undermined by cooptation of chiefs by the previous regimes, especially during the war years;
- (4) A growing dichotomy has emerged between "de jure" land "rights" in a customary sense which are vested in males and "de facto" responsibility for land management which is increasingly vested in females as their spouses seek work elsewhere;
- (5) There has been increasingly explicit though limited negotiability of land use rights especially in areas away from the major population centers, by individuals who have become marginalized members of their traditional communities while living within them;
- (6) There has been diminished collective management of common resources in some areas of high land pressure where availability of land for communal grazing has vanished;
- (7) There has been increasing substitution of political party and/or elective officials for chiefs at the local level in the management of rural land;

- (8) Inequality in land holdings in TTLs may have increased despite overall population-land pressures;
- (9) A substantial number of people in the TTLs are wholly without access to the use of land; and
- (10) Corporate farming has played a major role in the productivity of the commercial farming areas by contrast to family-held farms.

The evidence for these hypotheses is variable in extent and reliability. When the reserves were created, population pressures were quite limited. At the present time, it has been estimated that the population of the TTLs may be twice their collective carrying capacity, the significance of this generalization depending upon the degree of consensus among specialists on this capacity. As a consequence of the impoverishment of the TTLs, the extent of migration of urban areas by male heads of household for employment has greatly expanded. Women have, therefore, increasingly been left in de facto control of the household estate. This phenomena presents a very important policy question to the Government of Zimbabwe: should families thus separated be reunited in the cities where the male head of household has acquired greater employment opportunity and security, leaving more land for those who remain behind in the TTLs? Implicit in this question are several sub-questions: (1) assumptions about the capacity of women heads of household as farmers; (2) their legitimacy as heads of household in traditional terms; and (3) the defensibility of promoting greater dependence upon the male head of household in the city than might occur in the countryside.

The increase control over community agricultural activities and land management by elected and/or party officials has been a consequence of a leadership vacuum created by the war years. In addition, party officials have tended to assume that such local leadership is the appropriate consequence of independence, chiefs have been greatly compromised in many areas during the war.

D.2. Land Use and Development. One of the most striking contours of rural development in Zimbabwe has been the limited utilization commercial farmers have made of the land they have struggled so hard to keep inviolate against African claims. Only about 20% of European land was under cultivation in 1976, somewhat greater proportions of APL land being cultivated. By contrast, TTL farmers have substantially overcultivated their land at the expense of some that should be left to pasture. Even making allowances for war and rotation patterns, European and APL land have clearly been underused.

Table 6

Percentages of Arable Land Under Cultivation ('000 ha)

	<u>European Land</u>	<u>APL Land</u>	<u>TTLs</u>
Total Land Area	15769.6	1416.1	16279.4
Arable Region I (14%)	61.7	1.0	18.0
Arable Region II (45%)	1946.0	113.5	564.0
Arable Region III (27%)	875.0	144.7	760.0
Arable Region IV-V (0%)	-----	-----	-----
Total Arable Land	2882.7	259.2	1342.8
Land Under Crops	570.0	86.0	1677.0
Percent Arable Cropped	20.0	33.0	125.0

Table 7

1977 Livestock Numbers and Carrying Capacity ('000 LU)

	<u>European Land</u>	<u>TTLs</u>
Carrying Capacity	2700	1595
Actual Numbers	2000	2580

Once again the carrying capacities depend upon technical assumptions and criteria beyond the scope of this essay to examine. It is, therefore, unclear to what extent the carrying capacity of both European-herd lands and African TTLs could be substantially increased. According to present assumptions, European grazing areas have if anything been underutilized while the reverse occurs in the TTLs. Given the destruction of the war years, however, it is likely that the extent of overstocking has been considerably reduced. Overstocking, moreover, is a function not only of absolute numbers but of off-take rates which indicate saleability of livestock units, determination to cull herds and participated in the commercial market, and capacity to market the stock. European participation has been good on each of these criteria, while African off-take rates have remained very low partly for traditional reasons and partly because of marketing difficulties.

D. 3. Productivity. The major characteristics of land use productivity in Zimbabwe have been (1) European productivity is concentrated in a small number of agricultural firms, a number of which are corporate, while others have been unproductive to the point of not yielding taxable income; (2) African productivity in comparison to the average figures for European farms has been very limited; but (3) if African and European land use productivity are compared with the relative distribution of land use potential, African cultivators compare with their European counterparts far more favorably.

The distribution of landholdings is very unequal in the European areas. The smallest 20% of the farms, all under 200 hectares, account for only 10% of the land area, while the largest 20% -- all over 3000 hectares -- comprise just under 75% of the land. While considerable account needs to be taken of the natural regions in which these farms are found, the most intensively cultivated farms appear to be those in the middle range, between 75 hectares and 1250 hectares, while the smallest farms in 1976 had only 2.3% of their acreage under cultivation. These differences in size appear to bear some relationship to productivity, larger farms attaining somewhat higher yields per hectare. In 1976 European agriculture accounted for 76% of total production and 92% of marketed output, having expanded by a factor of 20 since World War II. But it is also the case that, as Riddell reports (1978) only 5% of the farms holding 50% of the land accounted for 48% of marketed output. Similar disparities have appeared in income levels and income tax yields: 50% of the reported taxable income in 1974 having been produced by 5% of those filing returns while 45% of the filers produced only 10% of the taxable income.

There is considerable evidence that significant inequalities of a similar nature have occurred in the TTLs. However, the data are lacking to test that hypothesis.

TABLE 5
Output per Hectare on European Farms
(1973-1975) and APL and TTL Farms (1971-1975)

(kg/hectares)

	<u>Europeans Farms</u>	<u>APL Farms</u>	<u>TTL Farms</u>
Maize	459	1497	659
Cotton	149	607	802

A full assessment of the relative productivity of European and TTL farming would require examination of these output figures in terms of a great number

of variables including farm size, seed varieties, extent and use of inputs, and the cost of those inputs. Moreover, the table compares 3 year averages for European farms with 5 year averages for TTL and APL producers. In addition, comparative information is required on differences in the use and cost of inputs between and within these communities in order to determine marginal costs and marginal returns. Such data are not presently at hand. One may suggest, however, that differences in land quality do account for a substantial portion of the difference in output effectiveness between the groups, particularly in the case of cotton. TTL farmers were more output efficient than APL growers for this period, and if differences in land quality are taken into consideration much of the difference between TTL and European cultivation is removed.

Table 9

Ratios of Yields per Hectare
to Differences in Land Quality

	<u>European Land</u>	<u>APL Land</u>	<u>TTL Land</u>
Land Quality Ratios	1.7	1.8	1.0
Maize Yield/Hectare			
Ratios	5.8	2.3	1.0
Cotton Yield/Hectare			
Ratios	3.5	1.0	1.3

Frequently its assumed that only a small proportion of those who cultivate for subsistence are able and/or willing to participate to a greater extent in the commercial agricultural economy. Evidence from Zimbabwe as well as other countries suggests that small scale, heavily subsistence farmers are indeed very responsive to price changes especially if the means are found to reduce the cost of inputs to smallholders. Moreover, it has clearly been the case that European growers believed, indeed feared that African farmers would give them major competition, and they used the power of the state to stifle it.

II
Current Land Policies

The Government of Zimbabwe has issued a commitment to comprehensive and integrated rural development leading not only to growth with equity but eventually to the elimination of the distinctions between commercial and tribal land regions that have perpetuated racial inequality throughout the century. The Government's broad strategy has been to reduce overpopulation in the TTLs by creating more off-farm employment and employment security, resettling refugees and landless persons on underutilized or abandoned portions of the commercial farming areas, and more intensive development of the TTLs themselves through extension work, irrigation projects, and intensive integrated rural development projects. This government, and its predecessors as well, have recognized that a major effort to promote family planning is the necessary concomitant of programs to provide more employment for a rapidly growing population.

The following specific goals have been cited by the Government in furtherance of these general aims: (ZIMCORD Documentation)

- (1) high rates of economic growth in all sectors and especially in the rural and peasant agricultural sector;
- (2) a more equitable and efficient distribution of productive assets, especially land;
- (3) a more equitable distribution of income and income earning opportunities across racial groups;
- (4) high rates of growth of productive employment in all sectors and especially for rural sector;
- (5) provision and extension of physical and social infrastructure especially in the rural areas; and
- (6) democratic and popular participation in the development process.

Table 10
Models of Land Development in Zimbabwe

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Intensive Resettlements</u>	<u>Extensive Resettlement</u>	<u>IRDAs</u>	<u>Irrigation</u>	<u>Extension</u>
Income Target	400	\$ 1000	\$600 - 1000	\$400+-	Variable
Off-farm Development Area	No 1.1m ha	Some business 69 t ha.	Urban centers 5 m ha	No 24 t ha	No Variable
Affected Families	18,000+	542	9700 AG 146 t (urb)	57,000	Variable
Wage Employment	Limited	Limited	Extensive	Temporary	Variable
Total Costs	\$50m	\$3.1m (33% Grant)	\$160m	\$150m	??
Est. Costs/Family	\$3000+-	\$3750	\$10,500 ag only \$500 (all)	\$2900	??
Land Tenure	Indiv.Arable Communal Graze Grazing	Indiv.Mixed Communal Ranch Ranching	Indiv.(Consol) +Urban Fr. Hld. Grazing?	Plantation? Plantation	Traditional Work Parties?
Cooperative Work Individual Holdings Size	5 arable+grable	75 indiv/150 mix 500 Ranch	40	Garden Plots	Variable
Terms**	Permit	3 yr. lease option Urb. Fr. Hld., Ag?		Permit?	Traditional
Oblig. Farm Family Displace	Occupy/Conserv No	Occupy/Cons.Repay/ No	Occupy/Cons. Yes	Occupy/Cons. No	?? No
Existing Infrastructure	Abandoned/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Limited?	Limited
Local Participation	Committees	Committees	Master Farmer Develop Advis Committees	??	??

Explanation of Abbreviations

ha. = hectares
m = million
t = thousand
ag = agriculture
urb-urban/com-mercial
Mixed=mixed farming/ranching
Fr.Hld.=freehold

**Terms on the May "Extensive" Resettlement are that successful farmers may have the option to acquire freehold after 1-2 3 year leasehold arrangements.

The Government has clearly given high priority to an effective rural development strategy centering about land tenure, use, and administration. The Government has made clear its preference for more cooperative forms of land use in the rural areas, but in advance of detailed investigations and conscious of the need to understand and foster the wishes of the people themselves, it has encouraged experimentation with a variety of land tenure models. To date it has continued to honor traditional tenure arrangements in the TTLs, issued individual permits to settlers in the intensive resettlement schemes, encouraged collective farms for youth and communal grazing on the settlement schemes, and contemplated some forms of plantation agriculture through irrigation. The existing rural development projects vary from a limited focus on agricultural development to projects that include the development of "growth points" for urban and commercial concerns. While most of the projects contemplate target incomes close to the present agricultural minimum wage of \$360 per household per annum plus subsistence, some projects have realized or demonstrated potential for substantially higher income levels. The target populations range from proven or potential master farmers to those with no proven agricultural inclinations. While content for the present to allow a measure of decentralized and traditional land use administration in the TTLs by the chiefs, the Government clearly plans to use legal authority inherited from the preceding regime to exercise more centralized direction of rural development projects in cooperation with new local organizations such as the political party and the newly elected district councils. Such increased administration of land use by the central government points to the possibility that existing patterns of land tenure that currently resemble de facto freehold in many respects will gravitate closer to de facto tenancy at the pleasure of the elected and/or public authorities.

Five existing rural development programs, each with its distinctive land tenure and land use development features, illustrate the diversity of rural development models the government is presently prepared to support. The basic features of each model are encapsulated in Table 10. Because of its central importance to the objectives of the Patriotic Front, intensive land resettlement on underutilized commercial farming land commands the most urgent and intense attention by the government at the present time. The other models

Best Available Document

of rural land use and development, while equally important to improving rural standards of living, are of a longer term nature in part because they are more removed from the country's immediate post-independence political agenda. Most of the discussion will focus, therefore, on the intensive resettlement program while the subsequent section will examine more cursorily the other longer range problems.

A. Intensive Resettlement. The underlying premises of the intensive resettlement scheme program are (1) abandoned or underutilized farms can be resettled in such a fashion as to increase the overall productivity of the commercial farming zone without disturbing profitable, predominantly European large scale farming; (2) settlement land use planning should be ecologically sound according to existing technical knowledge; (3) target family incomes should be approximately that of agricultural laborers earning the minimum wage; (4) settlers should hold land as a privilege conditional upon beneficial occupation; (5) cooperative activity should be encourage; (6) beneficiaries of the program should be those who are landless and unemployed; (7) settlements are not to be simply TTL expansion areas; and (8) farms should be purchased on a willing buyer-willing seller basis.

The Government has currently identified 1.1 million hectares for the resettlement of some 18,000 families. Target incomes have been set at \$400 per family, reduced by pressure from ODA and others from an earlier figure of \$1000 plus subsistence. Settlers are to be landless and unemployed with first preference to be given to war refugees. Wage laborers in the settlement area previously employed by a European farmer are to be included in the schemes. The landless of the applicants is checked with local authorities in the TTLs. Those who receive land are required to give up any rights to land they may still retain in the TTLs. In general, settlers are to be drawn from neighboring TTLs. Criteria for selection of land have included:

- '1) land which is suitable for resettlement near adjacent TTLs, particularly in areas of heavy land pressure;

Best Available Document

- (2) land not presently actively farmed which has agricultural potential
- (3) blocks of land large enough to permit economic provision of services and infrastructure;
- (4) areas reasonably well served with roads and other infrastructure -- at least for the initial settlements; and
- (5) areas where some planning information exists to facilitate rapid implementation.

Land is to be purchased on a willing buyer-willing seller basis at prices ranging from \$10- to \$35 per hectare, prices that are roughly in accordance with 1975 levels. Currently, over 400 farms have been offered for sale by European freeholders, far more than the government has the resources to acquire and settle at the present time. The land is being purchased from the Europeans for the African settlers by grant funds provided by the United Kingdom. By contrast to the programs in Kenya, the settlers are required to pay nothing for the land. These land purchase funds form a down payment on the commitment by the United Kingdom and the United States at the Lancaster House Constitutional Conference to provide on the order of \$1.5 billion for rural development over an unspecified period of years. The Constitution developed at Lancaster House in effect guaranteed continued occupation of the land by productive commercial farmers, adequate as distinct from fair compensation which can be repatriated in the event of expropriation. By contrast, the Kenya European settlers succeeded in enshrining elaborate constitutional safeguards for themselves rather than simply the right to beneficial occupation. Having persuaded the Lancaster House Conferees that an African government could not in good conscience be asked to pay for land it believed to have been illegally seized in the first place, the future leadership of Zimbabwe accepted continued occupation by productive commercial farmers and promised to match British land purchase monies with its own funds for the development of the schemes.

Best Available Document

The lands purchased are to be found in natural regions II through V, and the size of the holdings has been planned accordingly.

Settlement Holdings by Natural Region

Natural Region	Arable Ha.	Grazing	!LUS	Total Area
II	5	20	4	25
III	5	55	8	60
IV	5	75	10	80
V	5	195	20	200

It is useful to compare the settlement plan with the recommendations of Vincent and Thomas twenty years ago that were enshrined in the Land Husbandry Act. The target income at that time was \$140 which in real terms may have been close to the \$400 target proposed for the settlement schemes.

Table 12

<u>Natural Region</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Arable</u>	<u>Grazing Units</u>	<u>Hectares/LU</u>	<u>Size</u>
II	Land Husb.	8	6	10	68
	Resettle	5	4	5	25
III	Land Husb.	8	6	12	80
	Resettle	5	8	7	60
IV	Land Husb.	13	10	15	160
	Resettle	5	10	7.	80
V	Land Husb.	12	15	25	390
	Resettle	5	20	19.	200

This table is instructive in that it suggests either technical knowledge of land use capabilities has changed or the settlement schemes have been planned with more thought to intensive habitation than to ecological soundness. This is a point on which there is some considerable difference of opinion within government circles.

The Ministry of Land, Settlement and Rural Development (MILSRD) proposes to settle most of the families in natural regions III and IV as Table 13 indicates.

Table 13

Distribution and Costs of Settlement
by Natural Region

	Natural Region				Total
	II	III	IV	V	
Hectares	72,580	424,220	514,050	140,740	1,151,990
Settler Fams.	3,142	8,590	5,799	702	18,233
Costs/Ha	6,844	4,891	4,411	3,556	
Costs/Land Purchase/Ha	35	27	20	15	
Costs/Family	1,710	2,928	3,528	7,111	

The costs of settlement per hectare are roughly inverse to those of settlement per family. Approximately 85% of the land and 70% of the settlers to be housed in natural regions 3 and 4.

Settlers' tenure on the schemes is to be on the basis of permits to reside, cultivate and graze stock. (See Appendix I). These permits afford the settlers neither freehold tenure nor leasehold but simply permission to occupy and use a portion of land at the pleasure of the minister. These permits provide the settlers no rights and no recourse against governmental

actions which are supposed to be taken in the interests of effective land management. The minister may revoke the permit for any reason he determines to be evidence of settler non-compliance with terms and conditions of occupation. Though lacking security, the holder is required to pay all necessary taxes, destock on command, maintain the site in clean and sanitary condition, follow recommended agricultural practices, refrain from damage to natural resources, and protect crops and animals from disease. Settlers may be required to live in villages and to accept any placement of infrastructure decided upon by the government. Settlers have not in fact yet been required to prove relinquishment of land rights in the TTLs, a complicated matter in and of itself, but they are required to discard a degree of security in the TTLs for the possibility of improved standards and altered life styles under governmental supervision in the schemes.

The basic land use model for most of the resettlement schemes calls for settlers to cultivate on an individual family basis but to graze cattle collectively. They are expected to live in closer proximity to one another than has been the custom in the TTLs for purposes of economies of scale in the provision of water and other infrastructure and in order to promote a sense of cooperation among the settlers.

The Government has begun the development of the scheme for the settlers by ploughing an initial half hectare per family so they could get seeds planted promptly after moving into their homesteads. In the future the settlers will be responsible for all the cultivation activities. The schemes have been planned on the assumption that the settlers will have sufficient oxen as a group to obviate reliance upon tractor ploughing. Further assumed is the availability of boreholes, roads, and some dip tanks. MLSRD will repair such infrastructure if need be and construct it where it is absent. The Ministry will build clinics on the basis of one per every 300 to 500 families and staff the clinics with two medical assistants for whom it will provide accommodations. Partly at the request of the Ministry of Education which wishes to encourage self-help activities. MLSRD is providing the materials for schools on the basis of one classroom for every 45 children. The settlers will be required to do the actual construction. MLSRD assumes

that the Ministry of Education will make available staff and supplies to the same extent it does for other schools. Settlers are to be helped by Extension Assistants on the basis of one for every 200 families, animal health specialists for each 500 families, and cooperative development officers to help the settlers with marketing and inputs on the basis of one per every 600 settlers. For these officials plus the resettlement officer (one for each 600 families) responsible for overall scheme administration the government will tailor the construction of these residences to the preference of the employees is unclear. ILSRD assumes, finally, that after an initial period of separation from the district council areas, the settlement schemes will be reintegrated with the districts and that the settlers will be represented on the councils.

These provisions for the settlers leave them responsibility for cultivation and grazing in accordance with extension specifications, formation of elected settler committees and cooperative societies, establishment and maintenance of residences, cooperative construction of schools and other infrastructure, and payment of rates once the schemes rejoin the district council areas. The financial burdens on the settlers will be very limited, mainly to manage usefully and repay in timely fashion seasonal crop loans that may average around \$250 per settler family. Settlers on the Kenya schemes encumbered indebtedness for ten to 20 years of about \$3500 plus interest at about 7%.

There are a number of contrasts between planning for the Zimbabwe and Kenya schemes in addition to those that have been identified already. The Kenya settlers were not provided with clinics, nor were they given assistance in building schools. The intensity of supervision by extension agents was comparable. Most of the schemes were divided into much smaller primarily agricultural plots so that settlers were dependent upon commercial tractor services which were almost universally deemed unsatisfactory. Cooperative societies were mandatory where they appear to be voluntary on the Zimbabwe schemes. Moreover, the Kenya societies were under heavy pressure to assume large debt burdens in order to purchase the improvements left behind by the European settlers, much to the displeasure of the Department of Cooperative

Development. Credit and marketing problems were legion and the loan repayment burden was sufficiently heavy that settlers saw only a very small proportion of the sale price of their crops. Settlers were given permits similar to those that have been awarded the settlers in Zimbabwe. The Kenya settlers had the advantage of being settled in general on lands of considerably higher potential than is to be the case in Zimbabwe. Partly for this reason but partly also because of perseverance of the settlers themselves, the Kenya schemes have proved that it is possible to sub-divide large farms into smallholdings and maintain levels of productivity and employment. However, it is also the case that most of the more successful Kenya settlers either once had or retained land and employment elsewhere, notwithstanding the purposes of the schemes. (Harbeson 1973). The Kenya settlers enjoyed the advantage of a particularly suitable cash crop, pyrethrum, which yielded a steady income and made limited crop care demands upon the settlers. Finally, the Zimbabwe schemes have the advantage, it would appear, of relatively less political pressure for hasty implementation. The Kenya European farmers forced the government's hand by threatening to leave summarily and injure the country's rural economy if settlement were not accomplished before independence. Some of the Kenya European settlers carried through on the threat and migrated south to Zimbabwe and South Africa. At the same time Kenya's Freedom Fighters believed a plot of land in the White Highlands was owed them in return for their services immediately upon attainment of independence, apparently in contrast to the situation in Zimbabwe. Finally, the Kenya schemes were planned by the retiring colonial administration primarily in response to European settlers pressures and according to their terms and conditions, not by the independent government as in Zimbabwe.

By January 1981 the Government of Zimbabwe had purchased 387,000 hectares and had resettled something over 1200 landless and unemployed rural families. Six schemes have been placed on the ground, and settlers have been accommodated at the rate of about ten per day, a pace that could double in the forthcoming months. Even this rate will be far more deliberate than occurred in Kenya, particularly on the eve of Uhuru. Nine more schemes are being actively planned.

Table 14

Intensive Resettlement Schemes on the Ground

February 1981

<u>Name</u>	<u>No. of Families</u>	<u>Location</u>
Soti	530	Near Gutu TTL
Nyajezi	160	N. of Umtali
Wedza	145	S. of Marandelis
Umfurudzi	240-600	NE of Shamva
Nyagundi	160	Near Umtali
Mapudzi	210	S. of Umtali

It is noteworthy that the first schemes are all in the eastern portion of the country where on balance the land pressures are the greatest, the war destruction the most pronounced, and the Mashona numerically predominant. In the Kenya instance, one of the planning parameters was that each major ethnic group be accommodated by a settlement scheme regardless of the nature and extent of the land pressures, though the Kikuyu were to receive the largest allotment of settlement land for these reasons. One may inquire whether the siting of the first schemes places undue stress upon the still fragile coalition between the Patriotic Front parties with roots in the eastern and western portions of the country respectively.

Settlers have in some instances shown reluctance to enter the settlement schemes, though this problem appears to be diminishing. The reasons reported for settlers' hesitancy have related to (1) fears of possible conversion of the individual plots into collective farms; (2) loss of contact with families in the TTLs; (3) land that had not brought a good livelihood to the European farmers might not be any more generous to the Africans; (4) isolation of the schemes from schools and clinics; (5) fear of hunger if late crops on marginal land did not prosper; (6) distaste for the degree of planning involved in the schemes, and (7) and sense that they would enjoy less security of tenure than in the TTLs. (University of Zimbabwe Rural Development Research Project,

1980-1981) On one of the schemes, Solti, where the reluctance to enter the schemes was the most pronounced initially, the settlement officer reports thousands of applications for settlement plots not that the scheme has been filled.

In some areas, however, settlers have not waited to be selected to enter the schemes. While some of those present had previously worked for the European settlers in the area and had been tenants of long standing, the others simply staked claims, in some instances at the behest of local political leaders. While MLSRD has pledged to remove recent squatters who don't qualify and has done so in some instances such as near Umfurudzi, it is not clear that this policy will be universally or systematically enforceable. It is also now not clear how pervasive the problem itself will be.

Responsibility for selection of settlers has devolved to a substantial degree upon the local party workers. While, on the one hand, they have provided inexpensive assistance in an important part of the settlement endeavor, the result has been -- not surprisingly -- that not all of the settlers have matched the specified qualifications. For example, some master farmers have acquired plots on one scheme.

The settlers' security of tenure has been more limited even than that set forth in the permits. Although the permits awarded complete and untrammelled development authority to the minister, the permits themselves have not been issued to settlers on at least two of the schemes. The reasons for non-issuance have been the same as the reasons for the permits in the first place: (1) the need to be sure that those selected are conscientious; and (2) the need for the government to keep its options open with respect to more collective tenure at some point in the future. Moreover, there has been pressure, to which the government may yield to reduce the size of the arable holdings from five hectares to four or three, and some plots have not been as satisfactory in reality as they appeared in the planning states, so some adjustments will be necessary. Even while pressures for more intensive settlement are upon the government, the ministry plans to purchase more than 500,000 hectares for settlement along the lines of the former African Purchase Lands, i.e., larger holdings at income targets closer to the original plan of \$1000.

The responses of the settlers so far have been to plant the initial 0.5 hectares prepared for them, late in some case, and to build their residence as required. With the local prty officials playing a central role, they have selected village chairmen and committees as well as area committees on the larger schemes. The subjects with which these committees deal appear to have less to do with development than with administrative and political matters, for settlement -- officers make extensive use of these committees but the extension agents have steered away from them. The settlers attitudes toward the resettlement enterprise appear to be positive, though the nature of their reservations is apparent from the reasons offered for being slow to enter the schemes in the first place. While monitoring of the schemes, including the thoughts of the settlers, is a much needed undertaking which is included in MLSRD's planning, a few hypotheses may be advanced concerning settler responses to the scheme's opportunities:

- (1) The settlers are disinclined to cooperative activity in farming though they may accept cooperative grazing as planned;
- (2) Past experiences with the cooperative movement under the preceding regimes have caused the settlers to be wary of the cooperative societies recommended for them. The settlers appear to be unaware that procedures are available to ensure that differences between settlers in the size and quality of their produce can be reflected in the prices paid them.
- (3) Settlers are most concerned with the provision of water, roads, and market facilities.
- (4) Settlers dislike the obligation to live in closer proximity to one another than was the case in the TTLs. Settlers feel health risks are greater and that it is more difficult to protect crops and stock from human and animal marauding. The MLSRD is not impressed with the reasons, thinking settlers have traditionally lived away from their fields and that good health clinics will solve the disease problem. But settlers are also cognizant of some traditional taboos against close settlement.

Settlement schemes have been administered by resettlement officers who in some instances are well-trained but lacking in first hand farm management experience. The administration of the settlement schemes requires a multiplicity of technical, managerial organization, and interpersonal skills. The preferences of the LMSRD have been for degree holders in the social sciences, but provision for training may still be in order for the specific tasks and objectives of the settlement program. While the employment of retired European farmers in the Kenya schemes had obvious disadvantages in the first months of that country's independence, they were nevertheless beneficial in that they were experienced farm managers who knew the particular farm areas. Peace Corps volunteers also helped enormously while the Kenya Government was in the process of Africanizing its cadre of settlement officers.

B. Alternative Land Development Plans. In addition to resettlement schemes there are four other principal kinds of land development models presently enjoying the support of the Government of Zimbabwe: (See Table 10)

1. Extensive Resettlement. Exemplified by the Mayo scheme, extensive resettlement differs from its intensive counterpart in that target incomes are closer to \$1,000, much of the development cost is loan rather than grant money, the costs per settler are higher (\$3,750 in contrast to about \$3,000), only experienced farmers with some financial resources are eligible, plot sizes are much larger and may involve differing mixtures of grazing and agricultural development, tenure is on a leasehold basis with a possible option to acquire freehold, and settlers carry substantial loan repayment burdens as well as agricultural development responsibilities.
2. Integrated Rural Development Areas (IRDAs). The Government has planned 5 integrated rural development districts in the midst of heavily populated tribal trust lands which may provide enhanced income through more intensive settlement and urban development for 50% of the TTL population, on 30% of the land, at an initial five year cost of about \$160 million. Unlike the intensive or extensive

resettlement programs, the IRDAs envisage the establishment of substantial urban centers to accommodate 90% of the target populations who will be displaced by consolidation of larger farming units. More use of wage labor is contemplated and irrigation is planned. IRDAs concentrate on intensive development of specific zones within TTLs, spreading a thinner package of benefits more widely within them. If one assumes the successful accommodation of displaced agricultural labor in the urban centers, the cost per family is far lower than for the settlement schemes. Were such accommodation not to occur, the costs would be far higher (\$200 v. about \$10,000). Freehold tenure in urban areas is contemplated while agricultural area tenure is not yet defined except that those displaced by consolidated farms are to be compensated in some fashion for relinquishing their access to agricultural land. Implicitly, the mode appears to assume somewhat less authoritative direction of the producers by the government because stronger security of tenure is contemplated. Explicitly, the model involves more reliance upon popular participation, but the participants are to be actual or potential master farmers in general.

3. Irrigation Schemes. The government has inherited and/or planned a number of irrigation schemes, reflecting widely held beliefs that irrigation-based development offers the best hope for reducing TTL populations in the long run. Most of the irrigation schemes appear to contemplate settler incomes in the vicinity of \$400 or somewhat more. Like the intensive resettlement schemes, urban development and off-farm employment do not appear to figure as prominently as in the case of the IRDAs. However, unlike the intensive resettlement schemes, substantial use of peak period wage labor is envisaged. Costs per settler appear to be comparable to those of the settlement schemes, though costs per hectare or job created may be considerably lower. Most models appear to include development of irrigated crops collectively by settlers in addition to small garden plots which they tend individually. As a group the plans for these schemes propose creating more employment than some of the other models, since much of

the IRDA employment generation is urban. Displacement of residents does not appear to be a prominent feature of the irrigation schemes, most being absorbed as project participants. Tenure security appears to be somewhat greater than that planned for the settlement schemes, with some form of leasehold being implemented.

4. Extension. In addition to these planned land use development schemes, the Government plans to increase the presence of extension workers in the TTLs. With the merger of the Conservation and Extension Department (Con/Ex) which until now has served the commercial areas exclusively with the Department of Agriculture (DEVAG) which has concentrated on APLs and TTLs, it is to be presumed that there will be some redeployment of extension workers from commercial to TTL areas, also to settlement, irrigation and IRDA projects. Implicit in the increased attention to the TTLs is the requirement of greatly increased agricultural research, experimentation, and extension effort, for TTLs were all but ignored for most of the history of the previous regimes. Since extension staff have been associated with measures like forced destocking and similarly unpopular measures enforced by despised minority governments, the interpersonal skills of extension personnel and the approaches of DEVAG will be critical to the success of the extension effort.

Extension programs differ in important and clearly visible ways from the other rural development efforts. They proceed on the assumption that traditional land tenure patterns will be honored at least in the short run, the only one of the models discussed that does so. Inputs consist more of technical than infrastructural and financial help. However, credit, seeds, fertilizer, and marketing arrangements are critical to the success of these efforts. Income targets are not established, each peasant farmer being inspired to seek whatever levels are within his/her reach. A higher number of

women heads of rural households will be affected by extension officers than by those administering the other schemes, since the schemes are planned on the assumption of male heads of household. The focus of extension workers is less upon specific regions than upon particular farmers who may receive attention in proportion to their enthusiasm and development motivation. Among the extension efforts those at Gokwe stand out as a particularly illuminating example of successful extension work, marketing and input problems to the contrary notwithstanding.

In addition to the Government's programs there are a number of private land use and development programs about which relatively little is known. To some extent individual Zimbabweans who are among the few with substantial financial resources have purchased whole farms in the commercial areas. In addition, however, it appears to be the case that some prominent political leaders have been acquiring land for the purposes of privately administering quasi-settlement programs of their own. Almost nothing is known about the extent of these efforts, what kind of planning has gone into them, what kinds of rights and obligations are retained by the purchaser and his/her settlers, or whether they are in reality anything but private estates with wage labor. Are these individuals latter day "founding ancestors" of chiefdoms?

Another very different kind of rural development effort is represented by private and non-governmental organization such as the Danis People to People Project near Shamva, and a scheme developed by the followers of Partrick van Rensburg and the Sotswana Brigades. Schemes of this nature, perhaps more in keeping with the Government's professed preferences than its own programs at the moment, appear to give highest priority to the achievement of cooperative agricultural development and rather less to the actual economic productivity of the effort. While very little is known of the basis of their tenure on the land or the manner in which they schemes actually operated, it appears that the pattern of social organization envisaged is the primary concern. MLSRD looks with favor on these enterprises perhaps not only because they stress cooperation but because they afford the government a way to reach the people without going through the civil service to the same extent. While it is

acknowledged that there are a number of very able and conscientious civil servants engaged in rural development work whom the government will wish to retain, it is also the case that the government feels somewhat isolated from its own constituents in the short run because such a high proportion of the civil servants built their careers under the influence of the previous regimes.

III

Alternatives and Issues

There are at least four categories of land issues before the Government of Zimbabwe as it seeks to promote three general objectives. The general objectives are (1) equity, including participation, geographical distribution of resources, and access to economic opportunity; (2) growth, including the efficient use of scarce resources, attention to marginal costs and returns, and maintenance and investment in productive assets; and (3) conservation, including the preservation of forest, water, soil, wildlife and energy resources. While it is frequently assumed that these objectives are antithetical to one another, the reality is that beyond a certain point none can proceed without attention to the others. It is simply a question of trade-offs at the margin. These trade offs are apparent in problems with each of the major land issues; (1) land tenure; (2) land distribution; (3) land use and development; and (4) land administration.

A. Land Distribution. The fundamental land distribution question before the Government of Zimbabwe is how far to redistribute land holdings to promote greater equity through measures such as intensive resettlement. To what extent should land distribution as distinct from commercial, agricultural wage labor, and industrial employment promote the general objective of equitable growth? Eventually, as in Kenya, the Government may face the question of how far to permit landholding inequalities among Africans themselves to arise.

Under the Lancaster House agreements, the government has accepted the proposition that productive European commercial farmers should be allowed and encouraged to remain. At the same time MLSRD up to this point has recognized

that ecological and economic considerations prevent more intensive settlement than that planned unless greater investments in irrigation are launched. The essential problem before the country is that there are still large numbers of people, to whom the Patriotic Front has political obligations, who have not yet acquired an economic stake in independent Zimbabwe. There are still people in assembly points, urban squatter areas, and refugee reception who have not yet been fully reintegrated in the new Zimbabwe order. The Government may have difficulty holding to even the existing income targets for the settlement schemes as long as these pressures remain, for even if resettlement is not the best answer to such unemployment is one of the quicker answers.

B. Land Tenure. Among the major land tenure issues with which the Government is to wrestle are (1) whether land tenure in rural areas should be on identical terms across the country; (2) how much security of tenure to permit to encourage; (3) how far to supplant traditional land tenure practices with "modern" ones; (4) how much negotiability to permit in land tenure holdings; (5) whether to permit or discourage families holding employment both in urban and rural areas, or in TTLs and settlement areas, -- an issue which directly affects the role of women in the development of Zimbabwe; (6) how far to proceed with cooperative activity in cultivation, grazing, and villages; and (7) whether management of land allocation should be left to local district councils, chiefs, or supervised to a greater degree by the ministry.

Equity is the principal issue in determining how far to seek tenure conformity throughout the country, the question being whether the government should seek to legislate such uniformity at the expense of customary variations and on terms that, left to their own devices, not everyone would choose. Clearly, the government wishes both to honor popular aspirations and valued customs, on the one hand, but it also wishes to eradicate the most visible vestiges of past racial inequalities, e.g., the division of rural land into commercial and Tribal Trust Land categories.

The government has shown some disposition to limit the extent of tenure security in the interest of ensuring beneficial occupation, promoting new forms of rural socio-economic organization, and preventing wealthier rural citizens from acquiring the assets of the poorer ones. Such a strategy can be defended on both conservation and development grounds, for it is not necessarily the case that either conservation or growth can occur without the state playing a significant leadership role. But security is one of the most important concerns of rural citizenry living relatively close to the margin of survival. There has been some evidence in the staff of the settlement schemes that prospective tenants are wary of giving up more certain tenure in the TTLs for a situation offering more opportunity but less security. The Government appears to have recognized the strong inclination on the part of peasant farmers, particularly on the settlement schemes, for secure individual tenure and to be aware of the need to avoid some of the excesses of forced villagization-Tanzania style. Its strategy to date has been to state a clear preference for more cooperative endeavor by rural people but from a position in which individual control of land is established. The government appears to seek cooperation among individuals rather than the submersion of individuality in collective rural enterprise.

The issues of traditional tenure practices, negotiability in land, and dual holdings by individual families together state important questions for all three major objectives. In the interests of equity, government might well decide to allow individuals freedom on an equal basis to determine how many holdings to maintain, whether or not to sell land for a consideration, and whether or not to adhere to traditional land tenure practices. The problem, however, is a classic one of political freedom becoming the precondition for the development of economic inequality which the government clearly seeks to prevent. Moreover, there is no guarantee that without state intervention current practices leading to ecological degradation in the TTLs will not intensify. It is not clear, moreover, whether rural economic growth can occur at the desired pace were the government to adopt such a laissez faire posture. The other principal equity concern involved is the role of women in development, for proposals to force urban employees to relinquish their holdings and move their families to the cities implies loss of independence

for women, deprivation of a significant development role, and the presumption that women simply aren't the equal of men as farmers -- a point that some otherwise quite conservative extension officers dispute.

The independent government has inherited from its predecessor a Tribal Trust Lands Act of 1979 which, while allowing the possibility of considerable local discretion by traditional chiefs or local councils in the management of land, also gives the minister strong powers to intervene in such matters on behalf of the President in whom land is vested. There is a nice issue of jurisprudence involved in the proposition that a successor regime should rely on the legal authority established by the regime it has supplanted. That jurisprudential issue has a more practical political dimension; whether people will accept the same kind of governmental intervention as that so despised in the past simply because a more popular government seeks to use the authority for more acceptable ends. To date, on this issue as on others, the Government has adopted the tactic of stating its preference and waiting for events and persuasion to produce harmony between what it wishes and what it perceives the people seek. What the government will do if and when such patience appears not to bear fruit on an important issue remains to be seen.

Finally, there are several models before the government outlining various degrees of cooperation in cultivation, pastoralism, and village life. The predominant approach in the intensive resettlement schemes to date has been to plan for somewhat closer proximity in living arrangements than in the TTLs, cooperative grazing and marketing, and individual cultivation of arable land. At the same time, it has set aside some purchased farms for more collective schemes, primarily for youth, under the direction of the Ministry of Youth and Sports. At this point the government appears to be content to state its general preference for more cooperation test a variety of models, involve several ministries and private as well as public enterprise, and rely upon persuasion and negotiation to produce a consensus eventually on the most desirable course of action to be taken.

C. Land Use and Development. There are several major issues of land use which the Government will be called upon to resolve as it pursues a variety of land use and development schemes: (1) how much credit to afford settlers and

what kind of protection against indebtedness by smallholders to establish; (2) how far can more intensive cultivation and grazing in the various natural regions be made consistent with ecological preservation; (3) whether to focus on master farmers operating consolidated and enlarged holdings that displace other peasants or provide more attention to the poorer farmers on the assumption that their entrepreneurial capacities have been underestimated; (4) how far to promote estate development in conjunction with small scale individual or village agricultural projects; and (5) how to view what are sometimes called the "residual" TTL populations.

The land use and development schemes presently encouraged by the government, including the intensive resettlement effort, place relatively few financial burdens upon the settlers.

The limited negotiability of occupation and cultivation permits, moreover, makes it difficult for small scale rural entrepreneurs to acquire excessive levels of indebtedness or be manipulated by the rural "haves." Kenya has been not quite so careful in this regard, and predictable difficulties may have arisen as a result. The question has not been explored whether endowing the settlers with somewhat more financial responsibility for the success of their farming enterprises is a necessary concomitant of encouraging more developmental participation at the local level. There is a clear tension between two inherited maladies of the former regime that the new one seeks to cure; encouraging participation to counter inherited paternalism and providing infrastructural and social service support for the peasant farmers who have been deprived of same in the past. At what point and in what ways will the government be prepared to give economic meaning to local political empowerment with all the attendant risks of greater rather than less inequality ensuing.

Fifteen years of political and economic isolation may have deprived the country of opportunities to contribute to, as well as benefit from, exploration of new production technologies. The question arises, therefore, whether the technological and ecological assumptions of contemporary rural development planning in Zimbabwe are in need of revision. It is possible that revised assumptions about carrying capacity might lead to the discovery of more ways to provide rural employment and take a measure of burden off those

responsible for planning employment generating commercial and industrial activities. Moreover, it is the case elsewhere that rural development technicians have found their work informed and more successful to the extent that they have been guided by the local knowledge as well as the preferences of peasant farmers. Because of the orientations of the previous regimes, reasons, more emphasis on rural development research, experimentation and extension activity are in order.

One of the most serious questions before the Government is whether to focus on the cadre of master farmers or potential master farmers rather than upon those frequently assumed to be less entrepreneurial. The IRDA schemes in particular envisage development by and for master farmers on enlarged, consolidated holdings with everyone else finding work elsewhere. The political difficulty of this approach was demonstrated 20 years ago with the Land Husbandry Act. Once again, it is not necessarily the case that a government deriving its authority from a popular mandate will find it any easier to accomplish such an objective than did its predecessor. Moreover, there is an untested assumption in this strategy that only a certain proportion of the rural peasantry are in fact potential cash crop farmers. There have been quantitative estimates, ranging from 10% to 30% based, as far as one can see, on very little empirical evidence. It is not necessarily the case that pursuing a British-style enclosure movement will produce the same kinds of results in such different circumstances. The key to such schemes, however, may well be the capacity of the government to generate attractive urban employment for a large number of rural producers. To the extent that "surplus" cultivators are attracted rather than pushed off the farm, such programs may well be highly beneficial to the country's rural development program.

One of the approaches that may be most productive and generate the most employment per hectare is plantation or estate development with permanent cultivators having garden plots around the periphery. The government is examining such models in some of the irrigation schemes that are in the planning or implementation stages. The difficulty with them is that they represent far more of a wrench from still valued traditional lifestyles in the

rural areas than some of the other alternatives. Moreover, these involved a good deal of state or parastatal management that may be out of keeping with peasant aspirations for individual farms. However, such schemes may well be useful complements to IRDAs in that they provide an alternative to draining "surplus" cultivators off the farm.

The position of the Tribal Trust Lands in the country's rural development is one of considerable historical as well as contemporary interest. The British Government in colonial times saw the reserves -- as they then were -- as temporary phenomena, believing that Africans in them would be drawn off into other kinds of employment as economic development proceeded apace. The European farmers tended to view them as more permanent fixtures, providing an enduring supply of temporary and cheap labor for their farms. The size of this "labor pool" was taken by the settlers as an indication of how close to bare subsistence rates of compensation for African labor on their farms can be pushed. Today, the Tribal Trust Lands present a similar set of issues under very different circumstances. The question is whether interest in the TTLs will center relatively more on development of them for their own sake or whether they will be treated as a source of labor that must be absorbed in productive enterprise elsewhere if production and equity are to be achieved. Given that the government contemplates the eventual dismantling of distinctions between TTLs and commercial areas, it would seem to be important to focus simultaneously and in balanced fashion on rural development enterprises which will promote the development of TTLs themselves as well as programs elsewhere. This will be necessary so that the economic as well as political basis for the distinction between the two regions can be erased.

D. Land Administration. The principal issues in land administration are: (1) how much local participation to encourage in the land use and development process in rural areas; (2) conversely, how much state direction to undertake in bringing about rural development; (3) what priority to place on monitoring, research, extension, and experimentation in rural development matters; and (4) how to promote effective management of rural development schemes.

The previous regimes were noted for their degree of paternalism. The independent Government of Zimbabwe has made clear its intention to promote greater local participation. The problem is that to do so requires vesting local organizations with control over the allocation of at least some resources with the risks identified earlier. To date the government has deferred vesting local councils with a great deal of authority in rural development matters. The councils are still untested. With them, too, there is a bitter inheritance from the past. Moreover, the government is still establishing its own leadership and authority in the directing of Zimbabwe's post independence and development. Once again, an inherited lack of good information about needs and problems experienced at the local level inhibits making sound judgements on these issues. The use of party organizations will help, but more scientific inquiries are also in order. Finally, no matter how these issues are resolved there is an agreed lack of trained village level workers, administrators for the local council staff, managers for the settlement schemes, and field representation of central ministries generally. Workforce analysis is still in progress, particularly concerning the skills and interests of returning refugees and exiles. Upon the results of such an assessment will depend the magnitude of the government's political problems in Africanizing its civil service and its economic problem in providing quality local level rural development leadership.

IV

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions are inappropriate about a process of change and transformation that is just beginning. What may be more appropriate is to outline a few basic parameters that might usefully be kept in mind as the drama of rural development in independent Zimbabwe unfolds:

1. Successful reform of land tenure and development patterns in Zimbabwe will have an important bearing on the success of the African continent's possibly most hopeful experiment in political democracy on the foundation of established human rights.

2. While the specific understandings agreed to at Lancaster House may be known only to a relatively few individuals, the general point remains valid that international cooperation in the administration of economic sanctions to help end minority rule must now be continued in the form of international assistance to make majority rule work. In no area is this assistance more critical than in the transformation of the rural areas and the resolution of land issues.
3. In few countries has the rural poor majority been more systematically ignored for so long as in Zimbabwe under the previous regimes. While the nationalist movement that led to the present government has deep and extensive roots, this government still faces a major task in seeking to understand --locale by locale-- the requirements of the now enfranchised rural poor -- understandings that must be gained quickly if the political pressures fueled by their needs are to be met in timely fashion.
4. Inherited compartmentalization of the rural areas makes broad gauged rural development efforts far more difficult than they might otherwise be. It is important, however, to persist in and strengthen efforts to erase these barriers, for in the long term that adverse consequences for both equity and growth in maintaining those distinctions will be almost as serious as when they were employed to entrench the opposite of racial equality and justice.

Appendix 2

Ambassador Robert V. Keeley, U.S. Embassy Salisbury
Geoffrey Davidow, Deputy Chief of Mission, U.S. Embassy Salisbury
Charles R. Grader, Director USAID Salisbury
Alice Morton, Office of Rural Development and Development Administration,
Agency for International Development
Calvin Martin, Regional Economic Development Services Organization, Agency for
International Development
Hon. Moven Machai, Deputy Minister, Lands Settlement and Rural Development
Mr. Stephen Johnson, Acting Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. P. Dibble, Deputy Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. John Hilligan, Deputy Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. David Hillditch, Assistant Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. Zahutu, Deputy Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. J. Knowles, Assistant Secretary, MLSRD
Mr. T. Jordan, Department of Agricultural Development
Mr. A. Stubbs, Director, Department of Agricultural Development (DEVAG)
Mr. Peter Freeman, Overseas Development Administration
Mr. Peter Carter, Overseas Development Administration
Members of the District Council, Madziwa Tribal Trust Land
Mr. Roy Cripps, District Commissioner Shanva
Extension Assistant, Madziwa TTL
Mr. Kevin Roberts, Director, Cooperatives and Marketing, Ministry of
Agriculture
Mr. Tillet, Director, ARDA
Mr. Ted Morse, Deputy Director, Southern Africa, A.I.D.
Mr. Martin Lowenkopf, Department of State, INR
Dr. Rukutso Murapa, Department of Political Science, University of Zimbabwe
Mr. Daniel Simpson, Deputy Director, Southern Africa, U.S. Department of State
Dr. Ann Seidman, Acting Chair, Department of Economics, University of Zimbabwe
Dr. Robert Seidman, Faculty of Law, University of Zimbabwe
Dr. Conrad Brand, Department of Sociology, University of Zimbabwe
Dr. Charles Utete, Dean, College of Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe

Dr. Hasu Patel, Chair, Department of Political Science, University of Zimbabwe
Dr. Ridley Nelson, IBRD
Mr. David Gene Reese, IBRD
Mr. L. Laurens, Director, Conservation and Extension Department, Ministry of
Agriculture
Mr. John Hayward, Deputy Director, Con. Ex.
Mr. Peter Ivy, Con. Ex.
Mr. A. Stubbs, Overseas Development Administration
Mr. Bromley Walker, DC Buluwayo
Dr. L. DeSwaart, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Zimbabwe
Mr. A. McAllister, Buluwayo
Mr. Justice Leo Baron, Appellate Court, Zimbabwe
Mr. Roger Riddell, Salisbury
Mr. Steve Weissman, House of Representatives, African Affairs Subcommittee
Settlement Officer, Gutu Settlement Scheme
Mr. Evans Mtwarira, Wedza Settlement Scheme
Mr. Ernest Mbengo, Wedza Settlement Scheme
Mr. Cliff Sileya, Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture
Mr. Nelson Chirwa, Ministry of Youth, Sports and Culture
Mr. Michael Coleman, Con. Ex.
Mr. Sam Nguze, ILSRD
Dr. Grandolyn Carter, Indiana University

Best Available Document

Appendix 3

Selected Sources

- Whitsun Foundation, A Strategy for Rural Development. Data Bank No.2 The Peasant Sector 1978.
- Palmer, R. Land and Racial Domination in Rhodesia (Heinemann, 1977).
- Riddell, Roger The Land Problem in Rhodesia Mambo Press, 1978.
- Weinrich, A.K.H. Chiefs and Councils in Rhodesia (University of South Carolina Press, 1971).
- Bourdillon, M. The Shona Peoples, 1976.
- Harbeson, J. Nation Building in Kenya: The Role of Land Reform (Northwestern, 1973).
- Weinrich, A.K.H. African Farmers in Rhodesia (Oxford, 1974).
- Goldin, B. and Gelfand H. African Law and Custom in Rhodesia (Juta, 1975).
- Ranger, T.O The African Voice in Southern Rhodesia (Heinemann, 1970).
- Bowman, L. Politics in Rhodesia (Harvard, 1973).
- Holliman, J.F. Shona Customary Law (Oxford, 1952).

ZIMCORD

umentation

Appendix 3 (continued)

- Hume, I.M. A Preliminary Essay on Land Reform in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe (Whitsun Foundation, 1978)
- Clarke, D.G. Agricultural Plantation Workers in Rhodesia (Mambo, 1977).
- Bratton, M. "Development Strategy in Zimbabwe" unpublished.
- Bratton, M. "The Public Service in Zimbabwe" 95 Political Science Quarterly, pp. 441-454.
- Riddell, R. "The Land Question" From Rhodesia to Zimbabwe, Catholic Institute for International Relations.