

CHAPTER 4:

LAND IN ZIMBABWE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter is the cornerstone of this research report as it investigates the specifics of the very subject being analysed. The chapter is set out chronologically to reflect an unfolding process. It contains only the two sections highlighting land in Zimbabwe during colonialism and after colonialism in an attempt to simplify a very complicated subject. This chapter is not supposed to read as a history only, land issues are discussed against the backdrop of a history already described in the previous chapter.

The importance of land in Zimbabwe is obvious:

It is not too much to say that in one way or another fate of property rights in the land area will be a key determinant of the shape of Zimbabwe's entire political economy in the years to come.¹

Land was a central issue during the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, and continues to be an important domestic issue.² In 1980, the pattern of land ownership saw white large – scale commercial farmers, numbering some 6, 000, holding 39% of the land; black small – scale commercial farmers, numbering some 8, 000, holding 4%; communal lands where 4 million people lived holding 41%; and national parks and state forests accounting for 16% of the land.³

During the colonial period, European settlers appropriated African land and the present land issue in Zimbabwe is thus a result of continued social inequality.⁴ Much Zimbabwean politics is thus the result of land reform. This chapter examines this affect, and forms the backdrop to the later investigation of Zimbabwean, South African and British foreign policy.

This chapter focuses mainly on the years before the mid 1980's and the years after the early 1990's. This is because land reform was relatively neglected by the Mugabe administration from 1985 – 1995.

THE LAND ISSUE DURING COLONIALISM

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the section entitled “Early Colonialism”, The Land Apportionment Act of 1931 and the Land Tenure Act of 1969 were the two main pieces of legislation during colonialism that began geographical segregation of the population due to land and land rights. This legislation obviously coming after the Pioneer Column entered the country in 1890 and had acquired most of the good farmland ten years later.

This early land reform produced a rather feudal form of politics based on racial and class discrimination imposed on the African population by the British government and white Rhodesians.⁵ Also, tribal traditions present no form of property rights as understood by Western culture. This in effect was the beginning of Zimbabwe’s land problem. To the European pioneers, land in Zimbabwe was for the taking, and since there was no concrete land legislation imposed by the African living off the land, they had no say in land that was thus acquired. Even though much land was available in the late 1890’s and the early 1900’s, not all of it was arable, and this produced a want in the Europeans (already present in the Africans) to acquire only good land with arable soil.

When reviewing this early land situation some twenty years later in 1915, the Native Reserve Commission reported that the European authorities had acted on some very poor assumptions.⁶ One of these was that land that had not been acquired by Europeans could be given to Africans. The only problem with this was that no one occupied the land because it was of poor quality and it was therefore unsustainable. Also, when the European introduced legislation that allowed Africans to purchase particular land, their lack of understanding an exchange economy produced an ineffectiveness to exercise their purchase right.⁷

Another land issue that surfaced in the years between the Land Apportionment Act and the Land Tenure Act was migrant labour.⁸ The majority of young African men left the African areas in search of work in the European areas. This began a breakdown in the tribal African tradition for it was the young men who worked the land and took over from the elders when the time was right. Also, with only women and children to work the land, productivity was lowered, leading the African

population to suffer socially. On the up side, some of the men did return with either enough money to buy land or with enough exposure to advanced agricultural technology to influence the tribal trust lands positively. The labour force produced by migrant labourers became a vital part of Zimbabwe's economy, for as the economy advanced, these men became the backbone of the labour force.⁹

The land situation in what was then Rhodesia worsened after the Land Apportionment Act. In 1945, thousands of new white settlers moved to the country because the British government had promised them land, and demobilised soldiers were offered a chance to farm in Africa as a reward for their service in World War II.¹⁰ Around 85,000 African families were evicted from their land in the ten years between 1945 and 1955. From 1952 to 1954, the same sort of eviction (100,000 people) took place in Kenya and resulted in the Mau Mau uprising.¹¹ In Rhodesia, Ian Smith and UDI channelled these grievances into a liberation struggle.

The 1969 Land Tenure Act was then introduced by Smith, and intended to entrench a permanent division of land.¹² The guerrilla war that followed in the 1970's (Africans nationalists vs. white Rhodesians) was fought for liberation against white rule, yet winning back land provided much of the rhetoric and motivation for it.¹³

The issue of land in Zimbabwe came to the forefront during the Lancaster House conference in London in 1979, where British and Zimbabwean representatives met to resolve the transfer of power and other pre – independence issues. Indeed, the land issue was one of the most difficult to resolve.¹⁴ The whites, backed by the British government insisted that land rights be entrenched in a bill of rights in the new constitution.¹⁵

The compromise that Mugabe was forced to accept meant that for ten years the government could only purchase land against the owner's wishes if it was 'underutilized' or required for a public purpose, and then only if the owner was provided with prompt and full compensation in foreign exchange. In other words, land transactions could only be conducted on a 'willing seller – willing buyer' basis. This provision effectively restricted the government to purchasing limited and often poor quality land that was voluntarily offered for sale. Britain agreed to help finance a land redistribution programme but within a strict budget.¹⁶

Mugabe recalled what he had said during the Lancaster House negotiations on this issue:

*I said, "But you are Africans, how dare you accept the position of land shall be governed by the Bill of Rights? We can't get anywhere with the Bill of Rights. Don't you remember your history? The land was never bought from us. Support our position on this one!"*¹⁷

THE LAND ISSUE POST - COLONIALISM

The land issue only worsened after Zimbabwe achieved independence and ZANU – PF won the 1980 elections. Mugabe now wanted land reparations from commercial farmers (mainly white) for the segregation of the land that had been enforced by white Rhodesians. The land issue was also still used to gain support among the African people in Zimbabwe.

In the run up to the 1990 elections, ZANU stressed the need to speed up the land redistribution process in order to keep past promises to retain the support of its constituency.¹⁸ The 1990s also promised to keep the land debate alive due to the expiration of the Lancaster House Constitution and its prohibition on government expropriation of land.¹⁹

*In December 1990 Parliament passed a bill that allowed the government to seize farmland and pay whatever compensation it chose. But this new land policy, with its potentially dramatic challenge to property rights, obviously clashes with Zimbabwe's efforts to reform its economy and promote domestic and foreign investment.*²⁰

The argument that compensation was never given to the Africans for land that was unlawfully taken by the Europeans in the first place (so what then compels the Africans to compensate the Europeans some years later) is a strong one. This argument compels people like Dr. Tetteh Osabu – Kle to write: "There is talk about compensation. The question is who should pay the compensation – the robber or the robbed? Certainly, natural justice demands that the robber, when caught, should pay the compensation."²¹ Dr. Osabu – Kle believes that Mugabe is addressing the injustices of the past, and that makes him the wisest African leader alive today – "For some few white Africans to own 80% of the arable land and millions of black

Africans to have nothing, is very unAfrican and unacceptable!’”²² (But are the means used to address past injustices just?) Yet, what Herbst rightfully shows us, is that the Zimbabwean government seems to go to war with itself. On the one hand they want land back in the hands of the African peasantry, yet on the other hand, they want to sustain a viable agricultural economy.²³

Zimbabwe’s wants reparations for past actions, and even though they have gone the wrong way about it, it is understandable. In 1889, the British South Africa Company was formed in Rhodesia to buy concessions from the British Crown that formed the basis of the subsequent wholesale land theft.²⁴ Profits went into British coffers.²⁵ Over the next decade, white settlers hemmed the majority of the black population into Native Reserves and began the division of the African peoples’ land (they received small, infertile tracts while the white farms were the largest and the best).

*Zimbabwe was once renowned as the “bread-basket of Africa. The country was able to feed itself and give generously to drought stricken African nations. Government subsidies on food production and regulated prices played a major part in this agricultural success. But IMF prescriptions changed all that. The IMF argued that it didn’t make economic sense to use the fiscal budget to capitalise the agricultural market. Rather, farmers should be planting and selling their goods independently. That is proper capitalism.”*²⁶

This is when the Zimbabwean government started buying back land in the late 1990’s so that the peasantry could become landowners.²⁷ This was to be done on a willing buyer – willing seller basis, yet in practice, the government was not prepared to meet the farmers’ prices (few governments in such situations do – the current South African land redistribution programme highlights this).²⁸ Then it all fell apart, for where actual land was bought it was given to party cadres instead of peasantry, and to top it off, Britain stopped providing financial support as a result.

America also pledged money to Zimbabwe for land redistribution after its involvement in the Lancaster House Conference in 1979, yet President Carter’s successor, President Reagan, and his Assistant Secretary of State, Chester Crocker arbitrarily stopped the money that was pledged.²⁹ This began uncertain relations between the US and Zimbabwe. The US also has great influence over the IMF and

World Bank that were responsible for the poor economic advice given to Zimbabwe in the 1980's.³⁰

The above – mentioned reasons alone show that land in Zimbabwe is simply the catalyst of bigger issues.³¹ “The real causes of distress are poor economic management, ruling party hegemony, racial anxieties, global aid politics and the inability of a nation to execute change”.³² If the principles of good governance (which include a co – operative foreign policy approach) are not adhered to, starting with government structures, then everything that follows on from this (land policy, economic policy, human rights etc.) will not yield sustainable, democratic results.

In terms of the political economy, the land problem in Zimbabwe is illogical. “Land is Economy and Economy is Land” was the election manifesto of the ZANU-PF in the elections that followed the land invasions.³³ “In modern economic theory land is no longer the basis of an economy. It was replaced by intellectual property and good environment (health, good governance, and good economic policies)”.³⁴

Unfortunately, Zimbabwe has not developed to this stage yet, and through the loss of economically viable land, her economy has dramatically slumped. Zimbabwe has the land, but lacks development. Proper planning and sound policies are required in order to achieve development. One cannot create an economy that relies on the output of farmers, and then seizes the farmers land and expects the economy to flourish. Zimbabweans have been led to believe that land is a goal- once you have it everything else will be solved. The current situation in Zimbabwe is a perfect example of how the acquisition of land does not solve all problems.

Much of the land that has been taken through the land reform process was the source of Zimbabwe's main export crops: coffee, flowers, and tobacco.³⁵ To raise these crops for international markets requires a high level of sophisticated technical expertise.³⁶ Thus, productive commercial farms have been transformed into multiple parcels of farmland only adequate for subsistence farming. The people who acquired this land had no such expertise, and also had no use for heavy machinery or pesticides, which means that those industries lost their business. According to Terence Bragge, a farmer in Zimbabwe, “it is devastating to see what has happened to some of the prime farm

land in Zimbabwe – hectares of roses destroyed to be replaced by a tiny area of subsistence farming.”³⁷

Zimbabwe’s economy is not such that can sustain its land reform process. In 1990 Zimbabwe agreed to implement a five – year *Economic Structural Adjustment Programme* (ESAP).³⁸ Measures introduced included removal of price and wage controls, reduction in government expenditure and removal of subsidies on basic consumer goods.³⁹ “Subsequently, in 1991, the government announced the *Framework for Economic Reform* (1991 – 95), which set a time frame for reducing support to parastatals.”⁴⁰ Furthermore, in 1998, the government launched the second stage of its economic structural adjustment programme, the *Zimbabwe Programme for Economic and Social Transformation* (ZIMPREST). This outlined the macroeconomic reforms it intended to implement through to the year 2000.⁴¹

Since 1991, the Zimbabwean dollar has been repeatedly devalued, and Zimbabwe’s economy has progressively suffered.⁴² This is due to the lifting of protectionism which resulted in the closing and down – sizing of many labour – intensive industries, South Africa’s decision to impose tariffs on Zimbabwe’s textile exports, drought and a decline in manufacturing productivity. The inflation rate in the country has now sky – rocketed.

ESAP also led to severe cutbacks in social programming and spending which severely affected the role of civics in Zimbabwe. “Zimbabwean civil society is littered with the wreckage of countless failed self – help organizations, training programmes and other schemes which never established a consistent regime of operation nor attracted a regular monetary income.”⁴³

Social Inequality and Land in Zimbabwe

The land issue has also seen much social inequality over the years. It now includes ethnic and patriarchal overtones, and highlights gender issues, for example, more than half the Zimbabwean population consists of women but in terms of hereditary rights, land is passed from man to man.

Women's perspectives and needs have been marginalized in the discourse shaping land reform in Zimbabwe's resettlement programme. The 1993 Land Tenure Commission (Rukuni 1994) was appointed by the president of Zimbabwe to investigate the key issues in all land categories in Zimbabwe, and through its recommendations to act as a central vehicle for land reform. Although it had no specific brief to examine gender issues, the commission consulted women on some topics and commented on their perspectives in its report. Local feminist activists also undertook their own extensive study on women's' perspectives on land reform and submitted it to the commission (Zimbabwean Women's' Resource Centre and Network (ZWRCN) 1994a). All this occurred in a context wherein the Zimbabwean government had, in 1991, signed the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, Article 14 of which declares:

'State parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in rural areas, in order to insure – on a basis of equality between men and women – equal treatment (of women) in land and agrarian reform as well as land settlement schemes.'

In its final recommendations, however, the commission has almost entirely ignored women's' views and interests. Its recommendations on privatisation and the granting of title deeds are likely to heighten women's' insecurity concerning their entitlement to resettlement land (Chenau – Repond 1996). The recommendations also jeopardized some of the current advantages for women in resettlement, especially those accruing to widows.⁴⁴

Since most women on resettlement schemes are married, they hence have no primary rights to land except those mediated through marriage.⁴⁵ In the early years of resettlement, the Zimbabwean government allowed certain categories of unmarried (widowed or divorced) women and their dependents to obtain permits for resettlement in their own right. This was a major advance for women, because for the first time they had primary rights to agricultural land. However, over the years, only a small number of women have obtained this permit.⁴⁶

Early Donor Support for Land Redistribution

Zimbabwe abandoned its hard line stance on land reform (for a while) at a conference, which ended on 11 September 1998, when donors failed to offer any serious money.⁴⁷ The message from the donors was that if Zimbabwe could afford a military excursion into the Democratic Republic of the Congo, then it did not need money for land

reform.⁴⁸ After a year of confusion surrounding the land reform, the country's precarious economy had weakened and smallholders had invaded some commercial farms.

Mugabe had promised to acquire land for the people in 1997. He had the political support since the issue of land was the *raison d'être* of the liberation war. Yet, land reform has been mishandled since the first phase of the resettlement programme ended in 1985.⁴⁹ The prospects for rapid land redistribution faded as economic problems mounted in 1998. Despite balance of payment support from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the domestic debt was threatening and the currency collapsed to Z\$ 35 = US\$ 1; interest rates rocketed to 48 per cent.⁵⁰

During the three day land conference hosted by Zimbabwe in September 1998, Zimbabwe accepted all conditions laid down by the donors (especially those from Britain, the World Bank and the European Union (EU)), and conceded that the land reform process would be implemented in a transparent, fair and sustainable manner, which showed respect for the law and would broaden stakeholder as well as beneficiary participation.⁵¹ The donors also stated that it was to be affordable, cost effective and consistent with economic and financial management reforms.

Harare had expected donors to pay the full US\$ 357.2 million cost of land acquisition and to raise a total of \$ 1.9 billion for its five – year programme. However, pledges announced at the end of the conference amounted to less than \$ 1 million...In June (1998) the IMF agreed a standby facility and disbursed US\$ 52 million, leaving the country with enough foreign exchange for two months – until Mugabe plunged into a costly war in Congo – Kinshasa. On 16 September (1998), the United States' Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, Susan Rice, said her government regarded the intervention in Congo of Angola, Namibia and Zimbabwe, as 'destabilizing and very dangerous as well'. The USA wants Zimbabwe out of Congo if it is to be bailed out by the IMF...Some 3,000 Zimbabwean soldiers are thought to be in Congo and Sagit, a leading Zimbabwe stockbroker, estimated Zimbabwe's operation there costs about US\$ 1 million a day. The National Constitutional Assembly (NCA⁵²), which lobbies for a more democratic constitution, wants to take the government to court for engaging in the war without consulting parliament.⁵³

Good governance and effective foreign policy could have ensured a peaceful and cooperative land redistribution process for Zimbabwe, yet their intervention into the Congo was just one of many mistakes. Mugabe did (and still does) not seem to realize that effective foreign policy is essential to ensuring the frontrunner to effective cooperation and support.

The economic collapse of Zimbabwe was commented upon in a debate in the Zimbabwe House of Commons quoted in its Hansard for 25 June 2002. A member stated: "Inflation (in Zimbabwe) is 122 per cent, almost two thirds of the population are unemployed, foreign direct investment has decreased from \$430 million in 1998 to \$4 million in 2001, and gross domestic product in 2003 is predicted to be half that of 2001."⁵⁴

Food shortages due to drought and the agricultural disruption caused by the seizure of white – owned farms led Mugabe to proclaim a state of disaster in April (2002). In August the government ordered 2, 900 white farmers to leave their farms, but more than half did not comply, and the police began arresting those who did not. By the end of 2002 some 600 white farmers remained (out of a pre – redistribution total of 4, 500) mainly on smallholdings.⁵⁵

The disruption caused by the seizure of smallholdings does not have the same implications as that of commercial farms. The owners of small - holdings (a number of them black Africans) are still left landless, yet the Zimbabwean economy is not hit in the same way as the destruction of a working commercial farm. Some owners of smallholdings are not farmers, so they are still able to seek employment elsewhere. For the rest, unemployment is an issue, yet they were not yielding a product that supported the core structures of the Zimbabwean economy.⁵⁶

The MDC stands in direct opposition to not only to the government's land reform policy, but also its economic aims and objectives. Even though the economy has virtually collapsed as a result, Mugabe retains grassroots support. This is because "the MDC's core supporters - trade unionists, the jobless, professionals – are in the towns, where there is little interest in ZANU's brand of land resettlement."⁵⁷ But, 63 per cent of Zimbabwean households are rural (1997 census), and ZANU's election

strategy is to move tens of thousands of urban voters into rural areas offering them a resettlement scheme.⁵⁸

CONCLUSION

During colonialism the European settlers and white Rhodesians took land from the Africans. The fight for liberation in Zimbabwe was supported by the notion that land was to be reclaimed by the Africans and for the Africans. As the ZANU – PF government consolidated power the land issue became more and more important. As one can see, however, things took a turn for the worst when white farmers were offered no compensation for land (even though this was written in the constitution). The 1998 land conference only increased international tension; a thoroughly implemented, sustainable land programme in Zimbabwe now seemed impossible. In the years after the 1998 squatting on land became commonplace, and the ruling government ignored the laws of the country in this respect. Violence against farmers has increased to such a level that many people are fleeing the country. As a result of this, Zimbabwe's economy is in ruins.

ZANU – PF had placed pressure on itself when, in 1990, it used speeding up the land redistribution process as one of its election promises. Later, the government made some really negative economic decisions with its structural adjustment programmes. The results of this were a devalued currency, a neglected social sector, and huge domestic debt. In light of these results, rushing the redistribution of land, especially land yielding a good crop that contributed to the exports of the country, was not well considered. The government needed to be more focussed, and understand how land and the economy work hand in hand, yet even more attention was shifted away from domestic issues with Zimbabwe's military excursion into the DRC in 1998. The country's involvement in the DRC had a negative effect on the attitude of its donor nations. This lessened international support for the land redistribution programme.

It is vitally important to understand the land issue in Zimbabwe if one is to comprehend its politics and foreign policy. When making a study of the country in the last thirty years, it is hard to overlook the role that the land redistribution programme has played. The importance and effect of land on Zimbabwe is applied to foreign

policy in Chapter 6, while the human rights violations to come out of land reform and Zimbabwean politics will be examined in the next chapter.

Endnotes

- ¹ Herbst, J., "The Dilemmas of Land Policy in Zimbabwe" in Baynham, S (ed): Zimbabwe in Transition. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1992, pp. 129.
- ² Ibid, pp. 129.
- ³ Meredith, M., Op Cit, pp. 120.
- ⁴ Herbst, J., Op Cit, pp. 129.
- ⁵ Yudelman, M., Op Cit, pp. 61.
- ⁶ Ibid, pp. 64.
- ⁷ Ibid, pp. 64.
- ⁸ Ibid, pp. 132.
- ⁹ Ibid, pp. 138.
- ¹⁰ Blair, D., Degrees in Violence – Robert Mugabe and the Struggle for Power in Zimbabwe, London: Continuum, 2002, pp. 172.
- ¹¹ The Mau Mau uprising was a violent battle between a specific African tribe in Kenya and the British settlers. The British suppressed it, and the Mau Mau lost their land. Yet the uprising did lead to Kenyan independence.
- ¹² Meredith, M., Op Cit, pp. 116.
- ¹³ This war was called "the second Chimurenga" by the Shona. Chimurenga was the name the Shona people gave to the African uprisings against white settlement in the 1890's. The word means "uprising" or "resistance" in Shona. Taken from Moorcraft, P. L. and McLaughlin, P., Op Cit, pp. cover page.
- ¹⁴ Meredith, M., Op Cit, pp. 118.
- ¹⁵ Ibid, pp. 119.
- ¹⁶ Ibid, pp. 119.
- ¹⁷ Meredith, M., Robert Mugabe: Power, Plunder and Tyranny in Zimbabwe. South Africa: Jonathan Ball Publishers, 2002, pp. 119.
- ¹⁸ Herbst, J., Op Cit, pp. 129.
- ¹⁹ Ibid, pp. 129.
- ²⁰ Ibid, pp. 129.
- ²¹ Osabu – Kle, T., "The Fundamental Problem in Zimbabwe" in Ankomah, B. (ed) New African issue no. 400. London: IC Publications, 2001, pp. 47.
- ²² Ibid, pp. 47.
- ²³ Buckle, C., African Tears: The Zimbabwean Land Invasion. South Africa: Jonathan Ball Publishers, 2001, pp. 42.
- ²⁴ Lawton, S., "British Colonialism: Zimbabwe's Land Reform and Settler Resistance" (accessed from <http://home.clear.net.nz-pages-cpa-news-Zimbabwe.htm> on 9 January 2005), pp. 1.
- ²⁵ Ibid, pp. 1.
- ²⁶ Mbele, L., Op Cit, pp. 1.
- ²⁷ Ibid, pp. 1.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 1.

²⁹ “History of Zimbabwe” (accessed from <http://www.zimembassy.se/history.htm> on 24 July 2005), pp. 6.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 6.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 2.

³² *Ibid.*, pp. 2.

³³ Zunga, L., *Farm Invasions in Zimbabwe: Is Zimbabwe a Democracy?* South Africa: Truth House Publishing, 2003, pp. 82.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 82.

³⁵ Random Pensees, “Zimbabwe v. Kenya, a Different Approach to Land”, 2004 (accessed from <http://randompensees.mu.nu/archives/042655.php> on 9 January 2005), pp. 1.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 1.

³⁷ Taken from an interview with Zimbabwean farmer, Terence Bragge, in June 2005.

³⁸ Sichone, O., “Zimbabwe’s Economic Policies, 1980 – 2002” (accessed from <http://dpmf.org/bulletin-apr-03/zimbabwe-economic-policy-sichone.html> on 9 January 2005), pp. 1.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 1.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 1.

⁴¹ Article written by Morgan Tsvangirai (now leader of the MDC) when he was still ZCTU Secretary – General about the predicted impact of ZIMPREST:

“Since the end of ESAP 1 in 1995, the Government finally launched the long awaited Zimbabwe Programme for Economic and Social Transformation (ZIMPREST) document, which is intended to spearhead the second phase of the reform programme. One of the lessons drawn from ESAP 1 is that the lack of fiscal discipline resulted in excessive borrowings, which fuelled inflation and exacerbated poverty. Another lesson identified is that for comprehensive reforms to succeed, they should be embedded in the aspirations of the people and that reforms should empower people to participate in the economy.

Judging from the past experience, it is highly unlikely that the targeted 6% annual rate of growth under ZIMPREST will be achieved. During ESAP 1, the actual average annual economic growth rate of 0.2% was way below the target rate of 5%. This will largely fail due to the inability of Government to reign in on its expenditure. Two years into ZIMPREST the budget deficit is in excess of 10% of GDP, inflation is closing in on 30%, interest rates are above 35% and unemployment at around 50%.

With General and Presidential elections due in the year 2000, it is difficult to see Government implementing unpopular aspects of civil service reforms, including far reaching restructuring of the role of the state. ZIMPREST also rightly observes that any reform programme will only succeed if it is nationally owned. The National Economic Consultative Forum (NECF) is given a central role in ensuring national ownership and implementation of ZIMPREST. Regrettably, the fact that those that

are currently participating in the Forum are doing so in their individual capacity will not foster national ownership of ZIMPREST. This therefore implies the need to re-examine the composition of the Forum to ensure institutional representation.” – “Current Economic and Political Debate in Zimbabwe” (accessed from http://www.samara.co.zw/zctu/position_papers/debate.htm on 24 July 2005), pp. 1.

⁴² *Ibid.*, pp. 2.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 3.

⁴⁴ Goebel, A. “‘Here It Is Our Land, the Two of Us’: Woman, Men and Land in a Zimbabwean Resettlement Area” in Southall, R. (ed) *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* vol. 17 no. 1. London: Carfax Publications Ltd., 1999, pp. 75.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 79.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 79.

⁴⁷ “Zimbabwe – In the Badlands” in Smith, P. (ed) *Africa Confidential* vol. 39 no. 19. London, Africa Confidential, 1998, pp. 7.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 7.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7.

“Mugabe’s land reform in the 1990s was implemented in a chaotic manner from the start. No attempt was made to consult farmers, rural communities, or even the government’s own agricultural specialists. In December 1990, amid singing and dancing, parliament passed a constitutional amendment that empowered the government simply to confiscate land, fix the price it paid, and deny the right to appeal to courts for fair compensation.” (Meredith, M., *Op Cit*, pp. 122.)

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 7.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 7.

⁵² is now the MDC, still headed by Morgan Tsvangirai.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, pp. 73.

⁵⁴ “United Kingdom Parliament” – House of Commons Hansard Debates for 25 June 2002 (accessed from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020625/debtext/20... on 9 January 2005>), pp. 1.

⁵⁵ “History” (accessed from <http://www.factmonster.com/ce6/world/A0862066.html on 9 January 2005>), pp. 3.

⁵⁶ “Activists: Fast track is right track in Zimbabwe land redistribution plan” (accessed from http://www.finalcall.com/artman/publish/article_477.shtml on 24 July 2005), pp. 1 – 3.

⁵⁷ “Zimbabwe – Hanging in There” in Smith, P. (ed) *Africa Confidential* vol. 42 no. 16. London, Africa Confidential, 2001. pp. 4.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 4.