



Fast tracked into citizens or subjects? The impact of Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform on Chiredzi district land beneficiaries' citizenship.

Mutanda, Gideon, Walter^{1*} and Simatele, Danny Mulala²

¹ Department of Physics, Geography and Environmental Science; Great Zimbabwe University

² Department of Physics, Geography and Environmental Science; Great Zimbabwe University

*Corresponding author: gmutanda@gzu.ac.zw

Abstract

In the early 2000s, the Government of Zimbabwe embarked on the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) with the primary aim of redistributing land from white-owned farms to black farmers under A1 (subsistence) and A2 (commercial) model. Using data collection methods inspired by the tradition of phenomenological research, this paper discusses the impact of FTLRP on citizenship of A1 beneficiaries in Maware and Peter Wenhamo farms in Chiredzi district, Zimbabwe. A central theme on which this paper is anchored on argues that while the FTLRP had instilled feelings of personal worth and the right to belong, feelings of being held as political hostages and helplessness have also ensued among beneficiaries. There is a feeling of increased disenfranchisement, loss of civil liberties, insidious political victimizations and abuse among A1 beneficiaries. In view of this, it is argued that for the FTLRP to realize its intended socio-economic outcomes, there is an urgent need for Zimbabwean authorities to realize that access to the right to agricultural land makes 'incomplete' citizens in the absence of civil liberties since the later are empowerment rights to achieve other rights.

Key words: Fast track land reform, citizenship, beneficiaries, development, Zimbabwe.

1. Introduction

African colonization saw the dismemberment of land and differentiation of citizens based on colour (Nyangura, 2015). Colonial governments dualised rural land tenure systems into European settlements and African reserves (Kanyinga, 2009). Differentiated citizenship had begun in earnest as raced land tenure led to the creation of 'citizens' on European land and subjects on African reserves (Kanyinga, 2009). Jones and Gaventa (2002) argues that colonial legislation institutionalized white settlers as economically and socially privileged 'citizens' while devaluing the black majority as 'subjects'. This confirms ancient Greek and Roman description of 'citizens' as privileged people living in specially designated social spaces different from subjects or 'slaves' (Miraftab, 2012). Dualised tenure was a political tool used by the colonial government to remake citizenship (Ku and Pun, 2004) among the white land owners and landless black people. Their exclusionary land policies buttressed a dual land tenure system socially engineered to create opportunities and entrench colonial settlers' interests, (Magosvongwe & Makwavarara, 2015) while undermining African and liberal citizenship. However, in some African countries like Zimbabwe white farmers associations also heightened feelings of unequal citizenship by linking their superiority in production to their 'supreme citizenship' (Matondi, 2012). Dual land tenure systems that had been created by colonial policies made white farmers to see themselves as a distinct group of rural citizens with titled land and major contributors to the country's food security despite enjoying exclusionary agrarian policies. Gutto (2014) is of the view that citizenship was empty without indigenes' connection to the land which is at the centre of Africanness and liberal citizenship.



Citizenship is experienced and mediated through forms of identity, of which land is one of them (James, 2013). Landlessness created inequality in land and citizenship forcing indigenes to be 'second citizens' and workers of white industrialists and farmers (Moyo, 2005). Vengeseyi (2012) argues that colonial land dispossession from indigenous people was not solely for the purposes of economic production but was meant to create a class of white 'masters' and 'poverty' of citizenship among 'second citizens (black labourers). The African Charter on Peoples' Rights of 1986 urges nation states to award 'all' people the right to self-determination and enjoyment of political, socio-economic and civil rights, a pointer that access to 'tri-rights' is a preserve of the few (Tong, 2014). According to Ku and Pun (2004) people might have a right of abode in a community but this does not automatically translate into enjoyment of these tri-rights rights.

Nyagura (2015) observes that it is incontestable that many post independent African governments inherited a legacy of unequal citizenship supported by exclusionary policies. The transition into African independence forced respective governments to redistribute land in order to correct old wrongs of 'raced' land tenure (Adams & Howell, 2001; Binswanger-Mkhize, Bourguignon & van den Brink, 2009). Land reform became a tool to deal with several dimensions of the land question that include efficiency, equity and differentiated citizenship (Kanyinga, 2009). Deborah (2013) argues that regaining land was not an end to itself for liberation wars and land reforms but a means to restore African identities and citizenship (rights and freedoms) previously denied due landlessness. Land reform is an integral policy to achieve a (un)balanced society by addressing 'shortfalls' in the status of excluded indigenous blacks (Mazhawidza & Manjengwa, 2011) as the policy can promote social justice or exclusion of some sections of the society Nyagura (2015). Ku and Pun (2004) further articulates that a right of abode in a community does not automatically translate into communitarian and liberal citizenship. While the post-independent government had a task for social restructuring and reconstruction of citizenship (Chipenda, 2020), the post-2000 Zimbabwean land reform is believed to have entrenched subjecthood and fast tracked 'citizens' to become subjects of the state by undermining citizen rights (Mutupo, 2014). Though land reforms are celebrated for undoing 'raced citizenship', of particular interest in this paper is to unpack the status of citizenship among the land beneficiaries after the FTLRP.

1.2. Contextualizing the literature on land rights and citizenry

Ownership and control of land are believed to be cornerstones for development and reconstruction (Mkodzongi and Lawrence, 2019; Tom and Mutswanga, 2015). Unequal land distribution in most African countries forced many governments to undertake land reforms as a way to restructure societies and remake citizenship of the colonially disadvantaged indigenes (Chipenda, 2020). However, the Kenyan government implemented Haraka settlement areas and land purchase programme that were accused of producing a new class structure of employed elites with financial power, thereby contradicting the spirit of inclusivity and equity (Kanyinga, 2009). The transition from colonial period to the postcolonial period saw a shift from 'raced' to 'classed' land distribution (Fantu Cheru, 2002). Edifying this observation, Hall (2004) is of the view that while profile of beneficiaries varied between provinces, in



KwaZulu-Natal it is mainly the well-off who were able to contribute cash for land purchases. Land reform systems have tended to entrench 'separate citizenship' by promoting privileges of a small elite (Kariuki, 2004).

After the 1963 independence, successive Kenyan governments gave titled land in climate favourable highlands based on political loyalty and ethnic card (Klaus, 2020) while those with opposing voices were tagged 'foreigners' and evicted from settlement schemes (Kariuki, 2009). Jones and Gaventa (2002) argues that while race can cease to be the principal line of exclusion defining relations between individuals, value systems of exclusion will remain institutionalized.

In South Africa, the apartheid government accorded the indigenous people distinct 'homeland' citizenship accompanied by 'raced' provision of services and infrastructure (Coles, 1993). A post independent land reform that funded only for land purchases only signaled the return to apartheid as local people were assigned to undeveloped land with no social services capable of providing decent livelihoods (Hall, 2004). This undermined their citizenship as the contents of liberal citizenship include access to socio-economic rights. Land becomes a real socio-economic right and can be turned into sustainable livelihood when households are given ancillary support (Chimhowu, 2006). A survey of CPAs in South Africa in 2011 indicated that 60% of some land beneficiaries lacked title deeds to the land they owned and post transfer support (Cousins, 2016) to turn land into a livelihood forcing them to 'subject' themselves to white farmers and industrialists for wage employment. Exclusionary land policies pre-and post-independence Zimbabwe created labourers and 'farmers' that are perpetually unable to aspire higher than farm labouring (Magosvongwe & Makwavarara, 2015). This shows the failure of land reform to turn beneficiaries into self-sufficient citizenry and redefine citizenship of black communities (Chipenda, 2020). The Lancaster House Constitution (LHC) property clause that legalized dual citizenship with white farmers having better land and protected property rights while the indigenes enjoyed unprotected customary rights further worsened the situation. The inclusion of a clause in Zimbabwe's 2013 Constitution that states that land reform allow people to re-assert their other rights shows the importance of land in addressing the citizenship dimension of the land question. Failure by political independence and three land reforms to resolve the land and national question (Mutupo, 2014; Tom & Mutswanga, 2015) shows that even the citizen question spilled into Zimbabwe's FTLRP since it was part of the national question.

Some scholars believe that FTLRP radically transformed the 'raced' society by transferring 9.3 of the 11 million hectares from the 'privileged' white farmers to indigenes (Matondi, 2012; Tom & Mutswanga, 2015). Matondi (2012) further reports that though there was political patronage, fast track farms have a wider class mix of beneficiaries from the poor to the rich, men and women, opposition and ruling loyalists, youths and the aged as compared to the initial land reforms. While FTLRP is celebrated for addressing 'raced' land ownership, there is little assessment done on intra-racial 'citizenship' within resettled communities. Was there movement from being 'subjects' with inferior rights to real citizens with equal rights among new land beneficiaries? Mazhawidza and Manjengwa (2011) argues that most researches have become highly 'obsessed' with assessing the impact of FTLRP on raced citizenship in land



distribution at the expense of intra-racial citizenship among new beneficiaries. There is a feeling that though a racially balanced land distribution was achieved, citizenship among A1 settlers was differentiated. People can have a right of abode in a community (A1 farms) but this does not automatically translate into full citizenship (Ku and Pun, 2004).

Chingarande (2010) argues that Zimbabwe's land reforms deepened social divisions among land beneficiaries. Matondi (2012) further argues that the agrarian restructuring ushered in by FTLRP was only about changing the 'skin colour' in land ownership but did not tinker with the dual system per se as it was more about changing the 'players' than changing dualist systems. For Zamchiya (2011) in Mutupo (2014), FTLRP undermined people's citizenship through failure to honour citizens' rights. The 'citizen-subject' dichotomy initiated by colonial land policies, was inherited Zimbabwe's initial land reforms and further perpetuated by the FTLRP. If fast track had just changed the 'players', who then was the 'citizen' and 'subject' post-FTLRP? How then was differentiated citizenship entrenched among land beneficiaries? The colonial government used exclusionary agrarian policies and the property clause to preserve the 'citizen-subject' relationship. However, the current government instills fear of removal, offers subsidized inputs, gave untitled land and delays issuance of offer permits to make settlers subservient to the state (Matondi, 2012) thereby compromising other rights which are borne out of owning titled land and enjoying other freedoms. Zimbabwe's tenure remains strongly dualist with the A1 consisting of 'unbankable' family plots, while A2 schemes have marketable 99-year leases (Chimhowu & Woodhouse, 2010). Maguranyanga and Moyo (2006) argues that citizenship is only complete when one is connected to titled land which is the heart of all other rights and freedoms. To be a socially sustainable programme that meet equity issues, fast track was supposed not to be just about white versus black land ownership but apply fairness to every Zimbabwean (Matondi 2012). In some areas, there is suspicion that political patronage was at play for the very few A2 farmers who managed to secure leases (Mkodzongi & Lawrence, 2019) making them to enjoy superior rights while the unfortunate enjoy inferior rights. Some partisan state functionaries justified provision of untitled land arguing that liberation wars were primarily fought to regain only land and not about building democratic institutions and values (Sachikonye, 2003). This acted as a justification by the state to selectively fulfil some of the people's rights and freedoms despite the fact that land was at the heart of all rights. Zamchiya (2013) report cases of political patronage, rural differentiation and selective land allocation and provision of all forms of support leading to differentiation in production and unequal citizenship among A1 farmers.

Chimhowu and Woodhouse (2010) describes FTLRP as more of a 'free for all' programme with no selection criteria to balance equity and citizenship issues thereby making vulnerable groups like women to be marginalized. All the three land reforms have been accused of failing to mainstream gender issues in land allocation, thereby deepening social divisions (Mazhawidza & Manjengwa, 2011). Though the FTLRP changed the inherited racial structure in land ownership, it created new problems and feelings of discontent among the chronically vulnerable groups like women, farmworkers, youths and the disabled (Matondi, 2012; Mukodzongi & Lawrence, 2019). It failed the test of being an



empowerment discourse by failing to dismantle differentiation along lines of class, gender, politics and age in society (Matondi, 2012) as vulnerable groups failed to access land. While it is on record that some sections of society were marginalised, there is need for further investigation on FTLRP's impact on the citizenship dimension of the land question among A1 settlers. Very few studies have looked into how FTLRP had influenced citizenship among A1 new beneficiaries since access to land is believed to be at the heart of citizenship.

2. Materials and Methods

This article is a product of empirical evidence obtained in Maware and Peter Wenhamo A1 schemes of Chiredzi district, Zimbabwe. Data was collected using tools inspired by the tradition of phenomenological research to understand perceptions of resettled households on their contents and status of citizenship post-FTLRP. The research design allowed resettled communities to share experiences on whether they felt like citizens or subjects post-FTLRP. The two A1 schemes are in agro-ecological region four characterised by severe dry spells, unreliable rainfall patterns and relatively short growing season. The region receives moderate mean annual rainfall ranging from 600-700mm per year between November and March while temperatures range between 28 and 32°C. The vegetation is predominantly Mopani woodland. Main economic activities are sugarcane production and wildlife management while cotton, sorghum and millet are the main crops grown.

The two A1 schemes were selected using purposeful sampling since these had the largest 'mixture' of locals and 'foreign' beneficiaries who had come from other districts, making studies on citizenship crucial. A target population of 35 resettled household heads who had stayed long in the A1 farms were selected through purposive sampling to get their experiences of citizenship post-FTLRP.

In-depth interviews and general observation were used as research instruments. Interviews allowed resettled communities to freely share their experience of citizenship. The interview guide covered topics on access to different rights, perception of belonging and self-esteem of land beneficiaries. Written responses were coded using predetermined codes and short phrases. The coded responses were analysed by putting them into different ideas which became the research themes. Experiences of research participants collected were further transcribed and analyzed as quotations and tables showing percentages and frequencies. General observations also allowed for identification and recording of physical capital that communicated silent contents of citizenship. Views of land beneficiaries and key informants were further complemented with scholarly work from the literature review that corroborated or contradicted current findings.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Citizenship from African/communitarian perspective



Access to land without any ancillary support such as physical capital generated intrinsic feelings of improved personal worth and self-esteem to the A1 land beneficiaries. A male land beneficiary from Peter Wenhamo farm his early fifties stated:

Landlessness is like a curse to an African. It is better to have no relatives than being landless. Being a land-owner entails a lot in the life of an African person and among other men. It is the basis of our existence especially in rural areas.... And my life and that of my family has improved since being allocated land which we are currently used for farming

Although the FTLRP has been criticized by different stakeholders due to its political heavy handedness, one would speculate, based on the perspective above and the information in Table 1 that access to land by those who previously were marginalized, seems to have inculcated feelings of improved personal worth and self-esteem. Furthermore, it would not be an exaggeration to argue that for many rural people in the study sites and Zimbabwe at large, access to land and ownership have had a domino effect of developing individual self-belief to engage in more meaningful agriculture activities and practices, contribute to increased household income and wellbeing.

Table 1: Perspectives on effects of land ownership (N=35)

| Response | Number | % |
|--|--------|------|
| Increased household self-esteem/personal worth | 33 | 28.1 |
| Increased incomes | 30 | 25.4 |
| Increased community acceptance | 26 | 22.0 |
| Increased household security | 24 | 20.3 |
| Not sure | 5 | 4.2 |
| Total | 118 | 100 |

Source: Field-based surveys (Fbs), (2020)

A scrutiny of Table 1 suggests that an estimated 53% of all the beneficiary research participants of the FTRLP interviewed reported a significant correlation between landownership and self-esteem as well as increased income generation. A further 42% reported a sense of community acceptance and household security. Based on the information in Table 1, it would be plausible to argue that access to land is an important aspect to bringing out community transformation, as it not only empowers local people to participate in development projects and determine their future but allows them to live a more productive lifestyle. Edifying this observation, Alkire and Deneulin (2010) are of the view that, a central goal to human development is enabling people to become agents in their own lives and their communities by facilitating their access to important productive capital such as land. This view is further supported by Sen (1999) in development activities who argues that,

the people have to be seen ... as being actively involved-given the opportunity-in shaping their own destiny, and not just as passive recipients of the fruits of cunning development programmes.



From a point of view, one would argue that development, particularly community which imbues a sense of citizenry and triggers community transformation is one which requires that people are given freedom to make their own decision and advance key objectives. It is one which relies on people themselves deciding upon the kind of community transformation and development they would like for themselves; one which empowers and gives them a sense of being their own agents to set and define their own priorities as well as choose the best means to achieve them. Thus, recognizing agent and promoting access and landownership among poor rural people is one such avenue through which to encourage rural communities to determine their own development and define their futures. James (2013) asserts that citizenship is felt and mediated through different forms of identity, of which land is one of them. Furthermore, Magosvongwe and Makwavarara’s (2015) argue that ‘assetting’ people with land defines their identity individually and collectively.

3.2 Citizenship from liberal thought

Land reforms are political programmes that have the potential to undermine or reinforce people’s political rights and other rights given the indivisibility and interrelatedness of rights. A study of Table 2 suggests that an estimated 55.7% of the beneficiary households felt that land access during FTLRP had led to their political rights being undermined and gauged. Another group of research participants (22.9) felt that that land access had not compromised their access to political rights while 11.4% were not sure.

Table 2: Perspectives of beneficiaries on the political environment (N=35)

| Response | Number | % |
|------------------------------|--------|------|
| Political rights respected | 08 | 22.9 |
| Political rights violated | 13 | 37.1 |
| Political rights conditioned | 10 | 28.6 |
| Not sure | 04 | 11.4 |
| Total | 35 | 100 |

Source: Fbs, (2020)

Based on information in Table 2, it can be argued that the process of land allocation during FTLRP was non-partisan as needy households across the political divide accessed land. However, perpetual land ownership was determined by either ‘towing the ruling party’s line’ or subduing one’s divergent political ideology. An elderly land beneficiary from Peter Wenhamo farm in his early 70s further added:

Being active in opposition politics is only done if you don’t have land, relatives and properties here.....you have nothing to lose..... Some of us had their communal land and homes taken over by our family and alien members. Where will I go with my family if I lose it? Even if you contest as opposition member, where will you campaign...how....when?

Based on the above view and information in Table 1, one can infer that access to full political rights by land beneficiaries was conditioned on the display of the ‘ruling party citizenship’ and praise worshipping the ruling party



for launching the FTLRP. One's political beliefs seems to be the most important determinant in having uninterrupted land ownership in A1 farms. It can then be argued that access to the right to agricultural land was being used to undermine democratic values, freedoms and political rights of some beneficiaries by partisan, informal institutions that had allocated land to needy households. While household had gained access to untitled land through farm invasion, households lacked 'control of access' but had to 'maintain access' through displaying ruling party citizenship. One can further argue that partisan politics led to fears of eviction while perpetual land ownership seemed to depend on being loyal to the ruling party. Being a citizen require fulfilment of all or most rights since they are interrelated but this seems to be the opposite in A1 Schemes of Chiredzi and Zimbabwe at large as households appear to forgo some political rights to continue enjoying their land rights. Edifying this observation, Sachikonye (2003) argues that the notion that liberation wars were primarily fought to regain only land and was not about building democratic institutions and values is gaining currency in ruling party circles. Kanyinga (2009) also report cases of 'selective citizenship' in Kenya where successive governments are giving land to loyal individuals and clansmen, while some tribes are labelled foreigners and evicted based on the tribal card. While reasons for access and ownership to land varied by race, tribe and political affiliation in African countries, it will not be an exaggeration to say it leads to 'differentiated citizenship' among rural communities. Given these circumstances, one can argue that 'forced political and wrong ethnic belonging' have the potential to undermine not only one's national identity but also components of communitarian citizenship such as personal worth and self- esteem initially inculcated by land access. It is therefore undeniable that subjecthood among opposition loyalists seemed to continue post-FTRLRP as some 'assetted' land beneficiaries became subjects of political patronage to continue enjoying their right to agricultural land, contradicting Gonese and Mukora's (2003) views that Zimbabwean land reforms have a national agenda of achieving individual independence and self-determination among beneficiaries.

The above perspective shared by the elderly research participant from Maware farm makes one to further speculate that political patronage was correlated with procedural civil rights of citizenship such as the right to information, freedom of association, expression and from arbitrary eviction. 'Gauged' political rights seemed to affect access to many of these civil rights of the so-called 'sell-outs'. Edifying this view, Murombo (2010) in Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA) argues that rights are positively and negatively interrelated and indivisible because fulfilment of one right (such as the right to agricultural land) can be used by partisan institutions to trample on people's first generation rights (political and civil rights). From this point of view, one can argue that full citizenship can only thrive in an environment where each component of human rights is respected since rights are interrelated and complementary in either way. Lack of access to some first-generation rights have the potential to undermine communitarian components of citizenship such as social identity and belonging as these could be achieved through freely relating, meeting, expressing to others.

Many rural families are farming communities, thereby stressing the importance of access to agricultural land as an asset and right for the rural poor. Sentiments shared by many beneficiaries seemed to suggest that FTLRP had



corrected failures of the initial land reforms as it had actualised the landless’ constitutionally enshrined right to agricultural land. A male research participant aged between 60 and 70 from Maware farm reported the following: *‘If I die today, I will have a peacefully rest because I will have left a heritage (land) for my children and their grandchildren. It’s now their turn to make it productive’* (personal communication, March 2, 2020c).

Although the FTLRP has been criticized for weaponising land and undermining democratic values, one would speculate, based on the perspective above, that access to land by those who were previously landless seemed to have generated feelings of the right to land as a ‘super’ right more ‘equal’ than other human right since it was bequeathable to their children. Furthermore, the above remarks show that access to land through FTLRP had made beneficiaries to feel as real ‘right bearers’ as well as duty bearers with an obligation to make land productive and a sustainable livelihood. Building this observation, Thomas (2003) is of the view that FTLRP had reversed exclusionary colonial land policies that had ‘reduced’ and confined indigenous people to Bantustans which did not qualify to be termed agricultural land. This view is further supported by Alkire and Deneulin (2010) who argue that human development and full citizenship is achievable if right bearers shoulder their horizontal responsibility as duty bearers by being agents in their own lives and their communities through making productive use of the accessed land.

The interrelatedness of rights is evident among the rural poor as access to resources like agricultural land is believed to advance rural people’s other socio-economic rights (such as the right to property). A study of Table 3 suggests that an estimated total of 68% of all the A1 research participants of the FTLRP interviewed reported the right to hold and use land as the most important strands of the property right. A further 18% reported the ‘transfer’ as the third most important dimension of the property right.

Table 3: Perception of importance of property right strands (n=35)

| Strand | Number | % |
|----------|--------|-----|
| Acquire | 11 | 12 |
| Hold | 35 | 36 |
| Use | 31 | 32 |
| Transfer | 17 | 18 |
| Lease | 2 | 2 |
| Dispose | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 96 | 100 |

Source: Fbs, (2020)

Based on the information in Table 3, it would be plausible to argue that while the different strands of the property rights were equal and interrelated, the right to hold and use property (land) seemed more valuable than other strands. For the rural poor who had endured a long period of landlessness from the colonial period up to the early 2000, they felt FTLRP had made them right and duty bearers obligated to hold, keep and use their land as it was one important asset they could own in their lifetime. Settlers’ communal background made them to be satisfied with the first set of property rights (right to hold and use land) seemed to promote access to an ancestral heritage (land) to



settlers and their heirs through the 'blood line' rather than 'market line'. From this point of view, it can be argued that, for the settlers, FTLRP seemed to have addressed issues of intra-generational equity through these two strands property rights which automatically address inter-generational equity as they could bequeath acquired land to heirs. Edifying this observation, a liberation war collaborator aged between 60 and 70 years from Maware farm stated:

My son, the young generation should know and understand this, what was obtained through bloodshed is inherited through the bloodline

The above remarks by revealed settlers seemed to prefer traditional transferability of property (inheritability) more than economic transferability and disposability as evidenced by a lower regard for the right to transfer (Table 3). Unbeknown to many A1 settlers is the fact that FTLRP had offered them a piecemeal set of property rights through offer permits that cannot be 'transacted' in the market. It is also indisputable to say the three rights (right to hold, use and acquire) seemed important among A1 settlers because they appear to be linked to components of communitarian and African citizenship such as improved social identity and self-esteem. Furthermore, it would not be an overstatement to argue that despite A1 settlers having untitled land, they had no hard feelings with the FTLRP for 'denying' them the last set of rights (right to transfer, lease and dispose) through 'unbankable' offer permits.

Further scrutiny of the above remarks by the war collaborator appear representative of a perspective held by other land beneficiaries that the last set of property rights seem to give away a heritage and a 'prize' given to them by their ancestors and liberation war heroes respectively. In traditional terms, A1 settlers appear to view their land as a bequeathable 'capital from the dead' (ancestors) while in economic terms their land is viewed as non-transferable and 'dead capital'. Edifying this observation, Nyagura (2015) is of the view that land is the heart of indigenous African spirituality, a repository of the blood of our ancestors and liberation war heroes and prize they passed onto us.

While achieving food security is an outcome of an interplay of many factors, households can have better opportunities of becoming food secure if they are 'assetted' with important livelihood assets such as land. Zimbabwe's national charter states that the provision of land will advance other rights such as access to sufficient food, but findings in Chiredzi district shows a non-linear relationship between land access and food security. A female A1 settler from Maware farm, aged between 40 and 50 years stated:

We got fertile land in this place but food and relish are a perennial problem. We regularly get food handouts from government and donors but if you are a known opposition loyalist, it is difficult to get food aid. You will have to look for wage labour from these exploitative fellow A1 settlers or A2 sugarcane out-growers who have irrigation plots

Judging from the above remarks, one can speculate that land access only had failed to promote food security among A1 settlers except those who had irrigation plots along the canal or had political capital to access food. The above perspective appears to indicate that while rights are complementary (such as right to land and food), there relationship is not always straightforward as achievement of food security is an interplay of natural, economic and political factors. One can further speculate that reduced physical and social access to food was not only linked to natural processes such as drought but lack of ancillary support to dryland A1 arable farmers, making them



perennially food insecure. Edifying this observation, Harts-Broekhuis, and Huisman (2001) are of the view that FTLRP had recreated old challenges such as food insecurity by replacing climatically suitable wildlife operations with unsuitable crop farming practices in agro-ecologically dry regions. This is further supported by Chimhowu (2006) who argues that, land as key commodity for the rural poor households can be turned into a livelihood especially in dry regions if it is supported with access to other complementary capitals such as water etc.

The above remarks seem to further blame partisan politics for making some households food insecure by turning food aid into a bait and ‘weapon’ against perceived political and social ‘enemies’ in A1 farms. One can then argue that failure by the government to provide titled land and ancillary support in favour of offer letters and food aid respectively might have been a strategy to keep settlers under the ruling government’s ‘radar’ as hungry households had to subject themselves to partisan local leaders to receive food aid. Edifying this observation, Chipenda (2020) reports that there is marginalization in access to welfare services and food in A1 farms of Goromonzi though victims of selective application of citizenship were not opposition members but aliens being punished for supporting their former white employers during farm invasions.

Based on the above remarks, it will also be plausible to argue that perennial droughts in the district made A1 settlers to ‘subject’ themselves as seasonal labourers in exchange of food and money to the exploitative new ‘employers’ (A1 settlers or A2 out-growers) who owned irrigation plots. Building this observation, Sadomba (2008) is of the view that new land beneficiaries are poor employers who pay meagre wages for labour service given by fellow beneficiaries. Furthermore, Chipenda (2020) argues that the exploitative system did not end with the collapse of the colonial regime but left traceable remnants in the contemporary Zimbabwean society. Magosvongwe and Makwavarara (2015) argues further that ineffective land policies during pre-and post-independence Zimbabwe created labourers and ‘farmers’ that will remain perpetually dependent and unable to aspire higher than farm labouring. From these points of view, one can argue that class divisions that emerged between irrigation and dryland plot holders contributed to ‘differentiated citizenship’ as the former enjoyed better rights (such as right to sufficient food and ungauged political rights) and became self-reliant than the later.

Rural communities are farming communities which makes education very important if resettled households and their heirs are to make effective use of extension ideas and diversify livelihoods. Despite the importance of education to rural communities, A1 settlers reported lack of investment in the broader educational ‘infrastructure’ post-FTLRP (Table 4).

Table 4: Perspectives on education service (n=35)

| Response | Number | % |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|
| Adequate, well-conditioned buildings | 03 | 6.7 |
| Adequate teachers | 06 | 13.3 |
| Schools at convenient distance | 01 | 2.2 |
| Improved teaching material | 10 | 22.2 |



| | | |
|---------------------------------|----|------|
| Compromised educational quality | 25 | 55.6 |
| Total | 45 | 100 |

Source: Fbs, (2020)

A study of Table 4 suggests that an estimated 55.6% of all the beneficiary research participants interviewed reported no correlation between landownership and indices used to measure the quality of education such as adequacy of buildings, teachers, teaching material and distance to available schools. Transect walks in the A1 schemes in the district further revealed the two A1 schemes shared one ‘satellite’ secondary school (Chikwirire) which had no ordinary level examination centre.

Along this continuum, a grandmother of three in her mid-70s from Maware farm reported: ‘

Education here is poor in everything except for a few who got land closer to communal areas. Zvabatanawo nemamiriro ezvinhu ave kuitawo kuti vana vasaona kukosha kwechikoro’ (The collapsing economy is also making education valueless for our kids)

Basing on Table 4 and the above remarks, it can be argued that there was poor physical and human resources to support the provision of education seemed to promote unequal access to the education right between settlers who resided on farm boundaries closer to communal schools with better schools and those at the interior of A1 farms where government had not invested in educational infrastructure. It is seemingly valid to argue based on Fig 1 and Table 4 that the few schools available in A1 farms do not meet the educational standards and government policy that primary school children should travel a maximum of 5km to a school shared by 200 families (Gonese & Mukora, 2003).



Fig 1: Farm structure converted into primary school classroom. Source: Fbs, (2020)

The poor state of the economy had not only made education apparently valueless but engendered the challenges facing the educator sector in A1 schemes as government failed to provide resources to improve schools. Edifying this observation, Alemu (2012) reports that Decha settlers in Ethiopia blamed their government for failing to give attention to education in resettlement areas in the country. This is further supported by Ku and Pun’s (2004) who



reports that that the right of abode in resettlement community does not automatically transform ‘subjects’ into ‘citizens’ if there is no social policy to provide social services. Furthermore, it would not be an exaggeration to argue that FTLRP had created differentiated national belonging between residents of A1 farms and their communal counterparts as well as A2 settlers who had better access to schools.

While the colonial government had created a an unequal dual local governance system for rural areas i.e poorly funded rural councils for African ‘subjects’ and better resourced district councils to administer commercial farms for white ‘citizens’, many landless black Zimbabweans who had pinned their hopes to access better social services on policies such as land reform expressed dissatisfaction with the government’s social policy. A female heir to the initial land beneficiaries from Peter Wenhamo farm in his early 40s commented:

Out of the five A1 farms in Chiredzi district, none has an operating health facility. This is affecting women than men because of our biological make-up.... many are dying ‘before their normal time’ (from curable diseases) while they (top government officials) seek medical assistance outside the country. So for us, ‘foreign’ (neighbouring) districts are our foreign countries?

Underscored in the above quotation is the fact that while the post-independent government had made great strides to reverse the social service gap that existed in some communal areas, this was not the same in A1 farms. Lack of health facilities in undermined everyone’s right to health and specifically women’s access to reproductive health services and their right to dignity. Edifying this observation, Zamchiya (2011) reports that FTLRP undermined people’s citizenship by failing to honour citizens’ other rights through non-provision of accompanying livelihood enablers (Ntsebenza, n.d.). It is also plausible to conclude that movement to A1 schemes was therefore a ‘fall from grace’ by some households who had experienced better services in communal areas as they were ‘marched forward to the past’ colonial environment with poor health service. The above remarks seemed to further reveal horizontal and vertical feelings of unequal citizenship right to health between men and women, A1 households and their communal counterparts together with the ruling elite. Such feelings had the potential to undermine their self-esteem and sense of national belonging that had been created through deracialisation of land distribution during FTLRP.

Scrutiny of Table 5 also suggests that an estimated 78.6% of all the beneficiary research participants of the fast-track land programme interviewed were dissatisfied with all measures of the health service as well other infrastructure. Another total of 21.4% reported an improvement in the accessibility in health service and infrastructure post-FTLRP.

Table 5: Perspectives on quality of health service (n=35)

| Response | Number | % |
|--------------------------------------|--------|------|
| Clinic at convenient distance | 02 | 4.8 |
| Adequate personnel & equipment | 02 | 4.8 |
| Improved infrastructure | 05 | 11.8 |
| Poor health service & infrastructure | 33 | 78.6 |



| | | |
|-------|----|-----|
| Total | 42 | 100 |
|-------|----|-----|

Source: Fbs, (2020)

Building on the above remarks, information presented in Table 5 and Fig 2, it is apparently valid to further conclude that the post-independent government had not only failed to invest in new social services in A1 farms but also failed to maintain ‘inherited’ infrastructure. Edifying this observation, Alemu (2012) reports that Decha settlers in Ethiopia felt discriminated against their host communities as government had failed to invest in health services. This is further corroborated by Maposa et al., (2010) and Tom (2015) who argues that lack of proper land use planning, policy on social services and infrastructure provision during FTRLP had ‘sacrificed African peasants on the altar’ by exposing them to new problems. Therefore, it will not be an overstatement to say that lack of health facilities and poor infrastructure in A1 of Chiredzi district signal the continued subjecthood of A1settlers as they had to look for services such as health and education outside their areas of residence.



Fig 2. The state of ‘inherited’ infrastructure in A1 farms. Source: Fbs, (2020).

From a point of view, one would then argue that if multidimensional poverty (including poverty of essential services) is to be adequately dealt with, land reforms should go beyond ‘assetting’ the poor with land but provide services that actualise substantive rights, the bed-rock of inclusive citizenship. Building this observation, Chimhowu (2006) argues that land access only plays a permissive role in holistically dealing with poverty as poverty reduction is a product of an interplay between land and access to several complementing infrastructure. This is further corroborated by Gonese and Mukora (2003) who argues that during FTLRP, the Zimbabwean government reneged on its obligation to ensure availability of basic health facilities though government policy stated that 300 to 500 families should share a single clinic. Unavailability of health centers was an indictment of the government which had pledged to provide essential services like clinics and important infrastructure to A1 beneficiaries (GoZ, 2001).



4 Conclusions

Land access during FTLRP though without meaningful ancillary support had improved the settlers' sense of communitarian citizenship thereby making them feel transformed from being subjects to citizens. While FTLRP can be 'celebrated' for having addressed components of communitarian citizenship previously denied due to landlessness, many settlers felt that it had led to piecemeal achievement of some dimensions of liberal citizenship. There is now growing sense of disenfranchisement and loss of personal freedoms among A1 settlers due to insidious political victimizations, threats of arbitrary evictions, state failure to actualise some rights. FTLRP had actualised economic rights such as access to agricultural land but this did not translate into other rights despite land (reform) being touted as heart of all other rights. This is threatening feelings of increased personal worth and belonging that had been instilled through land access. Replacement of partisan politics with development politics and movement from 'citizen in right' to 'citizen in practice' has the potential to enhance citizens' holistic view of their citizenship. The study recommended for provision of support services as mechanism to improve social standing and access to social rights of land beneficiaries. Government can partner locals in building schools and health facilities, which allow them the right to participate in development and realise that rights and responsibilities are corollary. There is need to depoliticise community leaders and inculcate a sense of political tolerance and democratic values to avoid instability and violence based on political affiliation.

Author Contributions

M.G.W.; Original draft preparation and data collection,S. M.D.; Review and editing

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments:

I want to thank A1 beneficiaries who were cooperative to make this study a success.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Adams, M., & Howell, J. (2001). "Redistributive land reform in Southern Africa."
Natural Resource Perspectives Number 64: ODI.
- Alemu, K. T. (2015). "Resettlement and sustainable livelihoods in Ethiopia: A
comparative analysis of Amhara and Southern Regions." PhD Thesis, University of South Africa.
- Binswanger-Mkhize, P, Bourguignon., C & van den Brink, R. (2009). *"The growing*



- consensus on the Importance of Land Redistribution in Agricultural Redistribution.*" In *Towards Greater Consensus*, edited by Binswanger-Mkhize, P, Bourguignon, C., & van den Brink R, Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank.
- Chambati, W. (2011). "Restructuring of Agrarian Labour Relations after FTLRP in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38:5: 1047-1068.
- Chimhowu, A. O. (2006). "Tinkering on the Fringes? Redistributive Land Reforms and Chronic Poverty in Southern Africa, Working Paper 58." University of Manchester: Chronic Poverty Research Centre.
- Chimhowu, A., & Woodhouse, P. (2010). "Forbidden but not Suppressed: A 'Vernacular' Land Market in Svosve Communal Lands, Zimbabwe." *Africa* 80 (1).
- Chingarande, S. (2010). "Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 5 Gender and Livelihoods in Nyabamba A1 Resettlement Area, Chimanimani District of Manicaland Province in Zimbabwe." Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications.
- Chipenda, C. (2020). "Land reform, citizenship and aliens in Zimbabwe." *Africa Review*, DOI: 10.1080/09744053.2020.1731670.
- Coles, C. M. (1993). "Land Reform from Post-Apartheid South Africa." *20 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev.* 699.
- Cousins, B. (2016). "Land reform in South Africa is sinking. Can it be saved?" Nelson Mandela Foundation.
- Deborah, J. (2013). "Citizenship and Land in South Africa. From Rights to Responsibilities." *Critique of Anthropology* 33 (1): 26-46.
- Gonese, F., & Mukora, C. (2003). "Beneficiary Selection, Infrastructure Provision and Beneficiary Support." In *Delivering land*, Chapter 9. Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe.
- Government of Zimbabwe. (2001). "Zimbabwe's Land Reform Program." Harare: Government Printers.
- Gutto, S. B. (2014). "Re-theorising and Re-Conceptualising Land, Sovereignty, Socio-economic Rights and Responsibility in the Context of Pan-Africanism and African Renaissance in the 21st Century." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-,Inter and Transdisciplinarity* 9(1): 5-15.
- Hall, R. (2004). "Land Restitution in South Africa: Rights, Development, and the Restrained State." *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 38(3): 654-671.
- Harts-Broekhuis, A., & Huisman, H. (2001). "Resettlement Revisited: Land Reform Results in Resource-Poor Regions in Zimbabwe." *Geoforum* 32 (3): 285-298.
- Jones, E., & Gaventa, J. (2002). "Concepts of Citizenship. A review." Suxxex: Institute



- Kanyinga, K. (2009). "Land redistribution in Kenya." In *Agricultural Redistribution: Towards Greater Consensus*, edited by Binswanger-Mkhize, P, Bourguignon C, van den Brink R. Washington DC: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/The World Bank.
- Kariuki, S. M. (2004). "Can Negotiated Land Reforms Deliver? A Case of Kenya's, South Africa's and Zimbabwe's Land Reform Policy Debates, ASC Working Paper 59/2004." Leiden: African Studies Centre.
- Kariuki, S. M. (2009). "Agrarian Reform, Rural Development and Governance in Africa: A Case of Eastern and Southern Africa Policy Brief 59." Johannesburg: Centre for Policy Studies.
- Klaus, K. (2020). "Raising the Stakes: Land Titling and Electoral Stability in Kenya." *Journal of Peace Research* 57(1): 30–45.
- Ku, A. S., & Pun, N. (2004). "Remaking Citizenship in Hong Kong, Community, Nation and the Global City." New York: Routledge Curzon.
- Mabaye, T.M., & Lusignan, B. B. (2005). "Land Reform in Zimbabwe: An Examination of Past and Present Policy, Shortcomings and Successes and Recommendations for Improvement. Ethics of Development in a Global Environment." *Engr 297c EDGE-Spring*.
- Magosvongwe, R., & Makwavarara, Z. (2015). "Land Invaders and Land Occupiers: Demystifying Issues of Land Indigenisation and Further Liberation of Geophysical and Intellectual Spaces in Zimbabwean-authored Post-2000 Fictional Narratives In *Dialoguing Land and Indigenisation in Zimbabwe and other Developing Countries, Emerging Perspectives*." Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications Office.
- Maguranyanga, B., & Moyo, S. (2006). "Land Tenure in Post-FTLRP Zimbabwe: Key Strategic Policy Development Issues: Policy Brief." Harare: African Institute for Agrarian Studies.
- Makwavarara, Z., & Magosvongwe, R. (2015). "Introduction." In *Dialoguing Land and Indigenisation in Zimbabwe and other Developing Countries, Emerging Perspectives*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications Office.
- Matsa, M. (2011). "Fast-Tracked to Prosperity or into Poverty? An Assessment of Zimbabwe's FTLRP on Beneficiaries Lives at Beacon Kop Farm in Shurugwi District." *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 13(4): 1520-5509.
- Matondi, P. (2012). "Zimbabwe's FTLRP." London: Nordic Africa Institute, Zed Books.
- Mazhawidza, P., & Manjengwa, J. (2011). "The Social, Political and Economic Transformative Impact of the FTLRP on the Lives of Women Farmers in Goromonzi and Vungu-Gweru Districts of Zimbabwe." International Land Coalition.
- Miraftab, F. (2012). "Planning and Citizenship" In *Oxford Handbook of Urban Planning*,



- Mkodzongi, G., & Lawrence, P. (2019). "The FTLRP and Agrarian Change in Zimbabwe." *Review of African Political Economy* 46(159): 1-13.
- Mutopo, P. (2014). "Belonging and Rural Livelihoods: Women's Access to Land and Non-Permanent Mobility at Merrivale Farm, Mwenezi District, Zimbabwe." *Erdkunde* 68(3): 197–207.
- Nyagura, L. (2015). "Foreword." In *Dialoguing Land and Indigenisation in Zimbabwe and other Developing Countries, Emerging Perspectives*. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Publications Office.
- Sachikonye, L. M. (2003). "From 'Growth with Equity' to 'Fast-Track' Reform: Zimbabwe's Land Question." *Review of African Political Economy* 30(96): 227-240.
- Sadomba, W. Z. (2008). "War Veterans in Zimbabwe's Land Occupations: Complexities of a Liberation Movement in an African Post-Colonial Settler Society." PhD Thesis, Wageningen Universiteit.
- Tom, T., & Mutswanga, P. (2015). "Zimbabwe's FTLRP: A Transformative Social Policy Approach to Mupfurudzi Resettlement, Shamva District, Zimbabwe." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 20(8): 51-61.
- Tong, M. (2014). "Decolonisation and comparative land reform with a special focus on Africa." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies-Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity* 9(1): 16-35, DOI: 10.1080/18186874.2014.916857.
- Vengesayi, C. K. T. (2012). "Farmer Empowerment through Land Resettlement: A Case of Bluegrass Estate, Kadoma, Zimbabwe." Harare: Zimbabwe Open University.
- Zamchiya, P. (2013). "The Role of Politics and State Practices in Shaping Rural Differentiation: A Study of Resettled Small-Scale Farmers in South-Eastern Zimbabwe." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 39(4): 937-953.
- Zimbabwe Environmental Law Association (ZELA). (2010). "Securing Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in the Natural Resources Sector: Country Experiences in Promoting Community Assets and Rights in the Mining Sector." Ford Foundation.

