

Environmental Policy Brief

Project to Assess Impact of Multilateral Environmental Agreements on Zimbabwe (ZIMEAs)

No. 9 July 2000



Equitable access to land is an essential precursor for economic development in Zimbabwe.



Redressing past injustices: Which way for Zimbabwe's resettlement programme

THE LAND QUESTION

The land issue in Zimbabwe demands much more than simply the satisfaction of "land hunger" among peasants. It demands creating equitable land distribution that is capable of increasing livelihood opportunities as well as addressing colonial wrongs and re-establishing justice. Land was central to the liberation struggle.

Equitable access to land is an essential precursor for economic development in Zimbabwe. Most primary and secondary economic activities are based on land. These include agriculture, tourism (including hunting), mining and agro-based manufacturing sector. Land reform that redistributes land rights is fundamental to creating new investments, employment, poverty alleviation and economic recovery.

Equitable land distribution and security of tenure are key aspects of environmental sustainability. First, inadequate access to natural resources has forced many people to make choices that are unsustainable. For example, soil quality is depleted and soil erosion exacerbated as a result of repeated cultivation of poor soils. Second, population pressure contributes to the excessive harvesting of resources. This has had, for example, negative ramifications for woodlands.

Third, the denial of rights to potential economically productive land, whether it be for tourism, hunting or mining, locks people into poverty and denies them opportunities for improved livelihoods and development. Insecure tenure regimes also contribute to this state of affairs.

Zimbabwe has a total land area of just over 39 million hectares, of which 33.3 million hectares (ha) are used for agriculture. The remaining six million ha have been reserved for national parks and wildlife and for urban settlements.

Current land distribution is as follows:

- 4,000 large-scale commercial farmers on 11.2 million hectares;
- one million communal area families on 16.3 million ha;
- 10,000 small-scale commercial farmers on 1.2 million ha;
- 60,000 resettlement families on 3.3 million ha; and
- state farming on 0.5 million ha.

(Ministry of Agriculture)

Land distribution patterns have prevented the diversification of the productive base. See Table on page 2. Given this, Zimbabwe is faced with the scenario of the rich getting richer and the poor becoming poorer. The challenge is to find a politically acceptable approach to acquiring land from a racial and economic class that is reluctant to see land redistribution.

LAND REFORM AND REDISTRIBUTION

After independence in 1980, the new government embarked on various initiatives to create new economic opportunities for the majority of Zimbabweans. These include the development of the cooperative movement and the resettlement programme.

The Resettlement Programme's objectives as set out in 1980 (Bratton, 1994) were to:

- Reduce civil conflict by transferring land from whites to blacks.
- Provide opportunities for war victims.
- Relieve population pressure in communal lands.
- Expand production and raise welfare nation-wide.
- Achieve all of the above without impairing agricultural productivity or aggregate production.

Land distribution by farm sector and natural region

Natural Region	Communal Areas		Large-scale Commercial		Small-scale Commercial		Resettlement		State Farms		Parks and Wildlife		Other		Total Area	
	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%	ba	%
I	135.0	0.8	202.2	1.8	7.3	0.6	30.0	0.9	10.0	2.0	50.1	1.0	265.4	17.8	700.0	1.8
II	1,279.0	7.8	3,687.0	32.8	222.2	17.9	590.0	17.9	10.0	2.0	25.0	0.5	55.8	3.7	5,860.0	15.0
III	2,820.0	17.2	2,405.4	21.5	438.3	35.4	1,240	37.8	160.0	32.0	545.9	11.0	-319.6	-21.4	7,290.0	18.7
IV	7,340.0	44.9	2,429.1	21.7	473.3	38.2	810.0	24.6	60.0	12.0	2,514.1	50.3	1,153.5	77.2	14,780.0	37.8
V	4,790.0	29.3	2,489.7	22.2	97.6	7.9	620.0	18.8	260.0	52.0	1,843.0	37.2	339.7	22.7	10,440.0	26.7
Total	16,355.0		11,213.4		1,238.7		3,290.0		500.0		4,978		1,494.8		39,070	

The government established four resettlement schemes. Model A is based upon the communal lands system, with modifications of the village setting, village boundaries and demarcated arable holding and communal grazing areas. Model B is used in areas with a developed infrastructure and runs on a cooperative basis. Model C, with a core estate, has elements of cooperative committees and is run by the Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (ARDA), which provides back-up services.

Model D is operational in regions IV and V and is used as ranches for communal grazing schemes. Legal ownership in all these categories is vested in the state.

The resettlement programme was just one aspect of land reform. According to Moyo (1995) a central aspect of land reform was the creation of a black agrarian capitalist class. This, he argues, was promoted through various policy measures, including:

- Recognition of the land rights of small-scale commercial farmers and measures, which improved their access to markets and credit.
- Recognition of land ownership rights of blacks on large-scale farms acquired from 1977.
- Recognition and renewal of black large-scale leasehold farm contracts issued from 1977 through to early 1993.
- Direct support through the Agricultural Finance Corporation's (AFC) long-term loans to buy farms.
- Provision of short-and medium-term loans for inputs, equipment, livestock and infrastructure to leaseholders and farmowners through the AFC and Cold Storage Commission.
- Selective support to the "better-off" with credit, markets and extension services. The creation of out-growers on ARDA state farms with 10 ha each, making them effectively large landowners among peasants.
- The allocation of large-scale farms to relatively small groups of collective cooperative members.

LAND REFORM AND THE LAW

The Constitution and the *Land Acquisition Act* created the legal basis for resettlement insofar as it provides for the acquisition of land. The *Agricultural Land Settlement Act*, *Land Occupation Conditions Act* and *Titles Registration and Derelict Lands Act* also form part of the legal framework for resettlement.

Box 1: The Lancaster House Constitution – protecting settler rights

"In 1979, the British already had a model clause for the protection of private property from compulsory acquisition which they included in the independence constitutions of their former colonies. The clause, which first appeared in the Nigerian independence Constitution, was tightened in the Kenyan independence Constitution and became an integral part of subsequent constitutions.

In the context of Zimbabwe, the relatively large number of settlers and their historical links with imperialism assigned a special significance to the provisions relating to the protection of private property. As part of the Declaration of Rights, the British proposed Section 16 of the Constitution which sought to prohibit the compulsory acquisition of property of any description except under the authority of law." (Tshuma, 1997).

The law required:

- The acquiring authority to give reasonable notice of the intention to acquire the property in question.
- The property could only be acquired in the interests of defence, public safety, public order and morality, public health and town and country planning. A significant departure from previous independence constitutions, which reflected the importance attached to the protection of settler interests, was the proposal that only under-utilised land could be compulsorily acquired for settlement of land for agricultural purposes.
- In the event of compulsory acquisition, the acquiring authority would be required to pay prompt and adequate compensation.
- The state would be required to permit both Zimbabweans and non-Zimbabweans to remit money paid by way of compensation to any country of their choice.
- Access to the courts would be guaranteed for disputes arising out of land acquisition.

Section 16 would be entrenched for a period of 10 years from the date of independence, during which period a 100 percent parliamentary majority could only amend it. However, this was impossible in the first seven years due to 20 parliamentary seats which had been entrenched for the benefit of the white community in the Constitution.

The Lancaster House Constitution

The Lancaster House Constitution entrenched the “willing-seller willing-buyer,” as the basis for land acquisition. It provided that this could only be changed by a unanimous vote after 10 years. See Box 1.

The Patriotic Front (PF), at the Lancaster House talks objected to the British proposals, which formed the basis of Section 16 of the Constitution, because of the restrictions they imposed on land acquisition. PF argued that (Tshuma, 1997):

- to entrench the Declaration of Rights for 10 years placed intolerable restrictions on the sovereignty of Parliament and that it effectively granted a veto to the minority.
- the right of freedom from deprivation of private property would defeat the basic objective of the struggle in Zimbabwe which was the recovery of land of which people were dispossessed without compensation; and that the government would have to deal with the land problem and, therefore, must have the right to acquire land in the public interest and to pay compensation at its discretion.
- the right of freedom from deprivation of property would become a right to retain privilege and perpetuate injustice.
- the provision on the remittability of compensation was quite iniquitous; accorded wealthy citizens a privilege that is reserved for foreigners and could have disastrous consequences for the economy.

Legal reform

Initially, the government “was able to obtain land for purchase readily, either from farms that had been abandoned during the war or from whites who wished to liquidate their assets in the face of perceived uncertainty.” (Bratton, 1995) Due to this and the constitutional restrictions, measures for the acquisition of land were poorly developed until the 1990s.

However “due to a variety of reasons the resettlement programme did not perform to expectations. First, under the willing-buyer willing-seller principle land was not offered in sufficient bulk to the government. Second, the land offered to the government was the poorer quality in regions of low rainfall patterns and poor ecological soils. Third, because of the “fair market price” clause, the government was greatly constrained because it did not have sufficient funds forthcoming to buy the land.

Consequently, after seven years of independence only 40,000 families out of an original target of 162,000 had been resettled. (Mulenga, 2000).

Creating a supportive legal framework

Realising that “landowners were either unwilling to sell or asked for double or triple prices for this land, the government decided to compulsorily acquire land for resettlement,” (Mulenga) and embarked on a law reform process.

In 1985, the first *Land Acquisition Act* was adopted, granting the government the right of first refusal. It also provided that derelict land would be compulsorily acquired. The *Land Acquisition Act* (1992) and Constitutional Amendment No. 11 established categories of land for designation and procedures

for acquisition. In 2000, in the wake of “farm occupations” led by the Zimbabwe war veterans, Constitution Amendment No 16 was adopted. This paved the way for the amendment of the *Land Acquisition Act* by virtue of Presidential Powers (Temporary Measures) (Land Acquisition) Regulations SI 148A of 2000. These amendments seek to accelerate land acquisition.

Constitutional Amendment No. 16, which inserted a new section 16A into the Constitution, recognises that the current land distribution patterns are a result of the colonial history. Accordingly, responsibility is placed on Britain to pay compensation for any land acquired by the state as part of a land reform programme. See Box 2.

Consistent with this, Section 16 of the *Land Acquisition Act* has been repealed and replaced. This section provides for the payment of compensation. Section 20, as amended, sets out the procedure for the assessment of compensation for land other than agricultural land required for resettlement purposes. It provides for the payment of compensation for agricultural land that is required for resettlement purposes.

Box 2: Constitutional Amendment 16

This amendment inserts a new section 16A into the Constitution. Section 16A reads:

(1) In regard to the compulsory acquisition of agricultural land for the resettlement of people in accordance with a programme of land reform, the following factors shall be regarded as of ultimate and overriding importance:

- (a) under colonial domination the people of Zimbabwe were unjustifiably dispossessed of their land and other resources without compensation;
- (b) the people consequently took up arms in order to regain their land and political sovereignty, and this ultimately resulted in the Independence of Zimbabwe in 1980;
- (c) the people of Zimbabwe must be able to reassert their rights and regain ownership of their land; and accordingly;
- (i) the former colonial power has an obligation to pay compensation for agricultural land compulsorily acquired for resettlement, through an adequate fund established for the purpose; and
- (ii) if the former colonial power fails to pay compensation through such a fund, the Government of Zimbabwe has no obligation to pay compensation for agricultural land acquired for resettlement.

(2) In view of the overriding considerations set out in subsection 1, where agricultural land is acquired compulsorily for the resettlement of people in accordance with a programme of land reform, the following factors shall be taken into account in the assessment of any compensation that maybe payable:

- (a) the history of the ownership, use and occupation of the land;
- (b) the price paid for the land when it was last acquired;
- (c) the cost or value of improvements on the land;
- (d) the current use to which the land any improvements on it are being put;
- (e) any investment which the state or the acquiring authority may have made which improved or enhanced the value of the land and any improvements on it;
- (f) the resources available to the acquiring authority in implementing the programme of land reform;
- (g) any financial constraints that necessitate the payment of compensation in instalments over a period of time; and
- (h) any other factor that maybe specified in an Act of Parliament.

Section 29B establishes a procedure for assessing such compensation. Section 29C describes the circumstances under which compensation for the acquisition of agricultural land acquired for resettlement purposes shall be paid.

It provides that such compensation shall be payable where a fund for that purpose has been established as envisaged by Section 16A of the Constitution. Part II of the schedule provides for payment of compensation where a fund has been established. In determining compensation, it provides that the assessment shall include consideration of the size of the land; age, nature and condition of buildings; and the agricultural activities on the land.

It also provides that in valuing the land, consideration will be paid to soil types, extent of cultivation, variety of crops and the yield from such crops as well as the use to which the non-arable portion of the land is put. Part 1 of the Schedule sets out principles for valuing improvements to the land, grazing veld and the potential yield of tree crops.

1998 LAND REFORM AND RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMME POLICY FRAMEWORK

A new Land Reform and Resettlement Programme Policy Framework was adopted in 1998. This came in the wake of concern about the limited success of the previous programme (See Box 3). It had failed to provide new opportunities for economic development. Additionally, the economy remains firmly in the hands of the former settler community.

The Government views the new policy as one component of a broader strategy of “rationalising the entire agricultural sector.” The policy seeks “to redress inequitable access to resources in search of justice and social stability.” The legislation is now consistent with this objective.

Objectives of this programme include:

- the acquisition of land;
- reducing the extent and intensity of poverty among rural families;
- increasing the contribution of agriculture to the gross domestic product;
- promoting environmentally sustainable utilisation; and
- increasing conditions for sustainable peace and social stability by removing imbalances in land ownership.

The policy addresses the issue of “land occupations” and acknowledges that “increased squatting ... represents informal demands for land restitution.” Its focus is squatting on privately owned land. It does not address the issue in relation to state land, such as forests and parks.

The policy makes provision for the establishment of a Cabinet Committee on Resettlement and Rural Development; a working party of the cabinet committee whose primary function is to make recommendations; and a semi-autonomous agency to manage and coordinate the programme.

In 1998, an international donors’ conference was held in Harare. The donors unanimously endorsed the need for land reform and agreed to support a 24-month inception phase of the 1998 programme. However, funding has not been forthcoming.

RESETTLEMENT AND LAND REFORM: FULFILLING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

The land reform and redistribution programme needs to be linked to the achievement of Zimbabwe’s social, development and economic objectives. The Zimbabwe Programme for Economic and Social Transformation’s 1996-2000 (ZIMPREST) objective is “to bring about an adequate and sustainable rate of economic growth and social development to reduce poverty and create the basis for all of Zimbabwe’s citizens to provide a better life for themselves and their children.”

Box 3: Achievements of the resettlement programme

The resettlement programme was moderately successful notwithstanding the political and legal constraints the former colonial power had placed on Zimbabwe’s right to acquire land.

In the first 10 years 56,000 households (representing 300,000–400,000 people) were resettled. The achievements in resettlement areas vary from one scheme to another. The degree of success revolves around the availability of necessary resources, inputs and infrastructure. In three case studies, Maposa (1995) notes that there have been improvements in standards of living, better access to infrastructure and that there is minimal land degradation in these areas.

The realised income in resettlement areas was 20 percent higher than in communal areas (Moyo, 1995). An additional difficulty was that 44 percent of land acquired was in the marginal natural regions IV and V, and 37 percent was located in natural region III (Moyo, 1995). Only 19 percent was in prime agricultural areas.

The land resettlement programme did not, however, create adequate land reform, the formerly landless have no security of tenure, and it has not significantly changed patterns of land ownership.

Source: Mohamed-Katerere (2000)⁵¹

ZIMPREST’s specific objectives include:

- generating economic growth;
- employment creation;
- entrepreneurial development;
- economic empowerment; and
- sustainable poverty alleviation.

The land reform should be developed so as to contribute towards the realisation of these objectives. Meeting these objectives requires “fostering an entrepreneurial culture across society and investing in human resource development to give people the skills required to improve productivity and to acquire a meaningful stake in economic development.”

Going beyond a focus on agriculture

In this context, the question must be asked as to whether the focus on agriculture is in itself - sufficient and whether it can provide a route out of rural poverty.

Commercialisation of smallholder agriculture is increasingly a policy objective of government. Zimbabwe’s Agricultural Policy Framework (1995-2020) has four basic pillars:

- The transformation of smallholder agriculture into a fully fledged commercial farming system.

Box 4: Does land redistribution threaten food security?

Zimbabwe's land reform programme will not jeopardise the country's food security needs as it is designed to give more land to the people who produce the bulk of the nation's food requirements.

Zimbabwe's agricultural sector is dominated by two major players, commercial farmers and peasant farmers in communal areas. Despite being situated in poor sandy, rocky soils and semi-arid regions, which make agricultural production difficult, communal farmers produce 70 percent of the country's annual staple maize crop.

About 30 percent of the maize comes from the commercial sector which includes indigenous blacks numbering about 700 out of the 4,000 whites in that sector. J. Made (former Director of ARDA now Minister of Lands, Agriculture and Resettlement) says about 65 percent of the cotton comes from peasant farmers. "In a good season it reaches the 70 percent mark. The rest comes from commercial farmers who, again, are not exclusively white. A total of 15 percent comes from ARDA."

Made dismisses widespread fears that the land reform programme will see the country move into making Zimbabwe a nation of subsistence farmers.

Based on Machipisa (2000)

- An average increase in total agricultural output each year that is significantly large than the increase in population.
- The development of physical and social infrastructure in all rural areas throughout the country.
- The development of fully sustainable farming systems throughout the country which reverse current environmental degradation.

This approach is justified by the agricultural ministry on the grounds that Zimbabweans are predominately a rural people who derive their livelihoods from agriculture. They assert that the "most direct and effective means of raising standards of living and alleviating poverty, hunger and malnutrition is through increasing the productivity and incomes of small-holder agriculture..."

This would lead to a transformation of the rural economy through the development of rural-based agro-industry and the rural-based private sector. This ignores two important issues:

- the constraints to commercialisation; and
- that historically, rural communities achieved sustainable livelihoods through the use of multiple resources.

"Commercialisation may be a viable prospect for those households with adequate resources, however there is little evidence that it will work for less well-resourced households in less favourable environments. Commercialisation in practice usually means the increased use of bought inputs (fertiliser, hybrid seeds) and an increased concentration on cash sales, rather than production for home production." (Whiteside, 1998)

In Zimbabwe, 84 percent of inhabitants in the communal areas are classified as poor. This seriously undermines the ability of the poor to make the necessary investments in agriculture for it to be commercially viable. Given this, it is inappropriate for land reform simply to focus solely on increasing availability of agricultural land. It will need to address issues of capacity building and access to credit. Although agriculture will remain a key aspect of the rural economy, land reform should address access to land for a wide variety of economic activities.

The land reform programme needs to link access to land to other sectors of the economy other than agriculture.

Within the agricultural sector, it is necessary to redress tenure systems so that landholders are better placed to access credit. Additionally, new landholders need to be supported to ensure market access. This includes the development of skills and creating a better system for accessing key information. To make the programme a success, there must be complementary infrastructural development.

Although the productivity of the communal and small-scale commercial sector has been impressive (See Box 4) there are constraints to commercialisation. Therefore, an effective land reform policy needs not only to target landless peasants but also other economic classes. The government should unapologetically look to the de-racialisation of commercial agriculture through the development of a black commercial farming sector.

This requires giving opportunities to those with the financial and technical know-how to make farming a success.

The loss of land and its productivity is one of the most pressing problems facing Zimbabwe today. Security of tenure does not by itself lead to greater investment or productivity. Its effect may be entirely insignificant if farmers are overwhelmed by other risks and disincentives such as frequent droughts, or if the economic environment is otherwise stagnant (Juma in Juma and Ojwang, 1996).

Box 5: Majority of people in communal areas classified as poor

Poverty is more prevalent in the communal areas, small-scale commercial farming and resettlement areas where the majority of the people have been described as very poor. Eighty-four percent of people in the communal areas have been classified as poor. People in these areas are, therefore, forced to engage in unsustainable activities to earn a living. They are highly dependent on land resources for energy, food, medicines, wild fruits for sale, and wood for fuel and construction. All these activities are contributing to increased degradation of the environment.

Box 6: The 1982 amendment of the Parks and Wildlife Act

This amendment created the basis for the Department of National Parks and Wildlife to nominate selected rural district councils (RDCs) as appropriate authorities.

“The amendment was designed to eliminate the discrimination between farmers on privately-owned land and farmers on communal land. It was also aimed at helping communal land farmers and residents to take advantage of the Act’s proven environmental and economic benefits, opening an important new door to rural communities and their elected leaders for income generation and poverty alleviation.

“This new status gave the rural district councils the right to manage and utilise wildlife as if they were the owners thereof.”

This set the basis for the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE). Today, 37 RDCs have appropriate authority status and CAMPFIRE has been established in all these districts.

Based on <http://www.campfire.zimbabwe.org/>

Given the limited achievements of agriculture in the most marginal areas, there is a desperate need for an alternative rural production system.

Productive use of natural resources

Focus on the issue of natural resource tenure and the potential for rural development needs is critical. The colonial land and natural resource tenure policy alienated indigenous people from the land, creating the base for the development of large-scale settler commercial farming and securing the rights of the settler community and the state to natural resources. From a human rights and also an economic perspective this must be addressed.

Box 7: Land Tenure Commission

In late 1994, the Commission of Inquiry into Appropriate Agricultural Land Tenure Systems (established by the President) published a report, which recommends consolidating and streamlining laws on land and natural resources.

The report urges the state to relinquish *de jure* ownership of communal land and pass on full rights to village communities.

“By strengthening village level institutions,” the report states, ‘the management of grazing and other communally owned natural resources should improve considerably.’ It also calls for a new land act, which will define all land, monitor and enforce sustainable land and resource-use management, while allowing for development of bylaws at provincial, district and village levels on various aspects of land tenure, reform and settlement (<http://www.campfire.zimbabwe.org/>).

Natural resource management legislation limited the rights of inhabitants of communal areas to utilise natural resources, including water, forest produce and wildlife for subsistence purposes. The *Communal Lands and Forest Produce Act*, for example, restricts the right of use of inhabitants to domestic purposes yet allows for the granting of concessions to outsiders. Typically, concessions have been issued to large white commercial interests. Land and natural resource legislation deprived rural communities of their livelihood, forced them

to harvest natural products illegally and to abandon customary agricultural practices. Due to high poverty rates in the rural areas, people often venture into unsustainable livelihoods such as cultivation of marginal lands, migration and squatting.

This, coupled with the limited access to markets and agricultural inputs, push rural people into an ever-deepening spiral of poverty and environmental degradation.

The government made some progress towards addressing this issue by an amendment to the Parks and Wildlife Act in 1982 which set the basis for the development of the Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) – a local level natural resource management project. See Box 6.

However, it is clear that despite its successes, the CAMPFIRE programme has not gone far enough. It has contributed to improved well-being through increasing income to many rural families and had certain conservation benefits. However, it has not produced meaningful rewards in the sphere of livelihood opportunities and alternatives. It needs to make local people the managers and planners of natural resources, instead of just gatekeepers, only rewarding communities for their conservation efforts.

This weakness to develop the project so as to offer meaningful rewards and opportunities is perhaps as a result of its origins – that is as a conservation project rather than as a livelihood strategy or as a recognition of rights of rural people.

CONCLUSION

Rural economic development is critical for environmental sustainability. It is critical that development goes beyond the existing subsistence framework.

Land reform and redistribution needs to be based on political, historical and economic considerations. Successful land redistribution can lead to diversification of production, the creation of new markets, growth of rural economies, narrowing of the current income gap and better environmental practice.

Developing appropriate livelihood options is not just about greater availability of land. There needs to be an increase in tenurial security to all natural resources and as the basis for economically viable land-use options.

Box 8: Establishing accountable institutions

Institutional accountability requires creating transparent systems of decision-making based on an obligation to disclose relevant information and also to give reasons for decisions. The public must have a legally recognised right of access to information.

This must be complemented by real opportunities to contest these decisions. One possible way of achieving this is to recognise a right of “prior informed consent” of communities – that means giving communities the right to veto a project prior to its adoption and also the right to suspend a project after its inception.

Based on Mohamed-Katerere (2000-2)

This could result in increased opportunities for communities, not as employees but as entrepreneurs, in the areas of tourism and hunting. This is only achievable if communities are empowered and given full rights of management and the authority to decide how to use the resources. This requires legislative reforms. Success will be dependent on complementary capacity building programmes.

An effective land reform policy needs not only to target landless peasants but also other economic classes. Successful land reform also requires redressing tenure systems so that landholders are better placed to access credit.

Additionally, new landholders need to be supported to ensure market access. This includes the development of skills and creating better system for accessing key information.

To make the programme a success, there must be complementary infrastructural development.

“The lack of accessible and appropriate market research constrains the choice communities make in resource management. Market research is essential for identifying appropriate investment into secondary industry. There are numerous examples of the private sector utilising woodland resources for secondary activities. With the development of capacity and access to information, communal areas inhabitants may be able to engage in and develop similar activities.

The lack of access to information pertaining to the business organisation, management and systems, the market and the macro, legal and economic framework seriously undermine entrepreneurship at the local level.”(BUN, et al, 1996)

Access to capital and credit are key impediments and appropriate financial systems need to be developed. An alternative approach is to leave ultimate authority with the district councils but develop strong institutional systems of accountability. – J. Mohamed-Katerere.



Photos: M. Chenje

Land, which was at the centre of the liberation struggle in Zimbabwe, should not be seen only in the context of agriculture, but critical to other economic sectors such as tourism.

Sources for Further Information

Ministry of Environment
and Tourism
Karigamombe Centre
53 Samora Machel Avenue
HARARE
Tel: (263-4) 757881/5
Fax: (263-4) 757887

Ministry of Lands, Agriculture
and Rural Resettlement
Ngungunyana Building
1 Borrowdale Road
P. Bag 7701, Causeway
HARARE
Tel: (263-4)860055
Fax: (263-4)860009

Ministry of Local Government
Public Works and
National Housing
16-20th Floors
Mukwati Building
P. Bag 7706, Causeway
HARARE
Tel: (263-4)790601/9
Fax: (263-4) 728201

References

Bratton, M., 'Land redistribution 1980-1990' in M. Rukuni and C.K. Eicher (eds), *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Revolution*, University of Zimbabwe Publications, Harare, 1994

BUN, ENDA, SAFIRE AND ZERO, *An Operational Strategy for Sustainable National Woodland Management*, 1996

CAMPFIRE, <http://www.campfire.zimbabwe.org/>

Government of Zimbabwe, *Zimbabwe Programme for Economic and Social Transformation 1996-2000*, 1998

Juma, C and Ojwang, J.B., *In Land We Trust: Environment, Private Property and Constitutional Change*, 1996

Machipisa, L., "Land reform is not a threat to food security", 2000 (<http://www.woza.co.za/news/may00/zim10bhtm>)

Maposa, I., *The Legality of Land Reform in Zimbabwe*, Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, Harare, 1995

Ministry of Agriculture, *Zimbabwe's Agricultural Policy Framework 1995-2000*, Harare, 1995

Mohamed-Katerere, J., "Legal And Policy Studies For Shared Forest Management", Report Produced For Forestry Commission/ DFID Shared Forest Management Project, 2000

Mohamed-Katerere, J., "Local Level Natural Resource Management and Customary Law", Paper for Institute of Environmental Studies, 2000-2

Moyo, S., *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*, SAPES Books, Harare, 1995

Mulenga, S., "The Land Problem: Zimbabwe and South Africa – Comparative Analysis", 2000, http://www.glob.co.zw/economic/Comparative_Analysis_Of_Land_Issue.htm

Nhira, C., Baker, S., Gondo, P., Mangono, J. J., and Marunda, "Contesting inequality in access to forests: Policy that works for forests and people series no 5: Zimbabwe", Centre for Applied Social Sciences and Forestry Commission, Harare and International Institute for Environment and Development, London, 1998

Tshuma, L., "A Matter of (In)justice: Law, State and the Agrarian Question in Zimbabwe", Harare, 1997

Whiteside, M., *Living Farms: Encouraging sustainable smallholders in Southern Africa*, Earthscan, London, 1998

ZIMEAs Programme

The Zimbabwe Environmental Policy Briefs are produced as part of the Southern African Research and Documentation Centre-Musokotwane Environment Resource Centre for Southern Africa (SARDC-IMERCSA) Project to Assess the Impact of Multilateral Environmental Agreements on Zimbabwe (ZIMEAs).

ZIMEAs is a national project, covering Zimbabwe, with the intention of assessing the role of international environmental laws in the process of environmental law-making and enforcement in the country. The project is funded by the Royal Netherlands Government through its Embassy in Harare.

For further information contact:

The Director, SARDC-IMERCSA, P.O. Box 5690, Harare, Zimbabwe, Tel: (263-4) 720814
Fax: (263-4) 737301, Email: cep@imercsa.sardc.net