

ANNEXURES

GAPWUZ PRESENTATION TO THE PARLIAMENT PORTFOLIO COMMITTEE ON LANDS AND AGRICULTURE ON THE SITUATION OF HOUSING AND TENURE FOR FARM WORKERS IN NEWLY RESETTLED AREAS TROUTBECK INN NYANGA 14 – 16/2005

Honorable members of parliament, director of FCTZ and all invited guests, let me start by saying how much GAPWUZ welcomes this workshop on housing and tenure security for farm workers in newly resettled areas. It is a great opportunity to spend your time discussing issues affecting one of the most vulnerable groups in our society. For GAPWUZ it is also an opportunity to present the plight of farm workers to the legislators so that their concerns can be taken on board during discussion and debates in parliament.

THE AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY

Zimbabwe is an agro based economy to the extent that once this pivotal sector is hit by an upheaval, the whole economy slows down in growth, employment and performance. Agriculture provides employment, raw materials for the industry and exports include tobacco, maize, sugar, and horticulture products. The contribution of a successful agriculture industry into a huge and highly segmented world market will help the country to achieve some of its national objectives of foreign currency generation, employment creation and supply of raw materials to industry. The agriculture industry is considered strategic in terms of high employment opportunities since most production systems are labour intensive.

THE LAND REFORM PROGRAMME

The government introduced the land reform programme (LRP) as a noble idea to increase and promote black economic empowerment through increasing their chances to get the resource land. To support this, the government echoed in most statements that, “**The land to the people, the land is the economy and so forth.**” Whilst it is true that agriculture is the backbone of the Zimbabwe economy, GAPWUZ believes that the land redistribution policy is the most important element of land reform as it is part of the government strategy of poverty alleviation where by communities are given access to land for sustainable development and or residential purposes. The LRP should seek to assist the rural poor, including women, emergent farmers and farm workers.

Consideration should have be made for the farm workers as a priority since they have lived for their whole lives on farms and they have experience and knowledge of what goes on a farm. A little training will make them successful farmers. Instead we see land acquisition by the rich who have now been commonly referred to as **cell phone farmers**. The simple rationale is that they can not with stand the harsh environment of the farm,

Farming in addition to resources also requires resilience and determination on the part of the farmer and the farm workers can be the best candidate to meet these conditions.

THE FARM WORKERS AND ACCESS TO LAND

Historically, most farm workers migrated to white farms from Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique, particularly up to the 1970s. Many of the present day farm workers are descendents of these migrants workers, with a small number of them actually born outside Zimbabwe. This history coupled with administrative difficulties in receiving identification documents has meant that farm workers are viewed as “foreigners” by most Zimbabweans, even though legally they have a claim to citizenship. Consequently, there is an assumption that farm workers are unable to acquire land in Zimbabwe’s LRP.

Farm workers benefited from the initial land resettlement scheme in the early 1980s, but were discriminated against by a revised criteria for settlement in the late 1980s. Although there are many farm workers who have no access to land, it is important to emphasize that every citizen of Zimbabwe has the right to a “musha” or home.

FARM WORKERS AND LAND RIGHTS

Farm workers have been generally lost their jobs through the LRP without getting land for themselves, leaving most of them as squatters on their previous sites of employment all through out the countryside. Farm workers have been discriminated against by those distributing the newly occupied farms based on the grounds that they are “foreigners”.

The farm workers are among the landless people, but were never recognized as the beneficiaries of the fast track land resettlement programme. The LRP had a negative impact among farm workers. They lost their jobs as livelihood depended on working in the farms. The resettlement exercise left out the farm workers who were never consulted over the national land policy. Farm workers remained in the domains of the marginalized group.

There is a powerful craving for land among farm workers, but not always for economic reasons as it is required for security or for residential purposes. The LRP should aim at poverty reduction, security of tenure, sustainable use of land and provision of security and shelter for the poor people. Relations between new farmers and farm workers have become very strained as a result of ownership of the compound and deteriorating working conditions. Some new farmers have sought High Court Orders to evict farm workers from farm villages. Ex-farm workers have been forcibly evicted from compounds by the war vets and police for the following reasons

You don’t qualify to stay at the farm because the farm now belongs to the government and the compound is for the new farmer

Refusing to work for the new farmer because they are under paying them

and say they cannot afford the stipulated wages since they are starting.

The houses are to be turned into a clinic

The houses should be allocated to the teachers

This means farm workers belong to the road side.

There is no legislation that protects these workers who currently live on acquired land now owned by new farmers with no tenure rights. Legislation should cover security of tenure in order to provide and enable farm workers to acquire land through assisted purchases of the land they currently occupy or of alternative land. Farm workers are and have been one of the biggest contributors of National Social Security Agency (NSSA) should also benefit from their contributions through the NSSA housing schemes.

RESETTLEMENT

There should be an OPPORTUNITY for farm workers who wish to be productive as small scale commercial farmers to be resettled. This should include opportunities for training.

Government should consider the concept of permanent central settlements within commercial farming areas for those who wish to work on farms. Land can be alienated by the state for this purpose, and using the current legislation, NSSA, and Ministry of Local Government, Public Works and Urban Development can then participate in building houses for farm workers on land with plots to till so that the communities can become self sustainable and the workers can provide for their own retirement

Accommodation/shelter is not a privilege but a right. NSSA should include farm workers in its housing scheme.

Dialogue is the way forward if the plight of farm workers is to be redressed all stake holders should sit down and iron out issues together. Chairperson we therefore propose that the government in its LRP introduce settlement villages for farm workers in resettlement areas. These will be self contained communities, which will provide the farm worker family with a home and security of tenure and most importantly are self sustainable and will provide for the worker and his family at retirement. Government can then provide infrastructure such as schools and clinics.

It will be very unfair Chairperson if I don't include the issue of wages in my presentation. The majority of farm workers are paid below the poverty datum Line (PDL) and the Food Poverty Line (FPL) and are subjected to abject poverty. Yet they are expected to feed their families and lead a decent life. Some workers have gone to the extent of withdrawing their children from school, thus increasing child labour. Chairperson the current minimum stipulated wages are as follows:

General Agriculture	A1	\$ 450.000
	C2	\$ 875.000
Timber	A1	\$ 1 100.000
	C2	\$ 1 984.083
Agro	A1	\$ 289.000
	C2	\$ 564.438

GAPWUZ has analyzed the shortcomings of the land reform program and realized that farm workers need a lot of support. We continue to work hard to lobby and advocate the government to include the displaced workers in the resettlement programme. Through dialogue the union will continue to fight for a living wage for the farm workers.

Chairperson let me conclude by returning to what has brought us together, the fundamental issue of land. Our current survival and future lies on the land. Accommodation is a basic right and farm workers are demanding that right. We therefore take this opportunity to say thank you to the organizers of this workshop for giving us the opportunity to listen, learn and to share. An opportunity to analyze our current efforts to demand our rights and dignity to those working in agriculture as citizens of Zimbabwe.

Housing and Tenure Security for Farm Workers in New Resettlement Areas **Godfrey Magaramombe. Executive Director Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe**

“Housing is a very critical factor in socio –economic development. It depicts the character of a nation, that is, its culture, values and wealth.” President RG Mugabe

1. Introduction

Land was the central issue in the liberation struggle for Zimbabwe and continues to be the most important domestic issue in the post independence period. At independence the land question had three major components: unequal and inequitable land distribution: insecurity of tenure, and unsustainable and sub optimal land use. (Government of Zimbabwe 1998).

While the benefits of land reform in terms of a more equitable distribution of land and an easing on pressures on communal areas have been discussed at length, relatively little attention has been paid to the land needs of those who have been working and living on the commercial farms. Farm workers live with pronounced insecurity about their future. By reason of their origin and biography most have little access to extended family, “safety nets” and have no claim to land in the communal areas.¹ They have been extremely dependent upon their employers to satisfy their basic needs, to a large extent unlike any other group of employees in Zimbabwe.

In more often cases the right to residency on a farm is tied to the employment status of the individual. Loss of employment would automatically mean loss of right to reside on the farm. Since 1980 the GoZ has initiated land reform programmes aimed at addressing the issues of inequality in access to economic and social opportunities and resources. Land reform as one of the key instruments for addressing rural poverty should therefore be used as a vehicle for emancipating farm workers, through the provision of security of tenure. This could be achieved among other options through the creation of residential settlements within the newly resettled farming areas. Tenure security would ultimately increase agricultural productivity for the benefit of both the employer and employee and ultimately the nation at large.

1.2 Historical background

Historically agriculture has played a central role in the economic development of the country. At independence in 1980, agriculture contributed 14% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 32 % of formal employment. It was also a large generator of foreign currency with crops such as tobacco being produced in Zimbabwe as the most competitive country in terms of leaf quality than other major exporters of the crop such as Brazil. It also competed in the horticulture sector with countries such as Kenya, gaining its own niche in the western markets. This was made possible by highly skilled agricultural workers, scientists, extension workers and support from government. (Kanyenze, 1999)

In addition commercial agriculture directly supported between 1.5 million to 2 million people who lived and worked on the land. (CSO, 1997; FEWS / FCTZ, 1999). The general farm workers also made a significant contribution to the agricultural development of Zimbabwe.

Over the first twenty years of independence Zimbabwe was hailed as the breadbasket of the region, because of its “successful”, agriculture policy based on the performance of the large-scale commercial farming sector (LSCFS). However a number of authors have noted that this prosperity was unsustainable as it was based on the skewed distribution of land. (Moyo1995; Sachikonye 2003; Lowenson 1992)

Zimbabwe’s colonization in the 1880’s based on land expropriation and unequal developmental support on racial grounds had given rise to the conditions, which influenced the pattern of income and wealth distribution in the country. A settler white minority took control of the country’s resources of wealth in particular land and mineral resources. The creation of native reserves in 1898 gave birth to the dual agrarian structures that existed until 2000. This saw the majority of the African population being assigned inferior and congested land while the white settler’s minority amassed most of the prime arable land.

The acquisition of customary land for redistribution as LSCF was a central component of the colonization process. Large scale commercial agriculture came to dominate the economy as it was economically and politically privileged in its relationship with the state. The recruitment of African workers and their working conditions in the large scale commercial farming areas were largely determined by that colonial paradigm of dual development, with farm workers being seen as temporary visitors within the large scale commercial farming areas. The legacy of that paradigm is that commercial farm workers, although the largest proportion of Zimbabwe’s proletariat, formed one of its poor segments, which has no access to land and housing rights.

Historically farm workers and their families constituted the majority of the people residing in the LSCF areas. Foreign labour recruitment during the colonial period brought in Malawians, Mozambicans and Zambians as cheap non-permanent labour. Foreign farm workers accounted for 50% of the total agricultural labour in the 1950s (Clarke, 1977). By 1974 the share of migrant workers employed in the LSCF sector had decreased to 34% and by the late 1990’s to between 10% and 30%.¹ Workers of “foreign” origin who remain on large-scale commercial farms are now second or third generation Zimbabweans, although most of them do not possess official documentation such as birth certificates and national identity documents to qualify them as such [(Magaramombe, 2001).

However, a significant number of the foreign/migrant workers have over the years integrated themselves into the Zimbabwean society. Some were able to acquire rights to

¹FCTZ, 2000; MPLS & SW, 1998; GAPWUZ/Magaramombe, 2002; Sachikonye, 2003. This MPLS & SW survey was conducted after 1500 farms were listed for compulsory acquisition in 1997.

land in communal areas through local Chiefs and some were resettled in the first phase of resettlement in 1980 (Rutherford 1996).

2.0 Policy Issues on Farm Workers in the Land Reform Discourse:

The disadvantages faced by farm workers in their living and working conditions, and with respect to their political and social rights, derive from their lack of land rights in Zimbabwe. (Herbst,1990: Loewenson, 1992: Amanor-Wilks 1995, Moyo et al 2000)

Farm workers were not considered as a relevant category in the land division during the colonial era. Most were of foreign origin and were [viewed as completely tied to the white farmer] and were thus ignored. At independence in 1980 the new government recognized that commercial farm workers and their families lived in exceptionally poor conditions and would need special attention. The 1980 election manifesto of ZANU (PF) singled out commercial farm workers as a group in need. (Herbst,1990) However during the immediate post independence period farm workers were not considered as a specific category in the resettlement programme, though they did fall into the broad category of “poor and landless” who were the main targets of the initial programme (Kinsey 1999: Moyo et al 2000)

Through out the first two decades of independence the issue of farm worker housing and security of tenure was on several occasions brought to the attention of policy makers. The Riddel Commission of 1981, the Ministry of Public Construction and National Housing in 1985 and the Rukuni Commission of 1994 and the 1998 draft Frame Work Plan of the land Reform and Resettlement Programme all recommended the adoption of rural service centers to provide off farm residential accommodation for farm workers. A number of NGOs also emerged to champion the cause of farm workers (FCTZ, FOST, GAWPUZ etc) and put pressure on policy makers to consider farm workers as equal in the redistributive programmes.

From the mid-1990s there was increased recognition within the policy framework of government for the provision of farm workers in the land reform and resettlement programme. Thus theoretically farm workers could also benefit from the land reform and resettlement programme. This position was further confirmed by the draft Land Policy Document of 1999, and the National Housing Policy for Zimbabwe of 1999 which specifically recognized issues of land rights by farm workers, both in terms of residential rights and rights to resettlement under the land reform programme (Moyo et al 2000). However the introduction of the Fast Track land Resettlement Programme in 2000 saw implementation of all the above policy recommendations being deferred.

GoZ policy on farm workers in relation to the fast track land reform programme is not coherently expressed in a single document, but can be captured in two dimensions. Since not all farms were being or have been acquired compulsorily, the implicit GoZ policy on farm workers is that a substantive proportion of them would remain employed on unacquired farms. Those who are ‘displaced’ by the FTLRP are covered by four specific policy measures: the obligation of LSCF farmers to pay severance packages to the

disengaged workers, GoZ assistance in the repatriation of those who wish to be repatriated and provision of resettlement land to some former farm workers². (Moyo and Chambati, 2004)

However a number of studies of the FTLRP have generally noted two salient points, firstly the small numbers of farm workers who were officially resettled and secondly that the majority of farm workers are still resident in the former farm villages. (Utete, 2003: FCTZ, 2004: Moyo and Chambati, 2004)

Farm worker resettlement policy varies at the provincial and district level, since no land allocation quotas were set for former farm workers. In some provinces, a number of farms were specifically set aside for former farm worker resettlement; in others they were not. (Magaramombe, 2002: Moyo and Chambati, 2004)

However while the above policy measures are commendable they do not go far enough in addressing the land needs of both continuing and former farm workers.

2.2 Policy framework on provision of social amenities in (former) large scale commercial farming areas

At independence commercial farming areas were initially ignored for several reasons. Firstly the communal areas were ZANU (PF) prime constituency as these had brought the party into power. Secondly the government felt that the welfare of blacks on white farms was the responsibility of the white farmers. Government did not want to be seen as subsidising commercial farmers in what was seen as essentially their duty to their employees. (Herbst,1990)

Social amenities provision in commercial farming areas was severely affected by the dichotomous institutional structure of local government which was in place until 1997. Communal areas were administered by District councils and commercial farming areas by rural councils. While all residents in a district council area could participate in local governance participation was reserved only for property owners and their spouses in rural council areas. Farm workers who outnumbered the commercial farmers did not have a voice in terms of how the councils administered these areas.

This dual structure was an inheritance from the colonial regime. Rural councils which were first formed in the 1920's were known as road councils and had the single function of building and maintaining infrastructure in the commercial farming areas. Although in 1969 local government structures in the commercial farming areas began to take responsibility for health and housing the maintenance of infrastructure still remained their core business. (Herbst,1990) Although local authorities were amalgamated in 1997 to form Rural District councils and farm workers were subsequently given the vote, their main focus still remained infrastructure in the commercial farming areas.

² According to the Utete Report only 3216 ex farm worker households were officially resettled as at 31 August 2003 under the programme these make up 2.7% of the total resettled population and represents 0.9% of the former farm worker population.

Ironically while substantial public sector investments were channeled in the areas of physical and marketing infrastructure in the LSCFA. Planning legislation made it very difficult to subdivide land for social amenities such as schools and clinics in the then large scale commercial farming areas. In addition public resources could not be invested on private property. As indicated earlier most of the former large scale farms were privately owned. As a result farming communities were not well represented in terms of accessing public funds for the provision of health, education and other social services from the government.

There was no legislation that compelled farmers to provide basic social services for farm workers and their families. This was one of the contributing factors for farm workers and their families not having access to social services which are of minimum standards.

The National Housing Policy document of 1999 acknowledges that not much attention has been paid to the issue of rural housing since independence. It further notes that there are a number of challenges / constraints that face housing delivery in general and rural housing in particular. These range from legislative and administrative organs, institutional arrangements and financial arrangements which were designed to serve the interests of a minority.

A number of the resettlement schemes of early 1980s are still not reasonably serviced with social services after more than 20 years. Like in the case of housing, new farmers might have problems in providing these social services as they are in the process of initiating the production process. The government and Rural District Councils must come up with some interventions that work towards improvement of housing with tenure security and social services for farm workers.

3.0 Lessons from the region

Farm workers constitute the largest proportion of workers in the national formal sectors throughout the region. The agricultural sector, is one of the most vital sectors in the SADC region in terms of food production and export earnings. Despite the size and the strategic position of the farm-workers as a workforce, they experience the poorest working conditions as well as social and political exclusion. The majority of the workers throughout the region are vulnerable to poverty exclusion and insecurity.

The plight of farm-workers in the region is as a result of the historical imbalances experienced during the settler colonialism and apartheid in South Africa. Three countries South Africa, Namibia and Zimbabwe face similar challenges in terms of addressing the land needs of a sizeable number of farm workers. In Namibia the preferred route seems to be resettlement on acquired farms. Although as in the Zimbabwean situation this is a commendable move it still does not address the needs of continuing farm workers and those who have not been formally resettled.

Perhaps of the three countries South Africa has gone the furthest in addressing security of tenure for farm workers and or farm dwellers. Faced with mounting evictions of farm workers the South Africa, government adopted basically two strategies. Firstly the government pursued the legislative route by enacting the following pieces of legislation, the Land Reform (Labour Tenants) no 3 of 1996 and the Extension of Security of Tenure Act of No 62 of 1997 (ESTA).

These two pieces of legislation are instructive and deserve further elaboration below. In South Africa there are three broad categories of farm workers/ farm dwellers who are defined as labour tenants. The first is rental where the tenant pays a form of rent to the farm owner. The second is sharecropping tenancy, where the tenants perform sharecropping duties in a certain part of the year in exchange for staying on the land. The last is labour tenancy, whereby labour is exchanged for the rights to reside on the farm. (Atkinson et al, 2004)

Land Reform (Labour Tenants) No3 of 1996

The act is specifically aimed at labour tenants and differs from ESTA, in that in addition to placing restrictions on evictions from farms, it also allows tenants to lay claim to stronger rights (including ownership) to the land on which they have grazing or cultivation rights. The act does aim to convert tenants into wage labourers but rather into owners of land. The law defines a labour tenant as someone:

- a) who is residing on a farm
- b) who has or has had right to use cropping or grazing land on the farm , referred to in paragraph a) or another farm of the owner , and in consideration of such right provides or has provided labour to the owner or lessee; and
- c) whose parent or grand parent resided or resides on a farm and had the use of cropping or grazing land on such farm or another farm of the owner, and in such consideration of such right provided or provides labour to the owner or lessee of such or such other farm, including a person who has been appointed a successor to a labour tenant in accordance with the provisions of section3 (40 and (50, but excluding a farm worker).

Extension of Security of Tenure Act of No 62 of 1997 (ESTA)

ESTA was enacted with a view of securing tenure rights of farm dwellers and to prevent illegal evictions. The Bill confers tenure rights, regulates evictions and provides mechanisms to facilitate long term security of tenure for farm workers. The act also provides the means to regulate the relationship between people who live on the farm and the farmer. It provides a series of rights and responsibilities to both parties as well as describing the procedures through which occupiers may be evicted.

According to Hall (2003) the act has four key provisions; firstly it provides the legal right to occupiers to continue to live on the land. This includes rights to services such as electricity, water and sanitation. Occupiers over the age of 60 who have lived on the farm for ten years or more and are no longer able to work are termed “long term occupiers”

and can only be evicted on condition that alternative accommodation is found or if they violate the terms of their occupation. Family members are also allowed to visit the graves of where their relatives were buried on farm, whether the surviving members still live there or not.

Secondly occupiers have to comply with certain responsibilities should they not wish to be evicted. Grounds for eviction include damage to property, causing harm to other occupiers or assisting others with constructing homes on the farm without the owners consent.

Thirdly, the act stipulates the circumstances under which occupiers may be evicted. Evictions can only be carried out once a court order has been granted. The owner must be in a position to prove that consent for the occupiers to live on the farm has been withdrawn. Conditions for the ceasing of consent include if the occupiers right of residence arose from the nature of the employment relationship alone, if the owner can show that eviction is desirable for the operation of the farm, or an occupier has violated the terms of his/her occupancy.

Fourthly the act makes it possible for occupiers to buy the land on which they live by means of government assistance.

In addition to the legislative enactments the South African government in the mid 1990's introduced the concept of common border villages / agri villages. These are off farm villages with freehold title option which provide accommodation for farm workers.

4.0 Options to improve tenure security for (ex) farm workers for Zimbabwe

There are several options for securing tenure security for farm workers which need to be seriously considered. According to the Rukuni commission there is no direct causal relationship between tenure system and productivity, investment and natural resources management. Rather the key to achieving these objectives lies in the **security of tenure** rather than the type of tenure.

From our discussion of lessons from the region we have noted that it is possible to offer some form of security of tenure to farm workers/ farm dwellers. These range from legislative enactments to direct ownership of land.

This section will discuss in detail the proposed tenure options for farm workers / farm dwellers in Zimbabwe.

4.1.1 Rural Service Centres'

Having access to housing with some reasonable degree of security of tenure is one of the fundamental human rights. In the case of farm workers on former large scale commercial farming areas, houses where the workers live belong to the employer. Once someone ceases to be an employee, that person loses access to the house. The person is expected

to leave the farm irrespective of whether the person has lost employment because of ill health, injury, old age or any other reason.

However farm workers like any other citizen of Zimbabwe should not be a captive community dependent for all time on the idiosyncrasies and charity of the farm management. Employees age and retire, they develop different interests, and their families are not necessarily bound to agriculture labour in perpetuity. They should be encouraged to contribute to and benefit from the improvement of their own immediate residential amenities.

Rural Service Centres have the potential for providing farm workers with access to housing and basic social services. Rural Service Centres with business premises, clinics and schools that services the farming areas would involve the creation of off-farm residential units with private tenure. Low cost housing schemes suitable for low-income workers could be implemented such as the ones being offered under Operation *Garikai/Hlalani Kuhle*. In addition small plots could be set a side for the farm workers to be in a position to grow crops and vegetables to meet their household food requirements. These service centres would solve the problem of tied housing which is currently the practice. These centres would act as social and micro commercial hubs. These would include periodic rural markets, clinics, housing for teachers and other civil servants, sectorial ministry and local government sub offices and transport facilities. These would in time see the development of light agro –industrial and craft based enterprises.

4.1.2 Financing options

The rural service strategy is in line with current rural development practice on promoting viable human settlements which relate to their own productive base.

In the past opponents of the rural service settlements have cited planning constraints and costs as the major deterrents to the establishment of these settlements. However the current land reform programme presents an opportunity to incorporate rural service centres into the district development plans.

Financing of these settlements will be via sectorial ministry funds in the areas of housing, health and sanitation, water and roads development, education and community development. Local authority will charge rents, rates and levies, community participation and development aid.

4.2 Farm towns

Some 'Farm Towns' already exist in the country. These include Chivhu, Macheke, in Mash East, Odzi in Manicaland, Selous, Banket and Tengwe both in Mashonaland West, Centenary and Concession, Mvurwi, Glendale, in Mashonaland Central to name but a few. These settlements which have developed from farm-centres provide important services such as schools, hospital/clinics, shops, banks and communication facilities. The government and Rural District Councils can facilitate provision of low cost housing with

tenure security in these areas and facilitate the establishment of more such towns. Provision of social services at such centres is cheaper than at individual farms. Besides farm workers the farm towns will benefit other low income employees.

4.3 Resettlement

The third option is resettlement in their own right for those farm workers who want to be resettled. This would take place through the various district land committees.

4.4 Policy on tenure security for farm workers / dwellers

Although the options discussed above which offer direct home ownership are the most desirable these will not be implemented immediately. There is therefore need for clarity on the issue of farm workers/ dwellers currently occupying farm villages. There is need for a policy that regulates the relationship between people who live on the farm and the farmer / resettled community. The policy should spell out the rights and responsibilities of both parties.

References

- Atkinson D, Pienaar D and Zingel J (2004) From on Farm to Own farm: The Role of farm worker Unions in land reform in South Africa” Report commissioned by FAO
- Auret, D, (2000) “From bus stop to farm village: The farm worker Programme in Zimbabwe” SC(UK)
- Cross S, (1987) .”An Assessment of Planning Options for Makonde District, Mashonaland West Province,” Harare: SC(UK)
- Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe / Famine Early Warning System / Agriculture Labour Bureau (1999) Survey of Commercial Farm Workers Characteristics and Living Conditions in Zimbabwe. Harare
- Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe / Famine Early Warning System / Agriculture Labour Bureau (1999) Survey of Commercial Farm Workers Characteristics and Living Conditions in Zimbabwe. Harare
- Hall R (2003) “Tenure Reform on South African Farms” Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies
- Herbst, J (1990) and State Politics in Zimbabwe Harare: University of Zimbabwe.
- Kanyenze, G (2001) ‘Zimbabwe’s Labour Relations Policies and Implications for Workers’, in FCTZ (2001) Zimbabwe’s Farm Workers: Policy Dimension, Harare: Panos Southern Africa
- Kinsey, Bill H (1999) Emerging Issues in Zimbabwe’s Land Resettlement Program. Development Policy Review.
- Lowenson Rene (1992) Modern Plantation Agriculture: Corporate Wealth and Labour Squalor. London Zed Books
- Magaramombe G. (1998) Tenure Security for Farm Workers. Mimeo
- Magaramombe, G (2001) ‘Housing, Sanitation and Farm Worker Settlements’ in Zimbabwe’s Farm Workers: Policy Dimension, Harare: Panos Southern Africa

- Magaramombe, G., (2003), "Resource Base and Farm Production: Farm Labour Relations Use and Needs", African Institute for Agrarian Studies Discussion Series Paper, Harare
- Magaramombe, G, P Waterloos and G Muti (1998) Survey Report of Farm Workers on Designated Farms, Mimeo, Harare
- Moyo S. Blair Rutherford and Dede Amanor –Wilks (2000) Land Reform and Changing Social Relations for Farm Workers in Zimbabwe Review of African Political Economy No 84:181-202. ROAPE Publications Ltd.
- Moyo S. Chambati W. (2004) "Review of the Zimbabwean Agricultural Sector following the Implementation of the Land Reform: Impacts of Land Reform of Farm Workers and Farm Labour Processes" Technical Paper No. 7 E U
- Riddell R (1981) "Report of the Commission of Enquiry into Prices and Conditions of Service". Harare.
- Rukuni M. (1994) "Report of the Commission of Enquiry into Appropriate Agricultural Land Tenure" Systems. Harare.
- Sachikonye L.M. (2003) "The Situation of Commercial Farm Workers after Land Reform in Zimbabwe". A report for Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe. London: Catholic Institute for International Relations.
- Sachikonye LM and OJ Zishiri, (1999) "Tenure Security for Farm Workers". Working Paper No27. Economic Advisory Project, Harare: Friedrich Ebert Foundation
- Utete C. (2003) Report of the Presidential Land Review Committee. Main report Vol1 Zimbabwe Government.

- _____ (1998) Land Reform and Resettlement Program Phase II: A Policy Framework and Project Document Harare.
- _____ (1998) Land Reform from A Labour Perspective: Farm Workers Survey Report
- _____ (1999) National Land Policy Frame Work. Harare, Zimbabwe.
- _____ (2001) Land Reform and Resettlement Program Revised Phase II
- _____ (2002) Land Reform Programme: "Fast Track Resettlement"
National Report as at 14 March 2002, Harare: Ministry of Local
- _____ (2000) National Housing Policy for Zimbabwe: National Task force on Housing

Agrarian Reform and Security of Tenure

Tendai Murisa, Research Fellow African Institute of Agrarian Studies

1.0 Introduction

The pattern of FTRLP impacts on former farm workers is diverse and complex. It varies widely among districts, depending on the nature of their agricultural activities, the scale of farms, their vicinity to the communal areas and other local economic and social dynamics. There have been both positive and negative effects of the FTRLP on farm workers in the former LSCF sector.

It is estimated that over 85 000 fulltime farm workers are still in employment (Magaramombe, 2003 quoting CFU, 2003). This is because most large agro industrial estates (sugar, coffee, tea and forest plantations) were not affected by the land acquisition programme (Moyo, 2003). We estimate that about 50 000 casual and part time workers could have retained their jobs in these regions and on the remaining LSCFs.

However some studies (FCTZ, 2001; 2002; Sachikonye, 2003; Zimbabwe Community Development Trust, 2003) cite a 50% job loss of former farm workers, but ignore new forms of re-employment such as piece work and maricho. In Midlands province farm worker job losses were minimal (Provincial Land Committee, 2003).

Some of the former farm workers have been re-employed by new farmers and state farms, others have relocated to their communal areas, some stayed on the farms they worked on and some have moved to informal settlements which have emerged since the FTRLP. In overall terms, the status of farm workers following the FTRLP can be crudely estimated as shown in Table 1

Table 1: Post-FTRLP Overall Status of Former Farm Workers

Type of farm workers	Pre-FTRLP Status*	Job Retention	Estimates of Former Farm Workers Current Status					Totals
			Re-employed by new farmers	Gained access to land	Repatriated to neighbouring countries	Relocated to Communal Areas	Squatting / Residing on A1/A2 farms	
Full time	167,459	85,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Part time	146,420	40,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	313,879	125,000	47,000	16,000	6,000	78,000	6,000	273,000

*CSO, 2001. These estimates are crude and are based on the general trend observed

1.1 GoZ Policy Situation of former and current Farm Workers

GoZ policy on farm workers in relation to housing and tenure security is not coherently expressed in a single document, but can be captured in two dimensions. Since not all farms have been acquired the implicit GoZ policy on farm workers is that a substantive proportion of them would remain employed on non acquired farms. Those who are 'displaced' by the FTRLRP are covered by three specific policy measures: (1) the obligation of LSCF farmers to pay severance packages to the disengaged workers leading to absorption into the wider economy, (2) GoZ assistance in the repatriation of those who wish to be repatriated (3) provision of resettlement land to some former farm workers.

Although the Inception Phase Framework Plan of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme Phase II (LRRP II) incorporated farm workers as a target group for resettlement, they are not specified as such in the FTRLRP document, which focuses on 'landless peasants' and 'war veterans' as beneficiaries. But GoZ policy, in practice, included farm workers as beneficiaries and those who wished to be allocated land were expected to apply through the provincial and district land committees. However, farm worker resettlement policy varies at the provincial and district level, since no land allocation quotas were set for former farm workers. In some provinces, a number of farms were specifically set aside for former farm worker resettlement; in others they were not. Since mid 2002 and in 2003 when the GoZ Land Audit was underway, District Land Committees were enjoined by GoZ officials to increase their allocations of land to former farm workers.

In addition to the provision of resettlement land to former farm workers, it is the stated GoZ policy (by verbal pronouncement) that former farm workers who have not been re-engaged by other farmers, who have not been repatriated or who are not absorbed elsewhere in the economy or communal lands, are entitled to temporary residency in their former farm compounds. This policy does not appear to have been widely or uniformly communicated to new farmers and tends to be interpreted in different ways.

2.0 Situation on new Farms

The condition of the farm workers vary among districts. In the Chikomba case, we found a broadly based distribution of former farm worker destinations (Table 2). Findings were that 47 percent of the former farm workers had been visibly accommodated in the new agrarian set up, as follows: allocated land (20 percent); re-employed (27 percent) and another 3 percent estimated to be squatting in the Charter Estate and in peri-urban Chivhu. But in districts such as Chiredzi and in the Eastern Highlands, more farm workers remained employed.

Table 2: Overall Status of Former Farm Workers in Chikomba District (2003)

Status	Number	Percentage (%)
Allocated Land	123	20
Re-employed		
State Farm	100	17
New Farms (model A1 and A2)	0	0
Relocated to other LSCF	60	10
Relocated to Communal Area	302	50
Squatting	18	3
Total	604	100

Source: Field Evidence.

Just like in the previous LSCF tenure security is still determined by the farmworkers ability to supply his/her own labour on the farm. Farm workers' compounds are still viewed as private property belonging to the farm owner. This relationship is heavily steeped in the Master Servant relationship that was institutionalized during colonialism where farm workers were made to be dependent on the farm owners not only for jobs but even for their accommodation.

2.1 Land Allocation to Former Farm Workers

There is a national perception that very few former farm workers benefited from the FTLRP as new landowners. Official GoZ statistics show that, by mid 2002, only 2 percent of the total beneficiaries of the model A1 (2,087 out of 110,885 beneficiaries) were former farm workers. These GoZ figures suggest that only 0.6 percent of all the former farm workers before the FTLRP, gained resettlement land. However, the rate of land allocation to former farm workers varies across different parts of the country. A preference survey carried before the FTLRP showed that 53 percent of the former farm workers wanted access to land if they were to benefit from the land reform (MPSL&SW, 2001).

In Goromonzi, official records show that 1.5 percent (26 out of 1, 719 beneficiaries of model A1) of the beneficiaries of the land resettlement programme were former farm workers (AIAS Field Surveys; Marongwe, 2003). This gives an average of 1.8 former farm workers per farm on the 47 farms compulsorily acquired for redistribution. The rate of land allocation to former farm workers in the Midlands Province was very low, due to greater retention of farm workers on remaining LSCFs. Based on four districts, the average rate of land allocation to former farm workers was 0.46 per farm, Gweru (0.5), Kwekwe (0.19), Mberengwa (1.2) and Zvishavane (0.11). Field evidence from Kwekwe and Gweru showed that only one out of 150 beneficiaries was a former farm worker (AIAS Field Surveys).

While, official records from the Chikomba District Council, for instance, show that only 12 former farm workers (0.36 percent of the beneficiaries) out of 3,292 new farmers in model A1 were beneficiaries of the programme, field evidence shows otherwise (Table 3). More than 5 percent of the beneficiaries of A1 farms were former farm workers.

Chikomba had, on average, 3.3 farm workers per farm, while official data suggests only 0.32 per farm. This disparity between official records from the District Council and our field findings, where 12 former farm workers are said to have benefited on 37 farms, compares poorly with 20 benefiting on only six farms. This suggests that a number of former farm workers benefited from the FTLRP through their communal areas, by presenting themselves as peasant farmers.

Projection of our field findings of a land allocation rate of 3.3 former farm workers per farm on 37 compulsorily acquired farms shows that potentially an estimated 123 former farm workers could have benefited from the FTLRP in Chikomba District. This implies that potentially about 20 percent of the former farm workers on compulsorily acquired farms were allocated land. This figure could actually be higher if farm workers on farms not compulsorily acquired for resettlement are considered since some also got land. This confirms statements from the Chikomba District Council that many former farm workers who had nowhere to go after compulsory farm acquisitions were allocated land.

Table 3: Farm Worker Resettlement in Model A1 in Chikomba District

Name of Farm	Total No. of Plot holders	No of Farm Workers Resettled	% of Farm Workers Resettled	Average Plot Size (Ha)
Ingulubi (3 farms)	145	8	5.5	30.00
Uitky	21	2	9.5	15.00
Bathest	46	6	13.0	30.00
Nyatsitsi	62	4	6.0	4.25
Total	274	20	8.5	

Source: Field Surveys.

In Mazowe District an estimated rate of 8.1 former farm workers allocated per farm was found (AIAS Field Surveys; Magaramombe, 2003a). Here they constituted 16 percent of the total beneficiaries of the FTLRP. But within their group they only amounted to 2.3 percent of all former farm workers on compulsorily acquired farms.

Thus, out of all the beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement, field evidence suggests an estimated 8.5 percent were former farm workers, compared to official figures of 2 percent. Taking this and other data into account, we estimate that at least 5 percent of the beneficiaries of the model A1 resettlement could be former farm workers. Since farm workers constitute about 10 percent of the rural population, the estimated level of 5 percent of the total beneficiaries implies that their land quota was about 50 percent of what, morally speaking, they should have been allocated.

It is also important to note that, in some districts, farms were specifically allocated to former farm worker resettlement, despite the fact that GoZ policy did not target them as a special group. In Mazowe Valley area, two farms (Dawye and Masasa) were set aside for the benefit of 350 farm workers, while some farm workers acquired land under a similar initiative in Zvimba North. This setting aside of land for farm worker resettlement is commendable because former farm workers deserved such preference and require at least

land for residential plots since they still seek jobs. Former farm workers have lived on private land with no agricultural or residential 'tenure rights' and the situation is worse for migrant workers who have no access to land elsewhere since they do not have ties to the communal areas and had no other home except the farm compound.

In Mazowe West, former farm workers were largely not allocated land under the FTLRP due to the dominance of A2 resettlement in that area. Former farm workers generally could not benefit from A2 land because of lack of resources. Another possible explanatory factor for former farm workers in this area being excluded is their origin. For instance, 90 percent of the workers at Sandringham Farm are migrants mostly from Malawi and Mozambique, unlike other farms where less than 30 percent are 'foreign'. Informal resettlement of former farm workers by remaining on white large-scale commercial farms, especially those involved in extensive beef ranching was observed on some of the farms in Mazowe West, where former farm workers were being allocated residential plots and small, one acre fields to grow crops in unused sections of the farm.

Although some former farm workers who benefited from the land reform programme practice farming in their own right, field findings show an emerging pattern of maintaining employment contacts as a strategy to cushion themselves from poverty. The fact that their specialist skills are mostly in areas not dominant in new resettlement schemes, which are mostly maize focused, can be a limiting factor. This leads them to contract out on short assignments whenever they are needed since there is a mismatch of skills deployment. A case in point is the government-run Charter Estate, where close to 60 workers have plot holdings acquired during the FTLRP within and outside the district.

This dual 'belonging' is not new to farm workers, as their spouses maintain their plots during their absence. Thus, during the rain season, there is a critical shortage of labour in general as farm workers engage in own agricultural production. In some areas, however, they have abandoned their new landholdings for the higher rewards offered by gold panning. In Zvimba North for instance, some 300 former farm workers abandoned their plot allocations to venture into lucrative gold panning, shifting valuable skills and experience out of agricultural production.

There is evidence, that by 2004 as the FTLRP progressed, former farm workers were increasingly being brought into the land allocation process, albeit on a small scale and on smaller plots. Government officials, politicians and NGOs continue to lobby for more land to be made available to them. Efforts are underway in some areas to increase the land allocated to farm workers, for instance in Zvimba, land committees and politicians have been encouraging new farmers to allocate small plots of unutilised land to farm workers still resident in farm compounds (Magaramombe, 2003b). In Bindura district, some A1 farmers who could not utilise all of their land allocated some of it to landless farm workers resident in farm compounds (AIAS Field Surveys, 2004). More members of parliament (MPs) appear to lobby for farm workers land access, while in communal areas, chiefs and headmen are being encouraged to allocate vacated plots to 'foreign' farm workers, especially those married to Zimbabweans.

However in some districts such as Mazowe, new farmers have entrenched the marginalisation of farm workers' access to land by declaring that "no former farm worker will get access to land" (AIAS Field Surveys, 2004). At Inglebroom and Calgary farms in Mazowe, A1 farmers took over the small food security gardens that farm workers had access to before the FTLRP. After pleading with the A1 farmers for access with no favourable response, former farm workers forcibly ploughed their food security gardens out of desperation and with no other means of amid resistance from new farmers. The position taken by the farm workers was later consolidated through the intervention of the District Administrator who demanded that the A1 farmers who had settled close to the farm compound set up their homestead close their allocated pieces of land. The local MP has appeared on Zimbabwe Television pleading for land allocation to farm workers. In addition farm workers have accessed land (e.g. two acres allocated in Macheke) which has been 'regularised' by local authorities.

2.4 Residential Status of Former Farm Workers

Former farm workers' access to farm compound residency after the reallocation of land to new settlers continues to face contradictions four years after the start of the FTLRP. By the last quarter of 2003, an estimated 50 to 70 percent (156,939 to 219,715) of the former farm workers were still resident in the LSCF compounds. Initially welcomed by new A2 farmers, as it would provide a convenient labour pool for their farming operations, tensions between these two groups have remained. On the one hand, former farm workers accuse new farmers of exploitative labour practices, thus they refuse to be engaged by them even when they are residing on their properties. On the other hand, new A2 employers argue that they cannot afford to pay higher wages since they are only starting up and need to build a capital base. This impasse has led to a deadlock between new farmers and former farm workers and there are reports that some workers have been chased away from farm compounds for refusing to do contract work (IRIN, 2004) and others have been forced to work in exchange for their continued residency in these areas. Some new farmers have resorted to charging access fees to former farm workers for use of farm resources, such as water, firewood, thatching grass, fishing on farm dams etc. (The Tribune, 5-11 March 2004) as retribution for their refusal to provide their labour services. Some former farm workers thus live in fear of being evicted from the farm compound

The FTLRP has had numerous effects on the residential status of former farm workers, who had resided on their employer's property for the greater part of their employment life. Some former farm workers have been forced to move off the farms to make way for new settlers, under either the A1 or A2 models, while some are still resident on farms acquired under FTLRP, either as squatters or in agreement with the new owners. Those displaced in this manner are often stranded on the outskirts of the farms or they trek to the fast growing 'informal settlements' where social conditions are desperate. Others with ties in the communal areas have relocated there.

Various studies³ have exposed the potential problem of farm worker displacement, although these have no in depth analysis of the precise circumstances, the magnitude and the time scale of this displacement, or the possible destinations of displaced people. The capacities of the destinations to hold increased populations and capacities of central and local government, NGOs and civil society to manage the displaced farm workers (Zimbizi, 2000) have also not been fully examined.

Although new farmers on the former LSCFs have displaced former farm workers from their previous homes, the 'squatter problem' is varied but seems to be limited. For instance in Chikomba District, it is limited to a section of the Charter Estate and an indigenously owned farm which was not gazetted for resettlement. There, farm occupiers are still waiting to be allocated land elsewhere by the District Council. These are mostly people from outside the district and they include former farm workers estimated to be about 3 percent of the previous commercial agricultural labour establishment. Farm workers that remain on farms are those that have been allocated land and/or re-employed.

GoZ policy that former farm workers should be allowed to continue residing in farm compounds after compulsory farm acquisitions seems to have been followed in some districts. For instance, former farm workers in districts, such as Seke, Hwedza, Esigodini, Mazowe West and Marondera have mainly remained in the former large scale commercial farming area compounds mostly without access to land and migrate temporarily within these confines to informal settlements, to seek work on new farms and remaining large-scale commercial farms. But a survey in three districts of Kadoma, Kwekwe and Chegutu showed that 33 percent of the former farm workers remaining in farm compounds had been given access to small arable plots of land to grow their own food (ZCDT, 2003). Some simply stayed put on the farms they used to work on with various arrangements in existence with the new farmers (FCTZ, 2002; Magaramombe, 2003a; Sachikonye, 2003; Save the Children Fund; and FCTZ, 2002). In Mazowe District only 3 percent of the former farm workers were reported to have relocated to their communal home (AIAS Field Surveys; Magaramombe, 2003a). Most of those former farm workers who did not access land under the FTLRP and remained in the former large-scale commercial farming areas are migrant workers with no links to the communal areas.

There were claims by Rural District Council (RDC) officials in Mberengwa District, for example, that no former farm worker has been left homeless or destitute as a result of the land redistribution programme. The Chikomba District Council also made this claim. There were no informal settlements in Chikomba. However these have sprouted since the onset of the FTLRP in other districts, such as in Chihwiti and Gambuli informal settlements in Chinhoyi, where an estimated 51 percent of the households were former farm workers in the district (Save the Children Fund and FCTZ, 2002), which has since increased to 64 percent as the FTLRP continued. Table 4-4 shows the various informal settlements that have sprouted since 2000, although some were already in existence.

³ e.g. Sachikonye and Zishiri (1999); Zishiri (1999) Magaramombe, Waterloos and Muti (1998); and the MPSL&SW (1998).

Evidence from Chikomba District shows that 50 percent of the former farm workers (mostly originally from communal areas and surrounding districts, Chihota, Buhera, Gutu, Mwenezi and Masvingo) from compulsorily acquired farms went to the communal areas (Table 3-2). This supports arguments of the ‘peasantariat’ nature of former farm workers, given their ties with the communal areas (USAID, 1998; Moyo et. al., 2000; AIAS and KWA, 2002, Rutherford, 2001). They belonged to two communities, the LSCF and the communal area, mainly because close to 50 percent of the former farm workers were employed on a part-time basis and practiced their own agricultural production in their communal areas. This is not inconsistent with our earlier argument that at least 50 percent of the former farm workers were part-time workers with links to the communal area especially in a district like Chikomba.

However there have been cases of legal eviction of former farm workers residing on farm compounds. The most recent being the Old Citrus Farm case where the owner of the farm (Phillip Chiyangwa) was granted an order to evict farm thirty six farm workers residing on the farm’s compound (Daily Mirror, 17 June 2005) .

Table 4-4: Farm Workers in Rural/Urban Informal Settlements

Province	District	Name of Settlement	Estimated Population	% of population of former farm workers
Mash Central	Mazowe	Marata	5000	50%
Mash West	Makonde	Chihwiti/Gambuli	+/- 35000	64%
	Zvimba	Porta Farm		
Manicaland	Old Mutare	Cyanra Farm	60	50%
Mash East	Murewa	Macheke	500	63%
Harare	Harare	Hatcliffe Extension	Not available	Not available
		Dzivarasekwa Extension	Not available	Not available

Source: Magaramombe (2003b)

Such former farm workers thus already had access to land before the FTLRP, although questions might be asked about the size and quality of their landholdings in the communal areas, and whether these provide a sustainable livelihood. In some Mashonaland districts, former farm workers, mostly with no previous ties to the communal areas have bought residential and/or agricultural plots from headmen. This has further increased congestion in the communal areas possibly reversing the decongestion gains of the FTLRP. Some of the former farm workers have resurfaced in the new resettlement areas as they got land as peasants through ‘their’ chiefs in the communal areas.

3.0 Policy Recommendations

The GoZ should refine its policy measures in support of former, retained and new farm workers. It should produce a coherent and integrated policy statement in consultation with relevant stakeholders and ensure that it is widely disseminated in relevant government ministries, throughout RDCs and local government offices, among farm workers and their organizations, to new farmers and to NGOs.

3.1 Access to farming and housing land

GoZ policy should aim to provide all farm workers, particularly former farm workers, with access to adequate land either for farming (of the A1 type) or for residential purposes (including room for food and nutritional gardens). Such access should be backed by secure title to the land in the form of long-term inheritable leases. Independent programmes to assist farm workers to build their own homes should also be instituted and support from the NGO sector should be mobilized. There is an urgent need to formalize land titles especially A2 so as to generate an atmosphere of permanency in their activities which will in turn encourage them to erect durable housing structures for their employees. Policy incentives such as tax relief measures should be considered as a strategy to induce farmers to build housing structures for their employees.

3.2 Rural service and residential centres

The policy should focus on creating viable rural communities through the creation of rural service centres and hamlets for provision of services to farm workers and new settlers in A1 areas and for non-farm entrepreneurs and workers within resettlement areas. Such centres should be built around some of the centrally located existing farm compounds. These should be augmented in area and excised from A1 and A2 land subdivisions. These centres should be turned into state properties governed by local authorities in collaboration with farm workers, settlers and relevant government agencies, within the existing hierarchy of settlements and administrative structures. This rural service centre programme could be initiated on a pilot basis in every district and expanded to all resettlement and remaining LSCF areas over the following five years. Government, the various stakeholders and humanitarian support service agencies should contribute adequate resources to this project, through which satellite social services can be provided.

**Farm Worker Tenure Security and Development
Synthesis of Issues**

Chrispen Sukume

**Lecturer, Department of Agricultural Economics and Extension
Research Associate, Centre for Rural Development, University of Zimbabwe
csukume@africaonline.co.zw**

Introduction

Discussion yesterday and early today highlighted a number of issues:-

- Welfare of farm workers has been poor historically and during current restructuring of the agricultural sector
- Farm workers do not have tenure security-may need worker villages
- Farm workers are essential for agricultural production turnaround
- Farm workers were siding with white farmers in the resettlement programme
- Farm workers were/are poorly linked to local and national governance institutions : birth certificates, national IDs etc
- Farm workers were prevented from participating in worker organization
- There is increased crime in resettlement areas with large involvement of farm workers

In the discussion the above issues were presented as arguments for or against strengthening of the tenure security of farm workers. In my opinion, these issues hinge on two interrelated important concepts – the concept of development and security of tenure. I will argue that the above raised issues (including those presented as against) actually form a strong basis for strengthening land/housing tenure for farm workers.

Outline of my discussion is as follows:

- What is development?
- What does it mean to have tenure security?
- Conclusion: How would ‘homestead plots’ enhance development?

What is development?

While there is no single definition, development can be characterized by the following seven categories of indicators.

1. Income and income growth

Nationally measured by GDP, but individually need to look at income earned as well as unrecorded sweat income.

Discussion Issues:

- Poor incomes of farm workers
- Costs of crime and social breakdown
- Cost of ecological damage, and also
- Productivity of resettlement areas

2. Poverty

Measured as percentage of people with income below a poverty line

Growth is only useful to reduce poverty if not accompanied by too much increase in inequality.

If there is less inequality, increases in national income will lead to higher poverty reduction.

3. Inequality and inequity

Equality of opportunities, capabilities (assets) and freedoms (power).

Positive aspects of equality

- (+) Cost of social control may fall with equality.
- (+) Cost of welfare programs may fall with equality.
- (+) Solidarity and cooperation may rise with equality.
- (+) Participatory development and democracy may rise with equality.
- (+) Greater share of the population with collateralizable assets.

Discussion Issue:

Provision of opportunities, capabilities and freedom has been less for farmworkers relative to say CA or Resettled families

4. Vulnerability

Vulnerability = Probability of falling in poverty.

eg. food insecurity: $\text{Probability}(\text{Consumption} < \text{Minimum consumption requirement})$.

If poor have lower average consumption relative to minimum needed, they are more exposed to disaster, and will have a higher level of risk aversion in their behavior, limiting their options. Situation of farm workers puts them in this category of Zimbabweans.

Vulnerability has a number of negative impacts:

- Poor management: tendency to invest in liquid assets rather than fixed long term assets

- Risks of irreversibility (fall into poverty traps): children taken out of school (child labor used as a short run risk coping instrument with long term loss in human capital for the child), malnutrition and stunting, fire sales of assets (land), move to refugee camps, homelessness (hard to reenter the labor force).

5. Basic needs (human development)

An expansion of definition of poverty to include level of access to health, education, nutrition, social infrastructure.

Discussion issues:

Magaramombe and the GAPWUZ representatives indicated poor provision of amenities in farming areas (farm workers are basic needs poor in addition to being income poor). By nature these amenities are better provided by the local and national government. If left to the farmers these tend to be under provided as the history in commercial farming have revealed.

6. Sustainability in the use of natural resources

“Sustainability” = concern for the welfare of future generations in our current use of natural resources (Brundtland Commission).

Discussion issues:

If farm workers do not have a stake in the farming areas they tend to engage in non-sustainable use of resources

7. Quality of life

Indicators of a range of economic and social choices available to an individual and a nation including among others:-

- Political freedoms: community and local decision-making, participatory democracy.
- Empowerment: participation, social incorporation.
- Harmonious Community Environment: reduced social tensions, security, stability, a sense of belonging (attachment to place), cooperation, household stability.

Discussion issues:

- tenure insecurity reduces a sense of belonging, rights to local decision processes
- need to counter the colonial mentality in former farm workers

What does it mean to have security of tenure?

A working definition I find useful is the following:

Land tenure security exists when an individual perceives that he or she has rights to a piece of land on a continuous basis, free from imposition or interference from outside sources, as well as the ability to reap the benefits of labour and capital invested in the land, whether in use or upon transfer to another holder.(Posterman)

Regardless of the land system, three criteria for assessing land tenure security derive from the above definition: (1) breadth; (2) duration; and (3) assurance.

- Breadth is a measurement of the quantity and quality of the land rights held, and may include the rights to possess land; to grow or harvest crops; to pass on to heirs; to sell land or to lease it to others; to pledge land rights as security for credit; to prevent trespass; to graze cattle; to harvest wildlife; to gather firewood; to build structures on land; to extract mineral resources; and to use surface water(varying 'bundles' of rights).
- Duration measures the length of time for which these rights are valid. Typically the same duration applies to every element in the bundle of rights, but this is not necessarily so.
- Assurance is a measurement of the certainty of the breadth and duration of the rights that are held. If an individual is said to possess land rights of a specific breadth and duration, but cannot exert or enforce those rights, they have no assurance. A land "right" which cannot be exerted or enforced is not a right at all.

Tenure security exists where an individual with rights to land possesses key rights (including at least the right to possess land, enjoy the benefits of the land, and pass land to heirs) for a duration sufficiently long to recoup the full value of investments made on the land, with enough certainty to prevent outside imposition or interference.

Conversely, tenure insecurity exists where an individual possesses an inadequate breadth of meaningful rights, or the duration of those rights held is insufficient to recoup investments made, or the ability to exert or enforce rights is lacking.

International experience shows that secure land rights are an essential component of economic development. Compared to weak or insecure rights, secure land rights facilitate economic development in a variety of ways, including:

1. Raising productivity through increased agricultural investment;
2. Increasing land transactions and facilitating the transfer of land from less efficient to more efficient uses by increasing the certainty of contracts and lowering enforcement costs;
3. Reducing the incidence of land disputes through clearer definition and enforcement of rights;
4. Increasing credit use by creating greater incentives for investment, improved creditworthiness of projects, and enhanced collateral value of land;
5. Reducing soil erosion and other environmental degradation to land; and
6. Creating political stability by providing farmers a more significant stake in society.

Homestead Plots

Evidence from diverse settings (see RDI papers) including Indonesia, Russia, Cuba, and South India indicate that very small homestead or garden plots can confer multiple important benefits, in terms of food, income, status, and economic security.

- In most of the schemes in South Asia the sizes of plots are rather modest ranging from 0.06 to 0.15 acres per family.
- Households with gardens often obtain more than 50% of their supply of vegetables, fruits, medicinal herbs and protein (for those with animals) from them.
- In Bangladesh, research indicates that rural homestead plots provide almost 90% of all fuel wood consumed by rural households.
- Vegetable growing as well as livestock rearing(chickens, rabbits, etc) can also benefit a family by providing them with saleable commodities, producing manure that can be used on their own land as fertilizer or sold to others. One study surmised that upwards of 20% of household income can be attributed to house plots through the sale of surplus vegetables and animals products, combined with savings on amounts spent to purchase food in the market and medicinal expenses.
- Homestead and garden plots can also provide an important safety net through their value as a source of food, income and capital for families in times of drought, unemployment, or other hardships.
- Homestead are important as a place to invest 'sweat capital'
- The status and self-image of rural households can also be increased by the ownership of a small plot of land. Such status is important for overall well-being, for its ability to increase a family's involvement in village politics, and for helping households to access informal sources of credit in the village. It has also been shown to increase agricultural laborers' ability to bargain for higher wages (or sharecroppers' ability to bargain for a greater share), as they are no longer dependent on their employer for a place to live.

FARM COMMUNITY TRUST OF ZIMBABWE

Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) Workshop to present to the Parliament Portfolio Committee on Lands and Agriculture, Housing and Tenure Security for Farm Workers in Newly Resettled Areas 14-16 October 2005.

Venue: Troutbeck Inn Hotel, Nyanga

DAY 1: Friday 14 October 2005

TIME	ACTIVITY	RESOURCE PERSON	CHAIRPERSON
2.00-2.20 pm	Registration and Introductions	AA	FCTZ
2.20-.2.30pm	Workshop Objective Background to the Organisation	FCTZ DIRECTOR	FCTZ
2.30-3.00pm	Official Opening	Parliament of Zimbabwe	
3.00-3.30pm	Situation of (ex) farm workers after fast track resettlement programme	GAPWUZ	
3.30-3.45 pm	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK
3.45-5.00pm	DISCUSSION	ALL	

Day 2 - Saturday 15 October 2005

TIME	ACTIVITY	RESOURCE PERSON	CHAIRPERSON
8.00 am- 830 am	Recap of previous day proceedings	ALL	
8.30-9.00am	General Overview on housing and security of tenure for farm workers	FCTZ	
9.00-9.30am	DISCUSSION	ALL	
9.30-10.00am	Case Study by (ex)-farm worker	(Ex) farm worker	
10.00-10.30am	Case Study by farm worker	Farm worker	
10.30-10.45am	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK
10.45- 11.20am	Agrarian reform and security of tenure	African Institute of Agrarian Studies	
11.20-12.00 noon	DISCUSSION	ALL	

12.00-12.30pm	Implications of security of tenure on development	Centre for Rural Development	
12.30am-1pm	DISCUSSION	DISCUSSION	
1pm-2pm	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK	LUNCH BREAK
2pm-3.00pm	Group Work on Recommendations	ALL	
3.00-3.30pm	Group presentations- Plenary session	ALL	
3.30-3.45pm	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK	TEA BREAK
3.45.4.00pm	Way forward	Parliament of Zimbabwe	FCTZ
4.00.4.15pm	Closing remarks	FCTZ	FCTZ
4.15pm	END OF WORKSHOP		

List of Participants

Name	Org/Min/Dept	Contact Address	Contact Tel/e-mail
Bote T.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Bushu S. Chief	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box CY298 Causeway	091950629
Chaeruka J.	UZ (RUP)	P. O. Box MP167 Mt Pleasant Harare	303211/091980021 joelchae@yahoo.com
Chambati W.	AIAS	19 Box Ave Eastlea, Harare	04-708654
Chawatama S.	IDS, UZ	P. O. Box 880 Harare	307900/3 schawatama@yahoo.co.uk
Chikomba F.	Makonde RDC	P. O. Box 296 Mhangura	011801354
Chikwati E.	The Herald	P. O. Box 396 Harare	790020/702218
Chitsinde E. Chief	Chief Negomo Mazowe	P. O. Box 339 Glendale	011764640
Chitsungo E.	Min Education Sports and Culture	P. O. Box CY 121 Causeway Harare	023259060 04-734051-9
Chiwanza P.	FCTZ	P.O. Box1592 Mutare	020-68873
Duru M. R.	National Association of Housing Coop	P. O. Box 2022 Mutare	023510375 020-30776/60908
Gochera M. G.	Min Local Govt Public Works & Urban Dev	P. O. Box 445 Marondera	079-24382-4
Gwakwakwa S.	Min Local Govt Public Works & Urban Dev	P. Bag 7706 Causeway Harare	737195
Gwitira E.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Hambira G.	Gapwuz	P.O. Box 1952 Harare	011624142/ 734141/2
Jera S.	NEC Agriculture	P. O. Box 312 Westgate Harare	04-334471-3
Juru O. T.	Goromonzi RDC	P. O. Box 96 Ruwa	011808825

Kadziyanike J. E.	Mazowe Rural District Council	P. O. Box 35 Concession	023-259993 075-6 2251/2
Kaviza M. T.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Machawira K.	The Voice	Zanu PF Headquarters 7 th Floor, Harare	011767713
Madhovi T.	Goromonzi RDC	P. O. Box 96 Ruwa	011502150
Magaramombe G.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough	godfrey@fctz.org.zw
Mahofa S. B. Hon.	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box 88 Mupandawana	04-498704 /011873486
Malunga T.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough, Harare	04-300290 tmalunga@fctz.org.zw
Manyati E.	Ex-farm worker	P.O. Box 141 Odzi	
Marerwa-Utete D.	Radio Zimbabwe	P. O. Box 9048 Mbare	
Marodza T.	Agricultural Labour Bureau	P. O. Box WGT 390 Westgate Harare	04-309800/309836/ 091219226 alb@cfi.co.zw
Marongwe A.	Min Local Govt Public Works & Urban Dev	P. Bag 7113 Mutare	(028) 2228/2561
Masomera A.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Marlborough, Harare	04-300290
Masumba A.	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P.O. Box Cy 298 Causeway	700171-9
Matowa M.	FCTZ	P. O. Box 143 Bindura	071-6109
Matsikidze P. P.	Daily Mirror	70 Charter House Cnr J. Nyerere/S. Machel Ave	011511168/091802140 ptsiki@yahoo.com
Maunge L.	Makonde RDC	P. O. Box 296 Mhangura	060-570415 / 011631919
Mavu J.	Min Land Reform and Resettlement	P. O. Box 752 Mutare	020-61118
Mbetsa F.	PA Manicaland	P. O. Box 535	020-61982 011870735

		Mutare	
Mbiri C.	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box Cy 298 Causeway Harare	mbiric@hotmail.com 700181-9
Mbwachena N.F.	FCTZ	P. O. Box 143 Bindura	071-6109
Mokam B.	UNDP	Takura House K Nkrumah Ave	Bernard.mokam@undp.org
Mpande C. D.	FCTZ	P. O. Box 1143 Marondera	011734396 masheast@cb.fctz.org.zw
Mufandaedza L.	Mazowe Rural District Council	P. O. Box 35 Concession	(0756) 091904994 2251-2, 2475 mufandaedzal@yahoo.com
Mugari S.	Manica Post	P. O. Box 960 Mutare	batsie@yahoo.com
Mugova M.	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box Cy 298 Causeway Harare	700181-9
Mujere M.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Mukaro A.	Zimbabwe Independent	1 Union Ave Harare	091889417
Murerwa R.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Close Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Murisa T.	African Institute of Agrarian Studies	19 Bodle Ave, Eastlea Harare	091362330 / 04-795751 tmurisa@aiatrust.org
Mushipe A. B	Mutare RDC	P.O. Box604 Mutare	020-64737
Mutasa Chief	Traditional Leader	P.O. Box 1490 Mutare	028-2228
Mutasa F.	Chief's Aide	P.O. Box 1490 Mutare	028-2228
Ndlovu H.	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box CY 298 Causeway Harare	252936 hndlovu@yahoo.com
Neshamba A.	Newsnet		011772923 aneshamba@yahoo.com
Nyadzayo T.	Manica Post	P. O. Box 960 Mutare	011783919
Padera M.	The Herald	P. O. Box 396 Harare	Michael.padera@zimpapers.co.zw 023813767
Pasipanodya T. M.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Marlborough	04-300290

		Harare	
Phiri G.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Marlborough Harare	04-300290 phiri@fctz.org.zw
Rainosi M.	New Ziana	19 Mass Media House Selous/3 rd St Harare	251754/251750-2 newsroom@ziana.co.zw
Rupwa E.	Min Local Govt Public Works & Urban Dev	P. O. Box 10 Guruve	058-2962 /011505266
Rwambiwa A.	FCTZ	P. O. Box 1162 Chinhoyi	067-28438
Samunda E.	Min Local Govt Public Works Urban Dev	P. O. Box 87 Marondera	011772321
Savanhu G. M.	Land and Water Rights	14 Hampshire Road, Eastlea Harare	04-746581
Shoko G. M. Hon	Parliament of Zimbabwe	P. O. Box 6850 Harare	091340376 /04-692523
Somerai P.	FCTZ	9A William Gale Marlborough Harare	04-300290
Sukume C.	UZ Centre for Rural Development	P. O. Box MP 167 Mt Pleasant	011210129 303211 Ext 1718
Tembo G. W.	DA Makonde	P. O. Box 97 Chinhoyi	067-22001/ 011865966