Commons

Southern Africa

15

Natural resource management and land reform in southern Africa

By Jeanette Manjengwa

PLAAS
PROGRAMME FOR LAND AND AGRARIAN STUDIES

CASS

No. 15

Natural resource management and
land reform in southern Africa

Jeanette Manjengwa

Natural resource management and land reform in southern Africa
by Jeanette Manjengwa

Natural resource management and land reform in southern Africa

Jeanette Manjengwa

Contents

Tables and boxes

1. Introduction

Throughout southern Africa, land holdings have remained significantly skewed between rich and poor, with discriminatory land tenure systems reflecting the land and agricultural policies adopted in colonial times and after independence (Fortin 2005; Moyo 2005a). Moyo (2000) indicates that, for countries in the southern African region, the land problem is characterised by contradictory tendencies towards irrational land use patterns through both over-utilisation in communal lands, and under-utilisation of land in commercial farming areas. Governance of land use is one of the most important political and economic issues in most southern African countries and land remains the basic source of livelihood for the majority (Kloeck-Jenson 1998), as well as the basis for agro-industrial development. Land reform is currently a significant process throughout southern Africa that is unfolding rapidly on continuously shifting ground. Land reform is a long-term process that aims to enhance agricultural production. However, to be successful, land use options within land reform programmes should incorporate not only social and economic viability, but environmental sustainability as well (Mohamed 2000). Environmental considerations of land reform are generally inadequately conceptualised, despite being a central consideration of sustainable land use. The challenge for land reform programmes is therefore to redistribute land and reform tenure rights ensuring productivity and ecological sustainability of the rural economy.

The research theme centres on policy processes for integrating natural resource management into land reform programmes in southern Africa. Policy has the overall objective of providing an enabling framework for the development and implementation of legislation in an integrated, harmonious manner, but is underpinned by more specific objectives that vary from country to country depending on the prevailing and historic circumstances and the selected direction of socio-economic development, as well as the bio-physical environment. Development of policy is not usually a linear process as policy comes from many directions. Implementation of policy can be as much about agenda-setting, decision-making, and negotiation and bargaining between multiple actors over time, as about execution of decisions (Keeley & Scoones 2003). Issues of power, political goals and technocratic practices influence the policy process.

Land policy formulation is a complex and dynamic process characterised by multiple actors and an intricate web of relationships (Drimie & Mbaya 2001). The demand for land redistribution in terms of redressing historical inequities has been a consistent feature of southern African politics and policymaking (Adams et al. 1999; Moyo 2005b). Moyo (2005b) identifies two main land reform experiences, namely the radical-cum-socialist redistributive land reforms, such as in Mozambique and Angola, and liberal approaches that were a result of negotiated settlements that left the land questions relatively unsolved, as in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa.

The paper begins with a discussion of environmental degradation discourses in southern Africa and how they influence policy processes. This section highlights the link between environmental degradation and poverty. This is followed by an overview of land reform processes in southern Africa, consisting of case studies on Zimbabwe, Mozambique and South Africa, which provide a variety of perspectives, ranging from radical land redistribution and resettlement in Zimbabwe to land tenure reform in Mozambique. These overviews contain a review of land reform that has taken place, and look at how environmental considerations have (or have not) informed land reform processes. The case studies examine the impact of land reform processes on environmental sustainability of land uses. They look at how communities are managing their natural resources in these new circumstances; and identify land reform policy processes that have generated opportunities for facilitating community-based natural resource management (CBNRM).

2.Methodology

Secondary data was gathered from literature and policy documents. Primary data for the Zimbabwean case study draws on research carried out in Zimbabwe between 2001 and 2004 by the author while undertaking a PhD thesis with the Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, UK, entitled 'Local environmental action planning in Zimbabwe: An analysis of its contribution to sustainable development'. This study included a background of land reform in Zimbabwe and an analysis of the development of the Integrated Conservation Plan for the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. The research was an activity under the NORAD-funded Zimbabwe Environment Sector Programme in the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. A qualitative approach was used to obtain primary data, namely: semi-structured interviews with key informants and groups; examination of materials such as reports, reviews, evaluations and minutes of meetings; and participant observation. A follow-up visit was made to Mazowe District in Mashonaland Central in August 2005 to collect updated information regarding the status of farm-level natural resources sub-committee in Fast Track resettlement schemes.

Additional material on environmental concerns, community-level natural resource management and committees in communities that have been delimitated under the Land Law in Mozambique was collected through research undertaken during a Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe (CASS)/ Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape (PLAAS)-funded networking field visit to Chimoio, Manica Province.

3. Environmental discourses in southern Africa

Environmental discourses impact on land reform processes to a greater or lesser extent, influencing how aspects of natural resource management (NRM) are incorporated into land reform policy processes. This section explores existing environmental degradation discourses and how they influence policy processes. In southern Africa, colonial structures of power had institutionalised a dualism in agriculture and conservation, resulting, for most countries in the region, in the development of two conservation policies and two sets of strategies, one for subsistence communal and one for commercial farming areas (Stocking & Garland 1995; Rihoy 1998; Fortin 2005). The approach to natural resources management in southern African countries has been, and largely remains, technocratic – being described as basically 'technicist, proscriptive and centrist' (Murphree & Mazambani 2002:59).

Land degradation, manifested by erosion of fertile topsoil, deforestation and desertification has been identified as a critical environmental issue in southern Africa (Moyo et al. 1993). However, the severity of the problem varies between countries. For example, in Mozambique, which has a relatively low population density, significant environmental degradation is localised. Nevertheless, throughout southern Africa, the dominant paradigm is of widespread environmental degradation, especially in communal lands, with severe over-grazing due to overpopulation, overstocking and mismanagement (Abel & Blaikie 1988 cited in Dahlberg 1994; Scoones 1992). Erosion is not restricted to communal lands only, as some commercial farming ranching areas suffer from sheet erosion and bush encroachment due to overgrazing and inappropriate use (Simon 1995; Pankhurst 1996; Jones 2002). There is a common belief that inappropriate farming methods and overgrazing are causing desertification and turning large parts of Africa into deserts (see, for example, Bourlière 1983; Kirby & Moyo 2001).

Although it is clear that soil erosion exists, the assumption that it is accelerating has been challenged – there is insufficient evidence to substantiate either the extent, or trend of environmental degradation (Cliffe 1988; Drinkwater 1991; Moyo et al. 1991; Dahlberg 1994; Vivian 1994). The scientific basis for predicting land degradation may not be as solid as is generally believed (Stocking 1996; Keeley & Scoones 2003). A new paradigm is emerging about semi-arid environments of Africa based on a critical examination of conventional assumptions that were heavily influenced by knowledge of temperate ecosystems. Research indicates an environment more resilient than had been traditionally assumed, and where stability and sustainability have to be defined according to local conditions and with an appropriate time scale (Dahlberg 1994).

There is a lack of a clear trend in the extent of the soil erosion. This, combined with unfulfilled desertification prophesies, indicates that the nature of environmental degradation in southern Africa is not entirely understood, and the extent of the environmental crisis that exists today may well be exaggerated and distorted (Dahlberg 1994; Stocking & Garland 1995). Nevertheless, the environmental crisis narrative has been, and still is, persistent and ingrained, despite doubts of empirical accuracy of the findings of environmental degradation (Adams 1993; Keeley & Scoones 2003). For example, the White Paper on South African Land Policy and the Integrated Conservation Plan for Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform refer to severe land degradation and soil erosion caused by overcrowding in communal areas and inappropriate farming methods in commercial farms (DLA 1997; Ministry of Environment and Tourism 2001). Various reasons have been suggested for the persistence of the environmental crisis narrative. Drinkwater (1991) proposes that the degradation in the African-held communal

areas was viewed with alarm because it threatened the colonialists' assumption that the 'native reserves' would suffice to maintain the local population indefinitely. Ironically, the argument that people would replicate the destruction they had caused on the reserves across the whole country, if they were given the opportunity, has been used against expanding resettlement (Moyo et al. 1991; Vivian 1994). Perpetuating the environmental crisis narrative in post-colonial times is seen as a means to attract donor funds. Scoones (1996) notes that around the time of United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, international donors were obsessed with environmental issues. An official from the Overseas Development Institute, London, remarked that 'to many…environmental degradation …is so obvious that a request to see the evidence which supports it appears to be fractious quibbling' (quoted in Cliffe 1988:52).

The prevailing solution proposed to address environmental degradation in southern Africa is the application of technical solutions such as ploughing along contours, filling in gullies, not cultivating wetlands and maintaining stock numbers within the carrying capacity (Dahlberg 1994; Stocking & Garland 1995). Policies on environmental issues, natural resource use and agricultural practice are remarkably consistent in their technicist approach, which marginalises local inputs and participation, since their initial formulation in the early years of colonialism (Murphree & Mazambani 2002). Strategically, policy relies primarily on prescription to affect sustainability in natural resource use. Even under the generalised acceptance by government of new policy directions towards communal participation and decentralisation, the 'command-and-control' approach has not essentially changed (Murphree & Mazambani 2002).

Environmental problems in the region are irrevocably linked to the existence of agricultural dualism. Cliffe (1988) states that no solution to the problems of over-population and over-utilisation of land in communal areas should be considered in isolation from an agrarian strategy that includes major land redistribution. The colonial legacy of alienating indigenous people into marginal areas and imposing a racially differentiated land tenure system have resulted in many of the environmental and developmental problems which face the southern African region today (Cliffe 1988; Moyo et al. 1991; Nhira et al. 1998).

Poverty poses a serious threat for land degradation and Cliffe (1988) argues that ecological problems can only be addressed when poverty is eliminated. With few or no savings and little access to credit and capital, poor rural communities cannot easily invest in environmental conservation measures, even if it is in their long-term interest to do so. Furthermore, activities that are undertaken in an attempt to satisfy basic needs are responsible for environmental degradation.

Land tenure reform and resettlement have potential to reduce poverty (Cliffe 1988; DFID 1999) and environmental degradation in southern Africa cannot be adequately addressed until the inequities of land distribution and land tenure are addressed (Moyo et al. 1993; DFID 2002). Land is a finite resource, which, if used efficiently and sustainably, can lead to development, economic growth, employment and the raising of living standards (Chenje et al. 1998). There are opportunities for land distribution to benefit poor rural households, especially if they are given better quality land than they have at present and had the necessary inputs.

4. Land reform in southern Africa: Policy processes and environmental considerations

Introduction

A central agrarian issue in southern African countries is that the repossession of land occupied by European settlers that has not been adequately addressed – despite liberation rhetoric (Adams 2000). Although not itself a guarantee of economic development, land reform is a necessary condition for a more secure and balanced society. Land reform processes in southern Africa tend to focus on land administration rather than land management. While land as a natural resource is administered under land departments, other natural resources, such as forests and wildlife, are dealt with by sectoral ministries. Despite the common colonial legacies, the following case studies illustrate different land reform policy processes, as well as different ways of dealing with environmental sustainability of land reform.

There is currently a great deal of serious conflict over land throughout southern Africa, but nowhere has attracted more attention than recent events of the Fast Track Land Reform programme in Zimbabwe. The first case study on Zimbabwe provides a detailed analysis of the land reform process in the form of redistribution and resettlement. The occurrence of accelerated land reform in Zimbabwe has undoubtedly affected land reform processes in other southern African countries.

Zimbabwe

In Zimbabwe, the land reform policy discourse is often understood exclusively in terms of resettlement. The emphasis is on redistribution with little or no reference to formal rights. The scramble for access to land has clearly taken precedence over discussions of long-tern tenure security. At the time of writing, resettled farmers do not have clear and secure tenure rights to the land.

At independence in 1980, Zimbabwe embarked on a Land Reform Programme to address the historical inequities of land distribution. Subject to availability of finance, the Zimbabwean government had originally planned to resettle 162 000 peasant families over a three-year period on land purchased from large-scale commercial farmers on a 'willing buyer-willing seller' basis. Although the resettlement process was initially quite rapid, this momentum was not maintained – by 1997 resettlement was well below the original target (Table 1). Components and benefits of this programme included implementation of sound land use plans, establishment of woodlots, water supply, communication and roads, agricultural credit facilities, improved sanitation, provision of schools, clinics and extension services (Moyo 1991).

Surveys indicate that resettlement had an impact on alleviating poverty (Deininger et al. 2000). Kinsey (2000) found that resettled households have higher and more evenly distributed income than their communal land counterparts. However, several serious problems arose with the implementation of the first phase of resettlement. The resettlement programme, while being applauded as a positive step to address the problem of over-crowding in communal areas, was seen as replicating the environmental conditions in the communal areas (Moyo et al. 1991). In particular, forest clear-cutting for construction timber and agricultural purposes posed a serious environmental challenge in these areas. However, Elliot (2000) points out that the validity of the environmental debate is limited by the general lack of data, or systematic monitoring, concerning environmental impacts of resettlement. Her research on woodland change in resettlement areas emphasised the complex nature of both the pattern and process of environmental change, and suggests that environmental change through land reform is not simple, linear or uni-directional as had been assumed.

The relative slowness of the first phase of land reform was attributed to financial

constraints; the fragmented nature of the land that was offered to the government for the programme; and poor location of the resettlement land in terms of the agro-ecological quality (Wekwete 1991). Generally, the land was of marginal agricultural value and mainly in arid or semi-arid natural regions with minimal infrastructure. Much of the land was not suitable for intensive arable farming purposes (Mutepfa & Cohen 2000). Funds for land acquisition were limited, with the government paying market prices for land (Government of Zimbabwe 2001).

The second phase of the land reform programme began with a donor's conference in September 1998 that intended to enlist more international participation and support. Out of the conference came a proposal for a donor-supported acquisition of about four million hectares of land. This was for resettlement from farms that had already been designated and gazetted for acquisition for the next two years. However, this was not very successful as only 4 697 families had been resettled on 200 000 hectares of land by June 2000 (Table 1).

The slowness of this cautious approach, compounded by increasing poverty, and the worsening political scenario precipitated the 'Fast Track' phase of the Land Reform Programme, the ultimate objective of which was to accelerate both land acquisition and land redistribution. The 'Fast Track', launched in July 2000, had been immediately preceded by *jambanja* (havoc), or spontaneous farm invasions. Murphree (2004:8) says that, 'for all its negative components, fast track resettlement seems to have found a lever for devolution which has eluded our scholarly stratagems' and the:

Foot soldiers of resettlement have seized the initiative and shifted the balance of innovation in the centre/periphery power equation. They have indeed "broken new ground", both literally and in institutional terms.

Since April 2000 the legal framework governing land acquisition has been significantly revised to take account of changes in government policy. The Land Acquisition Act was amended in May and November 2000, to clarify and streamline various procedural aspects of the acquisition process and to prescribe new compensation rules in accordance with the Constitution (Rugube et al. 2003). Under the 17th Constitutional Amendment of August 2005, all commercial farmland in Zimbabwe was nationalised.

Comprehensive agricultural production and environmental audits or livelihoods and demographic surveys of the impact of Fast Track resettlement had not been completed at the time of writing. Research by Sukume (2004) indicated that agricultural production fell by 22% in 2002 compared to an average annual growth of rate of 4.7% between 1990 and 2000. Crop production was also affected by drought during this period. Furthermore, there are no clear indications as yet that resettlement has significantly decongested communal areas or reduced environmental problems resulting from overcrowding and over use.

Unequal distribution of land and land-based resources is at the centre of environment and development problems in Zimbabwe. Cliffe (1988) asserts that there is not much chance of implementing any conservation policy in Zimbabwe without land redistribution. One of the objectives of the second phase of the

Table 1: Summary of resettlement in Zimbabwe

Date	Description	Families resettled	Hectares
1980	Independence	n/a	15 500 000[1]
1980–1997	First phase of resettlement	71 000	3 500 000
1998–June 2000	Inception phase of the second phase of resettlement	4 697	200 000
July 2000–2003	'Fast Track'	127 192 (under A1 scheme) 7 260 (under A2 scheme) 14 286 (informally settled)	4 200 000 2 100 000 416 808

Sources: Government of Zimbabwe 2001; Government of Zimbabwe 2003

Land Reform Programme was to 'promote environmentally sustainable utilisation of land' (Government of Zimbabwe, undated:2–3). 'Fast Track' settlers under A1 model[2] were being given resettlement certificates that specify the holder's right to erect a house and engage in farming activities and abide by the natural resources conservation legislation.

There was general concern over environmental degradation caused during the 'Fast Track' both from government agencies and the public. National and international media focused on environmental degradation decrying the 'decimation of wildlife', and rampant tree cutting. The magnitude of degradation may have been exaggerated. Research by Murombo (2002) in Masvingo Province indicates that although there was extensive deforestation due to clearing land for cultivation during the 'Fast Track', most farmers only cleared those portions needed for agriculture. Furthermore, Chaumba et al. (2003:17) concluded that even during the most violent and chaotic farm invasions during the time of *jambanja*, there was 'order beneath ostensible disorder'. Notwithstanding, the negative impacts of 'Fast Track' settlers' activities on the environment and natural resources were recognised and recorded by the relevant government agencies (Manjengwa 2004).

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism, mandated by the natural resources, wildlife and forestry laws to protect the environment and natural resources, responded to concerns over environmental degradation being caused by the new settlers. They formed a national-level Task Force at the beginning of 2000 to develop an Integrated Conservation Plan (ICP) for the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. The aim of the ICP was to address environmental concerns and come up with alternative land uses and options that would enable the Fast Track Land Reform Programme to be environmentally sustainable. The Task Force comprised the Ministry of Environment and Tourism's departments and parastatals, namely National Parks and Wildlife Management, Natural Resources, and the Forestry Commission.

The ICP document contains a number of strategies based on a variety of land use options for agriculture, forestry, wildlife management and tourism; and promotes the formation of conservation committees. In its preamble, the ICP document contains some of the environmental-crisis rhetoric, imploring that 'appropriate strategies be adopted to combat desertification in all resettled areas' (Ministry of Environment and Tourism 2001:2). Activities in the plan include environmental awareness; capacity building; environmental monitoring; enforcement of environmental legislation; facilitation of production of land use plans; promotion of natural resources-based income-generating enterprises; and management of wildlife resources on all resettled farms. Most of the actions proposed in the plan actually reflect the enforcement of existing legislation and management practices. The thrust was to extend this mandate to cover the newly resettled areas, as Department of Natural Resources and Forestry Commission extension previously operated mainly in the communal areas.

Comments on the ICP document were generally favourable. Murombo (2002) described the ideals behind the ICP plan as noble and prudent and, at the theoretical level, the ICP as a well thought-out environmental management strategy. Nevertheless, some factors – which are prerequisites for sustainable land reform programmes including decentralisation, secure tenure, appropriate marketing support and valuation of natural resources – are not adequately addressed by the ICP document.

The ICP was launched in October 2001 and provincial task forces were established to take it forward to the districts. The district task forces initiated the formation of farm-level natural resources sub-committees in resettlement areas.

The provincial task forces were charged with designing provincial ICPs following the standards set out in the national ICP. The provincial plan was expected to cascade to all districts in the province, which were to produce their own district ICPs for the 'Fast Track'. However, at the time of writing, this had not yet happened, and no provincial, district or local-level ICPs had been produced. Nevertheless, implementation proceeded with awareness and training workshops to inform stakeholders; and the formation of farm-level natural resources conservation sub-committees. Limited state funds were available as no external support was provided either for the ICP or the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. The ICP was implemented as cheaply and as quickly as possible in a top-

down process, the flow of command being continuous downward to the farm-level, with the aim of ensuring compliance with recognised conservation practices. Indications are that impacts of Fast Track resettlement are greatly diverse and varied, being influenced by a complex web of environmental, historical, political and socio-economic variables. Box 1 describes local-level natural resource management in a resettlement area situated in a region of relatively high rainfall (750–1 000mm per annum), where there was no resettlement before the 'Fast Track'.

Newly settled farmers were generally receptive to conservation measures, especially in cases where sound environmental management has tangible economic benefits, such as the establishment of woodlots by tobacco farmers (Manjengwa 2004). Nevertheless, a natural resources officer expressed scepticism about settler attitudes:

They seem very receptive to what we say, but taking action is another thing! For example, they will say 'poaching is very bad' but check their granaries and they are full of biltong (dried game meat)! (Manjengwa 2004).

A unique feature of the ICP programme is the concept of community-level policing, provided by farm-level natural resources sub-committees. The ICP document contains a number of CBNRM management strategies. However, apart from technocratic environmental protection activities, in practice there is little evidence of focused CBNRM initiatives emanating from the ICP. Programmes such as CAMPFIRE (Communal Areas management Programme for Indigenous Resources) have been absent from resettled areas. Sector policies are being developed to address the impact of fast track land reform on wildlife and forest resources, which may provide opportunities for CBNRM. The

Box 1: Natural resource management in a resettlement scheme, Mazowe District

The resettlement scheme on Holland Farm is situated in an area with high agricultural potential, near Mvurwi in Mazowe District, Mashonaland Central Province. Part of the farm was allocated to 43 resettled farmers under the A1 villagisation model while the other part is allocated under the A2 model.

The settlers under the A1 model were each given five-hectare plots for ploughing, plus access to communal grazing areas and land for homesteads. The settlers were described by one of the settlers as a 'mixed bunch', consisting of subsistence farmers from adjacent communal areas who formed the majority; ex-farm workers from nearby commercial farms; ex-mine workers; people from nearby small towns; and a few professionals, including an ex-police officer and an army officer. Two of the settlers were war veterans. In this resettlement scheme ex-farm workers had formed a committee and had successfully lobbied to be resettled.

All resettled areas fall under a local chief, which in this case is Chief Makope who resides in nearby Cheweshe Communal Area. However, the majority of resettled farmers were not from his area. The resettlement is administered by a 'Committee of Seven', and operates within the traditional setup – the Chairman being similar to a village or kraal head who reports any complaints to the local headman of the area.

According to the settlers, Chief Makope regularly addressed the resettled farmers under his jurisdiction on his expectations of them regarding conservation matters. He asked them to refrain from such activities as starting veld fires, cutting down trees and hunting animals. Although the settlers came from various locations, the chief appealed to them to adopt and conform to the traditional way of life for the area and to conserve the natural resources. The response from the new farmers to the chief's appeal was generally positive and the settlers agreed to follow the instructions of the local headman, as well as government extension officials. The chief made follow up visits to the resettled area to check on progress and to see if instructions were being followed.

Under the Committee of Seven, a natural resources sub-committee was formed, tasked primarily with checking on environmental issues. For example, if someone cuts down trees, the committee reports it to the chairman of the Committee of Seven. If he cannot deal with the offence, he then refers it to the chief who has his 'policeman', that is an elder, who is empowered to arrest the culprit. If he fails to cope, he then refers the matter to the District Administrator. However, the settlers affirmed that so far 'nothing of that sort has happened'.

Besides restrictions on cutting down trees and starting veld fires, the natural resources sub-committee also ensures the construction of contour ridges, encourages settlers not to build or cultivate on river banks, and to plant trees. The Department of Natural Resources, the Forestry Commission and the Department of Agricultural Research and Extension (AREX) are active in the area and disseminate information through the natural resources sub-committee at meetings. These are usually held at an open-air venue at the chairman's homestead. Similarly to the meetings with the chief, at these awareness meetings the settlers are given information and instructions regarding conservation.

Source: Manjengwa 2004

wildlife and land reform policy promotes community involvement in wildlife ventures.

No official monitoring or evaluation has yet been done of the impact of implementation of the ICP. However, indications are that not much had been done as implementation was inhibited by lack of resources, especially transport. This is corroborated by Murombo (2002) who noted that implementation of the ICP was hamstrung by lack of finance, human resources and, consequently, poor enforcement and monitoring.

Although there was a fair amount of initial enthusiasm (Manjengwa 2004), it appears that the ICP has been largely forgotten and sidelined. Enquiries made in 2005 revealed that some provincial and district officers could not recall the ICP (personal observation, August 2005). The various departments under the Ministry of Environment and Tourism continue to enforce environmental legislation and carry out their mandate for natural resource management, now extended to include resettled areas, with the traditionally technocratic and top-down approach. Despite the rhetoric, environmental sustainability has not been mainstreamed in the land reform process. An illustration of this is that the Ministry of Lands and Agriculture-led teams undertaking the land audit exercise of 2005 did not include officials from the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and did not focus on environmental issues or compliance with the ICP.

Mozambique

Unlike most southern African countries, settler colonialism in Mozambique was effectively destroyed at independence in 1975 with the nationalisation of all land. Hanlon (2002) points out that because of this policy, Mozambique has avoided many of the present problems that Zimbabwe is experiencing in its land reform programme. State farms and collectives dominated agriculture, while the population was organised into communal villages and co-operatives, retaining their right to use land individually. Investment by the state to the communal sector was low as this traditional sector was considered to be self-sufficient (de Assulai 2004). On the other hand investments to state enterprises were high and their operational costs were high, although productivity was low (de Quadros 2002/3). Unlike Zimbabwe and other southern African

countries, land reform in Mozambique has centred on tenure reforms.

With the end of the armed conflict with Renamo [Resistencia Nacional Moçambicana], which had caused widespread insecurity in the rural areas and large numbers of displaced people, together with the introduction of an economic structural adjustment programme in the late 1980s, demand for land accelerated. A national land conference was held in 1992, organised by the Land Tenure Centre of Wisconsin under a USAID contract. The National Land Policy of 1995, and the 1997 Land Law were developed after a period of empirical research and consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. The Land Law in Mozambique is generally regarded as progressive and is viewed by groups as diverse as the World Bank and Oxfam as being one of the best on the continent, offering significant opportunities for poverty alleviation and stability in the rural areas (Hanlon 2002; Durang & Tanner 2004; Independent Land News Letter 2004). The Land Law retains the principle that land is the property of the state and cannot be sold or mortgaged. The Constitution recognises the right to land by direct users and producers. The Land Law aims at both protecting customary rights of existing occupiers on communal land, as well as strengthening the rights of private companies and individuals wishing to acquire access to land and natural resources for commercial purposes (Hanlon 2002; Lahiff 2003). Customary rights of access and management are equivalent to the state-allocated 'land use and benefit rights' (DUAT – a direito de uso e aproveitamento de terra). Enactment of the Land Law was followed by a comprehensive public awareness campaign, the Land Campaign (Campanha Terra) that aimed to help people understand their rights under the new law (Negrão 1999; Palmer 2004).

The land debate in Mozambique centres on productive use and ownership of land and the Land Law is seen as a positive step towards devolution of authority and autonomy to local holders of rights (Drimie & Mbaya 2001). The current debate on privatisation of land is being driven by various stakeholders, including some donors, who regard the Land Law as having no clear legal framework for the development of private property and a free market in land (Hanlon 2002; de Quadros 2002/3). This pressure for privatisation of land tends to

undermine the highly progressive Land Law (Palmer 2004). However, many stakeholders agree that it would be unnecessary to privatise land in Mozambique as there are many opportunities under the Land Law that prevent conflict and protect investors (Hanlon 2002; de Quadros 2002/3).

The land reform process has not fundamentally changed the highly unequal and dualistic nature of property relations in Mozambique. Further, it has not delivered significant benefits to the rural population and natural resources remain in the hands of elite groups (Lahiff 2003). Although the Land Law was hailed as offering significant opportunities for alleviating poverty because it guarantees customarily-acquired rights, as well as strengthening property rights for investors, in practice implementation has been problematic. Good quality land and valuable natural resources are in demand and there is conflict between the interests of communities and private enterprises (Hanlon 2002; de Quadros 2002/3; de Assulai 2004). Delimitation processes raised expectations within the communities, but all too often, delimitation brought few practical gains or tangible benefits and the majority of rural people still live in extreme poverty (Hanlon 2002; de Assulai 2004). High-value natural resources are often not included in the area to be delimited for the community, for example, in the case of the proposed delimitation of Chadzuca and Nhakwanika communities in Manica District, the state authorities refused to include the valuable IFLOMA [Manica Forestry Industries] plantation. The plantation will remain in the hands of a private investor, although it is an integral part of the land of these communities (Durang & Tanner 2004; Cossa pers. comm.[3]). In the case of Coutada (hunting area) 9 in Macossa District, Manica Province, the area has been zoned rather than delimited and the largest and most lucrative hunting area remains with the private safari operator, while the community will control a buffer zone next to their settlement (Durang & Tanner 2004; Cossa pers. comm.) Competition for land and natural resources between local people and outsiders remains a high profile issue, despite provisions in the land law and the land campaign (Durang & Tanner 2004). Under the Land Law, communities have to be consulted about potential private investment and be involved in negotiations. The law contains mechanisms to facilitate partnerships and negotiations between investors, local and foreign, and communities. In practice, consultations are inadequate, and the resulting partnerships are often inappropriate and unequal, with the community receiving few lasting benefits (Hanlon 2002; de Quadros 2002/3; Durang & Tanner 2004). Consultations are often done in a rushed manner and do not secure the best deal for the community, but rather facilitate the new private sector land rights (Independent Land News Letter 2004). Furthermore, communities that have been consulted and have come to agreements with investors are often not aware they are giving up the land permanently; and have little understanding of the value of what they are giving away (Hanlon 2002). Communities themselves recognise their vulnerability when negotiating with private investors and are doubtful that they will get a fair deal (Knight 2002). The process of delimitation raises awareness amongst communities and strengthens their rights, which tends to strengthen the partnership relations with investors making them more meaningful. Community participation has been assisted and facilitated by a number of national non-governmental organisations (NGOs) such as ORAM [Associaçao Rural da Ajuda Mutúa – Rural Association for Mutual Help] and Kwaedza Simukai Manica.

There is a power imbalance in private sector-community partnerships, with the government and communities exerting much less leverage than the private sector, and communities less than government. For example, in practice, the government gives higher priority to allocating forestry licenses and concessions as quickly as possible than on insisting on the details of community involvement (Wolmer & Ashley 2003; Mendonga, pers. comm.4). Millions of hectares have been conceded to individuals and entities to engage in a variety of agricultural, livestock, forestry and hunting activities without meaningfully consulting local communities (Kloeck-Jenson 1998). Substantial areas of land have been allocated to white Zimbabwean and South African farmers. For example, in 2001, ten Zimbabwean farmers were allocated 4 000 hectares of land in Manica Province (Moyo 2005b).

Although endowed with valuable natural resources there has been a long history of resource extraction by colonialists, rebel movements, the private sector, party officials and the state, which has resulted in very few benefits for the rural poor (Norfolk et al. 2001). Sustainable use of natural resources is one of the basic principles of the National Land Policy. The Ministry of Environmental Coordination (MICOA) has recently developed a number of environmental laws, including forest and wildlife laws and the new Territorial Planning Law, which impinge on the implementation of the Land Law. They follow the same principle – that natural resources are state property and that granting licences can be done after consultation the community. One of the principles defended in the new land, forestry and wildlife laws is the recognition of local communities' participation in sustainable use and management of natural resources thereby entrenching common property rights. As yet, there is a gap between these laws and application on the ground, as the pertinent regulations are still being developed (Chilundo & Cau 2000). Under the forest and wildlife laws, local resource management councils composed of representatives of the state, the communities, the private sector, associations and NGOs that work in community development are created which promote sustainable use and protection of the resources (de Quadros 2002/3). Communities retain traditional use rights for hunting, firewood, forest plants, water for cattle and small-scale irrigation, even when titles are issued to other users of the land. A key legal tenure change provided by Articles 10 and 12 of the Land Law is the requirement that communities participate in the administration of natural resources and the resolution of conflicts. Under the Land Law, when a community becomes formally 'delimited', a natural resources committee is set up which is responsible for developing a natural resources management plan. Box 2 describes NRM in a delimited area with abundant forest resources. Indications are that state authorities, particularly those responsible for forest and wildlife, have a lot of influence over these natural resource committees.

The Land Law facilitates community management of natural resources and the delimited community can adopt various ways of organisation such as associations and co-operatives to respond to the specific situation. There are more than 58 CBNRM management interventions, many of which have a land rights component (de Quadros 2002/3). But most of the CBNRM initiatives in Mozambique rely on external resources and tend to be donor-driven. For example, the work of ORAM in Manica Province is funded by Christian Aid, Ford Foundation, Kellogg Foundation and Norwegian People's Aid, amongst others (Cossa pers. comm.) Through its food security programme in Manica, the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) has facilitated community participation in the zoning exercise of Coutada 9 that enables the community to receive some benefits from sport hunting. The sustainability of such externally-driven processes is questionable and often the initiatives fail to empower the local population (Pijnenburg 1999; de Quadros 2002/3; SLSA Team 2003).

If implemented successfully, land reform in Mozambique under the progressive Land Law has a good chance of securing tenure rights for communal people as well as strengthening property rights for investors, thereby encouraging private investment. However, in practice the private investors are benefiting most and continue to capture the best land and valuable resources with little or no return to the communities who hold nominal use rights over these resources. Land reform – through its requirement of community-level NRM plans and the formation of NRM committees – has theoretically placed communities at the centre of natural resource management; and allows natural resource use by communities. However, in practice, conflicts over valuable natural resources remain unresolved and there is insufficient monitoring of natural resource exploitation. The process of consultation during the Land Campaign, delimitation processes and subsequent negotiations with private investors are lengthy and costly – and rely on external resources and are organised primarily by NGOs (SLSA Team 2003, Independent Land Newsletter 2004). Although there are cases of positive developments that can offer lessons for other countries in the region, the land question in Mozambique continues to be shaped by a history of dispossession, exclusion and exploitation; and so shares much with neighbouring Zimbabwe and South Africa (Lahiff 2003, Independent Land News Letter 2004).

South Africa

Access to land in South Africa has been based on race for generations. This emanates from colonialism and was entrenched by the passing of the 1913 Native Land Act and subsequent legislation and practices. As a result, land ownership in South Africa is racially skewed with over 13 million people crowded into areas where rights to land are unclear and contested; and where land administration is in disarray (DFID 2002). Land was the key aspect of the negotiated settlement that made way for democracy in 1994. Deriving from mandates of the Freedom Charter and the Constitution, South Africa embarked on a land reform programme as the driving force for its broader national reconstruction and rural development programme. The policy framework for land reform has three major elements, namely land redistribution, land restitution, and land tenure reform. Redistribution aims to provide the disadvantaged and poor, including labour tenants, farm workers and new entrants to agriculture with access to land for residential and productive purposes (DLA 1997). Land restitution covers cases of forced removals which took place after 1913, while land tenure reform aims to improve tenure security for all and to accommodate diverse forms of land tenure, including types of communal tenure (DLA 1997).

The land reform process in South Africa is a complex and difficult process (Pearce 1996). The scale for redistribution is ten times that in Zimbabwe and was predicted to be both very expensive and administratively unrealistic (see Murray & Williams 1994). The three components of the land reform programme, with different objectives which may be unrelated, have largely been implemented in isolation from each other and are poorly integrated (Williams 1995; Lahiff 2003).

South Africa's land reform is based on a World Bank model and redistribution of land is market-assisted, based on buying land with the help of settlement and land acquisition grants from the government. The concept of 'willing buyer, willing seller' has dominated the discourse on land reform in South Africa, but as Lahiff (2005) points out, unlike in Zimbabwe where the willing buyer is the state, in South Africa the buyers are the historically disadvantaged landless people. Buyers have to negotiate with the sellers on an agreed price at the land's full market value. The sellers are free to sell to the highest bidder of their choice. Since government grants have to be matched financially by new farmers, the poor tend to be excluded in the redistribution process, and elite well-off farmers have benefited (Benjaminsen et al. 2005). Therefore, there is no guarantee that the landless will acquire the required land.

The redistribution programme based on the market-led agrarian reform model has failed to date to address the injustices of apartheid (Fortin 2005). Lahiff (2005) suggests that this effective veto over land reform can be overcome by such means as selective expropriations in areas where sufficient land is not coming onto the market, or where excessive prices are demanded. Such expropriations, with just and equitable compensation, are provided for in the Constitution, which places clear responsibility on the state to bring about land reform (Lahiff 2005). On this basis, the Land Summit of July 2005 acknowledged the failures of the land markets and limitations of the 'willing buyer, willing seller' practice, recommending that the state actively intervene in the land market (MALA 2005). It was also recommended that the principles underlying the approach should include the decentralisation of the land reform process, through participatory and people-centred methods that are area-based and planned to integrate land and agrarian transformation into wider development priorities.5

The land reform process in South Africa, although seemingly radical, comprehensive and ambitious, has been relatively slow and has failed to meet expectations (Lahiff 2003; Ngqangweni 2004). The collective aim of land reform is to ensure the transfer of 30% of all agricultural land by 2014 (MALA 2005). However, experience over the last 11 years demonstrates that the market on its own is unable to effectively alter the pattern of ownership in favour of equity for the targeted beneficiaries of land reform, as the pace of redistribution has been insufficient to realise the 2014 objective. By 1999 about 35 000 households had acquired rural land in former white commercial farming areas by means of government subsidies (Adams et al. 1999). By 2005, only 3.1 million hectares, about 3% of white-owned farmland, had been redistributed, of which 2.1 million hectares is for agricultural purposes (MALA 2005).

Box 2: Natural resource management in Pindanyanga delimited community

Pindanyanga, in Gondola District, Manica Province is a forested area, rich in valuable hardwood species. The main livelihood strategy is making charcoal and, consequently, the area is susceptible to deforestation due to unsustainable use of timber. The Pindanyanga community began the process of delimitation in 1999 with assistance from GTZ, FAO, the Netherlands and the provincial service for forests and wildlife (SPFFB – Servico Provincial de Florista na Fauna Bravo). They obtained their community certificate in November 2002 for a delimited area of 31 000 hectares. A natural resources committee was formed consisting of between 12 and 16 representatives from each fumo (village), including traditional leaders. In Pindanyanga, committee members were originally elected for five years. However, this time period was reduced to three years for the second committee. People from the first committee were invited to teach the new members their roles, thereby ensuring continuity. Meetings are held to inform the community to discuss problems and the committee also liases with the SPFFB.

A land use management plan (plano du usar terra) was developed which divides the delimited area into zones: forests, grazing, residential, agricultural and land reserved for future use. For the forest zone a management, a plan was developed which includes an inventory of numbers and species of trees. In order to ensure sustainability, the community was given a timber quota, the number of bags of charcoal that could be produced on a sustainable basis was calculated and a fixed amount of cubic metres of timber extraction allowed. However, currently, there is need for revision and another inventory to see if the quota is still sustainable. Copies of the natural resource management plans are kept by SPFFB in Chimoio and at the community centre.

The SPFFB issues licences for timber extraction and once the community is delimited, 20% of the license fee goes to the community. This is an important incentive for the community to undergo the delimitation process and conserve the forest resources. In Pindayanga, contracts were signed in 2003 between the community and two logging companies, Inchope Madeira and Lorena Lda, to harvest timber. The community also harvests timber and, because they are well organised, SPFFB gave them a licence for which they were allowed to pay for after sale of the timber.

Pindayanga community have obtained significant benefits from the forest resources in their area. They have opened their own bank account and fund their own activities. Money from timber sales has been used to build a clinic, improve a primary school, and build an inspection post (posto defiscalizasão). The inspection post allows checking the buyers and serves as a way of monitoring what is sold and what timber is taken out of the area. SPFFB monitors and supervises timber exploitation. The community is able to control use of natural resources and can determine which private companies are given licences to extract timber. The timber is transported to Maputo in log form and the community does no value addition. Attempts at furniture production proved unsuccessful because of the low quality. A sawmill is planned for the area, which will produce planks.

The delimitation process made the community aware of their rights under the land and forest laws and the certificate put them in a more powerful negotiating position with potential investors. However, the Pindanyanga community was poorly organised and divided due to political polarisation within the community between supporters of the major political parties who are reluctant to work together. Furthermore, the community has been mainly involved in prescriptive conservation measures such as refraining from burning grasses, cutting trees haphazardly, and killing animals. Nevertheless, Pindanyanga has potential for ensuring sustainable use of natural resources and providing tangible community benefits. It serves as a model for other community delimitations.

Source: Knight 2002; Durang & Tanner 2004; personal observation, November 2005

The Restitution of Land Rights Act ('Restitution Act') was the first law to be passed after the first democratic elections in 1994 and the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights was established in 1995. By the deadline of December 1998, 63 455 claims had been lodged, many of which were for urban land. By mid-2005, nearly 900 000 people had benefited from restitution, although most of these were cash compensation rather than transfer of rural land (MALA 2005). As such, restitution has made limited contribution to the overall vision of land reform (Hall 2005). Most of the outstanding claims are now large rural claims and the challenge is to transfer high quality land in ways that can genuinely empower claimants (Hall 2005).

In South Africa there is a growing sense of frustration amongst the would-be beneficiaries of the land reform programme, manifested by the emergence of the militant Landless People's Movement that threatened to forcibly occupy white-owned commercial farms (Independent Land Newsletter 2004). Furthermore, a recent amendment to the Restitution Act empowers the Minister to expropriate, without a court order, commercial farms required for restitution purposes if negotiation with a commercial farmer fails. Land invasions have occurred in South Africa, mainly in urban areas. However, in some

rural areas invasions have occurred such as in Dwesa-Cwebe, Mkambati on the Wild Coast and the Mudimbo corridor along the Limpopo River. Most of these cases involve restitution claims (Cousins 2000).

A functioning system to manage and protect communal land rights has not yet been developed (Hall 2005). The Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act of 1996, a holding measure until an Act on communal land rights was passed, protected the interests of people who have informal rights to land while investigations were in progress. The Communal Land Rights Act, passed in 2004, is yet to be implemented. It is controversial in that it lacks democratic guarantees, since traditional councils will constitute the land administration bodies, and the legislation will be extremely difficult and expensive to implement at scale (Hall 2005).

Redistribution in South Africa includes a large commonage programme and innovations such as equity share schemes and the establishment of legal entities for group ownership (Cousins 2000). The Communal Property Associations Act of 1996 provides a legal mechanism for communities to collectively access land reform grants and enables community management of natural resources. However, the newly formed legal entities, which require written constitutions, are likely to be problematic because of stringent administrative conditions such as the need for annual audited accounts.

The land reform process has failed to link with poverty alleviation and has not transformed land holdings or revitalised the rural economy (Drimie & Mbaya 2001). The most serious poverty occurs in former 'homelands' where 30% of the population live. Land reform processes lack local-level engagement and so far have made little difference to the lives of the majority of rural South Africans (Kepe & Cousins 2002; Lahiff 2003). In theory, significant emphasis is placed on land reform, but this is not adequately matched by budgets and institutional capacity (Benjaminsen et al. 2005).

Environmental sustainability is one of the principles of South Africa's land reform policy. The White Paper on South African Land Rights promotes a system of land management that will support sustainable land use patterns and ensure that land reform contributes to equitable and sustainable growth and development (DLA

1997). Similar to the Zimbabwean policy rhetoric, the White Paper states that one of the challenges of land reform is to relieve land pressure without extending environmental degradation over a wider area (DLA 1997; Ministry of Environment and Tourism 2001). The departments of Agriculture and Land Affairs are implementing the Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development (LRAD) programme jointly, and although one of its objectives is to promote environmental sustainability of land and other natural resources, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism is not directly involved (MALA 2000). According to guidelines in the policy framework, in order to access grants under the land redistribution programme, intended beneficiaries are required to develop project proposals and a feasibility study, which include an environmental assessment. The environmental assessment consists of technical opinions of local agricultural officers on the feasibility of the agricultural and environmental issues of the proposed plan. Environmental guidelines apply to all projects under land reform. Project designs which may have environmental implications, such as in the case of introduction of irrigation, are required to undergo environmental assessment plan screening according to the National Guidelines (MALA 2000).

Despite the inclusion of environmental guidelines within the policy framework, in practice there is not an overall environmental dimension in the implementation of the South African land reform programme. The majority of activities and projects on resettled areas focus exclusively on agricultural and small businesses. Since responsibility for natural resource management is spread over different national and provincial ministries, the institutional framework has generally failed to integrate approaches to land use – and natural resource management remains sectoral and fragmented (DLA 1997).

Some of the restitution cases of land reform have resulted in CBNRM projects that have an explicit environmental focus, such as restitution claims in protected areas. For example, parks such as Mkhambati and Dwesa-Cwebe in the Eastern Cape, and Makuleke in Limpopo province, have been nominally returned to communities, but continue to operate as conservation areas (See Box 3). In these cases, environmental protection,

rather than agriculture, has been the dominant concern. Overall, there is little evidence as yet that land reform in South Africa has had any significant impact on environmental degradation.

Box 3: Natural resource management in the Makuleke protected area restitution case

The Makuleke land claim has its roots in the 1969 forced removal of approximately 12 000 clan members from some 24 000 hectares of land known as the Pafuri Triangle. This is an area of high biodiversity, which became incorporated into Kruger National Park. Under the restitution law negotiations took place and the Makuleke were recognised as the owners of Pafuri. They agreed to use the land for conservation purposes, subjecting conservation and land management decisions to a Joint Management Board, consisting of themselves and the National Parks Board. The Board aims to create a harmonious and productive conservation and development relationship between the park and the community. The Makuleke community have exclusive commercial rights over the area and since their interests are now bound up with those of conservation and maintenance of biodiversity, they have launched several conservation initiatives, including an intensive conservation-training programme that integrates modern approaches with traditional knowledge.

In 2003 the Makuleke community received the equivalent of US$450 000 in compensation from the South African government, which members decided to use to electrify their villages. They have a partnership with a hotel group which runs a lodge in the protected area. The community receives 10% of the revenue generated. The income generated from the lodge has been used to build a multipurpose tourism centre in one of the villages.

The Makuleke case has become a model for other restitution cases in protected areas in South Africa. Nevertheless, although it involves some community participation, it remains basically a 'fortress' approach to natural resource management in that the claimants do not have any choice in the land uses of their land which has been nominally restored to them.
Source: Rihoy 1998; Koro 2005

Conclusion

Colonialism in southern Africa institutionalised dualism in both agriculture and natural resource management, resulting in different approaches for commercial and subsistence farming areas. Although sharing similar histories of land alienation, countries in southern Africa are currently experiencing diverse land reform processes, determined by an intricate web of interrelated environmental, historical, political, economic and social factors. Despite the Zimbabwe land crisis, there is little evidence yet of progress in land reform in the region. There is a wide gap between public statements of politicians about land reform and the capacity of governments to deliver (Drimie & Mbaya 2001). While government-led land reform is vulnerable to manipulation and inappropriate selection of beneficiaries, market-based mechanisms for land reform have been criticised in that the poor face enormous difficulties in accessing land through the market. Markets do not address structural inequalities in land ownership and therefore do not necessarily help level the playing field between smallholders and agribusiness (DFID 2002).

On the whole, environmental concerns figure very little in land reform processes in southern African countries. Generally, environmental policy is incorporated to some extent into the rhetoric of land reform policies, but implementation has proved to be weak. This gap between policy and practice can be attributed to several factors. Environmental issues are not mainstreamed into implementation of the land reform process and environmental concerns remain add-on extras. Fragmented, sectoral approaches to the natural resource management prevail where conservation is relegated to environmental agencies without functional involvement of other sectors, particularly agriculture, lands and rural development. Despite the rhetoric, this is often lip service and environmental agencies are inadequately resourced and understaffed.

Environment is normally a low priority for governments. There is lack of political will and real commitment to provide resources and support to enable effective environmental management on the ground. Environmental policy and legislative frameworks are in place, but there are insufficient resources, including human, financial, and material, to implement and monitor. Nevertheless, there have been a few positive experiences where land reform processes have provided opportunities for increased community environmental awareness and involvement in managing natural resources. Overall, dominant environmental paradigms of top-down, technocratic natural resource management influence the policy process. Inclusion of environmental aspects into land reform processes in most cases is in response to perceived environmental degradation, rather than opportunities for sustainable use of natural resources. Natural resource management tends to be an extension of implementing existing technocratic, prescriptive environmental legislation in newly resettled and delimited areas.

Effective environmental management driven by local initiative and participation should provide the key to reducing rural poverty, as well as conserving the natural resource base. The active involvement of local people in the process is therefore perceived as being a prerequisite for sustainable land reform. Some land reform processes do include opportunities for CBNRM, but more as a sideline (often externally-driven) than as an integral part of the national process. Local or farm-level natural resource management committees have the potential to ensure environmental sustainability in land reform programmes. A conducive policy environment, where land rights are clear and tenure secure – and where land administration is democratic and efficient – is needed to enable meaningful participation and commitment to natural resources management by the beneficiaries of land reform.

Endnotes

1 Total commercial farming area.
2 Under the Fast Track Land Reform Programme there were two resettlement models, A1 and A2. The A1 villagised self-contained settlement scheme targeted landless peasants in the overcrowded communal areas. The A2 commercial farm settlement scheme aimed at increasing the participation of black indigenous farmers in commercial farming through the provision of easier access to land and infrastructure on a full cost recovery basis. In addition, other farmers settled informally or illegally.
3 Felix Cossa, ORAM [Associaçao Rural da Ajuda Mutúa – Rural Association for Mutual Help], Chimoio, 9 November 2005.
4 Ormando Mendonga, ORAM, Chimoio, 9 November 2005.
5 Draft recommendation on the principle of 'willing-buyer, willing-seller' and government's approach to land reform', Land Summit, July 2005, South Africa.

References

Adams, M. 1993. Options for land reform in Namibia. Land Use Policy, 10(3):191–6.

Adams, M, Sibanda, S & Turner, S. 1999. *Land tenure reform and rural livelihoods in southern Africa*. London: Overseas Development Institute. (Natural resource perspectives; no. 39.)

Adams, M. 2000. *Land reform in Namibia*. Unpublished paper.

Benjaminsen, TA, Rohde, R, Sjaastad, E, Wisborg, P & Lebert, T. Forthcoming 2005. *Land reform, range ecology and carrying capacity in Namaqualand, South Africa*.

Bourlière, F (ed). 1983. *Ecosystems of the world 13: Tropical savannas.* Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.

Chaumba, J, Scoones, I & Wolmer, W. 2003. *From Jambanja to planning: The reassertion of technocracy in land reform in south-eastern Zimbabwe*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex. (Sustainable livelihoods in southern Africa; research paper; no. 2.)

Chenje, M, Sola, L & Paleczny, D (eds). 1998. *The state of Zimbabwe's environment 1998 report.* Harare: Ministry of Environment and Tourism.

Chilundo, AG & Cau, BM. 2000. *Traditional forms of common property rights: A case study in southern Mozambique*. Presented at 'Constituting the commons: Crafting sustainable commons in the new millennium', the Eighth Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property, Bloomington, Indiana, 31 May–4 June.

Cliffe, L. 1988. The conservation issue in Zimbabwe. *Review of African Political Economy*, 42:48–58.

Cousins, B. 2000. *Why land invasions will happen here too*. (www.oxfam.ofg.uk/landrights/SAZiminv.rtf).

Cousins, B. 2002. *Reforming communal land tenure in South Africa: Why land titling is not the answer*. Unpublished document for the Department of Land Affairs.

Dahlberg, A. 1994. *Contesting views and changing paradigms: The land degradation debate in southern Africa.* Uppsala, Sweden: Nordiska Afrikainstitut. (Discussion paper; no. 6.)

de Assulai, JP. 2004. Land legal reform process in Mozambique, in *Land reform and tenure in southern Africa: Current practices, alternatives and prospects*, edited by M Munyuki-Hungwe. Harare: University of Zimbabwe Documentation Unit.

de Quadros, MC. 2002/3. *Current land policy issues in Mozambique*. Report by the legal advisor to the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. Maputo:, Eduardo Mondalane University Law School.

Deininger, K, van der Brink, R, Hoogeveen, H & Moyo, S. 2000. *How land reform can contribute to economic growth and poverty reduction: Empirical evidence from international and Zimbabwean experience*. World Bank, Free University Amsterdam and Southern African Regional Institute for Policy Studies.

DFID (UK Department for International Development). 1999. *Zimbabwe: Country strategy paper, April 1999*. London: DFID.

DFID (UK Department for International Development). 2002. *Better livelihoods for poor people: The role of land policy, November 2002*. Consultation draft document. London: DFID Policy Division.

DLA (Department of Land Affairs [South Africa]). 1997. *White Paper on South African Land Policy*. Pretoria: DLA.

Drimie, S & Mbaya, S. 2001. *Land reform and poverty alleviation in southern Africa: Towards greater impact*. Conference report and analysis, Conference on land reform and poverty alleviation in southern Africa, Pretoria, 4–5 June.

Drinkwater, MJ. 1991 *The state and agrarian change in Zimbabwe's communal areas: An application of critical theory.* London: Macmillan.

Durang, T & Tanner, C. 2004. *Access to land and other natural resources for local*

communities in Mozambique: Current examples from Manica Province. Paper presented to the Green Agri Net Conference on 'Land Registration in Practice', Denmark, 1–2 April.

Elliot, JA. 2000. Resource implications of land resettlement in Zimbabwe: Insights from woodland changes, in *Land reform in Zimbabwe: Constraints and prospects*, edited by TAS Bowyer-Bower and C Stoneman. London: Ashgate.

Fortin, E. 2005. Reforming land rights: The World Bank and the globalisation of agriculture. *Social and Legal Studies*, 14(2).

Government of Zimbabwe. 1992. *Government of Zimbabwe national report to the UNCED [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development], June 1992, Brazil*. Harare.

Government of Zimbabwe. 2001. *Land Reform Resettlement Programme and Implementation Plan – Phase Two, February 2001*. Harare: Ministry of Lands, Agriculture and Rural Resettlement.

Government of Zimbabwe. 2003. *The Utete Committee Report on Agrarian Reform*. Harare.

Government of Zimbabwe. Undated. *Inception Phase Framework Plan, 1999–2000: An Implementation Plan of the Land Reform and Resettlement Programme – Phase II*. Report prepared by the Technical Committee of the Inter-Ministerial Committee on Resettlement and Rural Development and National Economic Consultative Forum Land Reform Task Force, Harare.

Hall, R. 2005. *Where are we? Where to from where? Towards an agenda for policy debate*. Presentation to the National Land Summit, Johannesburg, 27 July 2005.

Hanlon, J. 2002. *The land debate in Mozambique: Will foreign investors, the urban elite, advanced peasants or family farmers drive rural development?* Research paper commissioned for Oxfam.

Independent Land Newsletter. 2004. *Land reform highlights in southern Africa 2003–4*, June.

Jones, B. 2002. *Sustainable use of natural resources in an era of land reform and change in southern Africa: A Namibian case study*. Paper prepared for the Southern African Sustainable Use Specialist Group, May 2000.

Keeley, J & Scoones, I. 2003. *Understanding environmental policy processes: Cases from Africa*. London: Earthscan.

Kepe, T & Cousins, B. 2002. *Radical land reform is key to sustainable rural development in South Africa.* Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. (Policy brief; no. 3.)

Kinsey, BH & Binswanger, HP. 1993. Characteristics and performance of resettlement programmes: A review. *World Development,* 21:1477–94.

Kinsey, BH. 2000. The implication of land reform for rural welfare, in *Land reform in Zimbabwe: Constraints and prospects*, edited by TAS Bowyer-Bower and C Stoneman. London: Ashgate.

Kirby, J & Moyo, S. 2001. Environmental security, livelihoods and entitlements, in *Negotiating poverty: New directions*, edited by N Middleton, P O'Keefe and R Visser. London: Pluto Press.

Kloeck-Jenson, S. 1998. *Land tenure, rural livelihoods, and democracy in rural Mozambique: Options for a harmonized Oxfam strategy*. Maputo: Land Tenure Centre Project, Mozambique, April 20.

Knight, R. 2002. *Camponeses' realities: Their experiences and perceptions of the 1997 Land Law*. Unpublished document.

Koro, E. 2005. New development model spurs growth in South African rural community. *WRI Features,* 3(2).

Lahiff, E. 2003. Land and livelihoods: The politics of land reform in southern Africa. *IDS Bulletin,* 34(3).

Lahiff, E. 2005. *From 'willing seller, willing-buyer' to a people-driven land reform*. Cape Town: Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. (Policy brief; no. 17.)

MALA (Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs [South Africa]). 2000. *Land Redistribution for Agricultural Development: A sub-programme of the Land Redistribution Programme*, *final document (Version 3).* Pretoria: MALA.

MALA (Ministry of Agriculture and Land Affairs [South Africa]). 2005, *Land Summit, 27–31 July*. Pretoria: MALA.

Manjengwa, JM. 2004. *Local environmental action planning in Zimbabwe: An analysis of its contribution to sustainable development*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Institute for Development Policy and Management, Faculty of Social Sciences and Law, University of Manchester.

Ministry of Environment and Tourism [Zimbabwe]. 2001. *Integrated conservation plan for the fast track resettlement land reform programme.* Harare.

Mohamed, N. 2000. Greening land and agrarian reform: A case for sustainable agriculture, in *At the crossroads: Land and agrarian reform in South Africa into the 21ˢᵗ century*, edited by B Cousins. Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of Western Cape and National Land Committee.

Moyo, S, Robinson, P, Katerere, Y, Stevenson, S & Gumbo, D. 1991. *Zimbabwe's environmental dilemma: Balancing resource inequities.* Harare: ZERO (Zimbabwe Environment Research Organization).

Moyo, S, O'Keefe, P & Sill, M. 1993. *The southern African environment: Profiles of the SADC countries.* London: Earthscan.

Moyo, S. 2000. *Neo-liberal policy perspectives, the major constraint to land redistribution programmes.* Harare: Southern African Regional Institute for Policy Studies (SARIPS).

Moyo, S. 2005a. The politics of land distribution and race relations in southern Africa, in *Racism and public policy*, edited by Y Bangura and R Stavenhagen. New York: Pallgrave Press.

Moyo, S. 2005b. *Land question and land reform in southern Africa*. Paper presented at the Land Summit, 28 July–1 August 2005, Johannesburg.

Murombo, T. 2002. *Community based natural resource management and community based property rights in land reform: Zimbabwe's case*. Paper presented at the IASCP (International Association for the Study of Common Property) Ninth Biennial Conference, June, Victoria Falls.

Murphree, M & Mazambani, D. 2002. *Policy implications of common pool resource knowledge: A background paper for Zimbabwe*. Unpublished paper for the 'Policy implications of common pool resource knowledge in India, Tanzania and Zimbabwe' project.

Murphree, MW. 2004. Land reform debate wrap up. *Commons Southern Africa,* 2, November.

Murray, C & Williams, G (eds). 1994. Land and freedom in South Africa. Special issue of *Review of African Politics Economy*, 21(61), September.

Mutepfa, F & Cohen, T (eds). 2000. *Reflections on the land reform and resettlement programme – Phase II.* The Environmental Liaison Forum Land Working Group, Harare.

Negrão, J. 1999. *The Mozambique land campaign, 1997–1999*. Paper presented at Workshop on the Associative Movement, 14 December, Maputo.

Ngqangweni, SS. 2004. Land reform and related issues in South Africa, in *Land reform and tenure in southern Africa: Current practices, alternatives and prospects*, edited by M Munyuki-Hungwe. University of Zimbabwe Documentation Unit.

Nhira, C, Baker, S, Gondo, P, Mangono, JJ & Marunda, C. 1998. *Contesting inequality in access to forests*. Harare/ London: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe; Forestry Commission, Zimbabwe and International Institute for Environment and Development. (Policy that works for people series; no. 5)

Norfolk, S, Nhantumbo, I, Pereira, J & Z Matsimbe. 2001. *Mapping policy, institutions and livelihoods in Zambezia Province, Mozambique.* Brighton: Institute for Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Palmer, R. 2004. *Oxfam and land in post-conflict situations in Africa: Examples from Zimbabwe, Mozambique, South Africa, Rwanda and Angola*. Paper for the Conference on Land Tenure and Conflict in Africa: Prevention, Mitigation and Reconstruction, 9–10 December, Nairobi.

Pankhurst, D. Undated. *Unravelling the myths: land tenure, agriculture and land reform in independent Namibia*. Presentation to the Seminar on Land Tenure and Tenurial Reform in Africa, London School of Economics.

Pearce, B. 1996. *A critical assessment of land reform in South Africa 1994–1996*. Southern and Eastern African Regional Conference on Experiences, Perspectives and Strategies on Land Reform and Land Rights in Rural and Urban Settings, Johannesburg, June.

Pijnenburg, B. 1999. *A critical evaluation of CBNRM projects*. Paper presented at the Workshop on Integrated Analysis and Management of Renewable Natural resources in Mozambique. Maputo, 7–11 June.

Rihoy, L. 1998. *Natural resource tenure in Southern Africa: An overview of key issues and policy options for communal areas in southern Africa*. Unpublished paper.

Rugube, L, Zhou, S, Roth, M & Chambati, W. 2003. Government-assisted and market-driven land reform, in *Delivering land and securing rural livelihoods: Post-independence land reform and resettlement in Zimbabwe*, edited by M Roth and F Gonese. Harare: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe and Land Tenure Centre, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Scoones, I. 1992. Land degradation and livestock production in Zimbabwe's communal areas, *Land Degradation and Rehabilitation*, 3:99–113.

Scoones, I. 1996. Range management, science and policy: Politics, polemics and pasture in southern Africa, in *The lie of the land: Challenging received wisdom on the African environment* edited by M Leach and R Mearns. Oxford: James Currey.

Simon, D. 1995 *Land, environment and development in post independence Namibia*. Unpublished document.

SLSA (Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa) Team. 2003. Decentralisations in practice in Southern Africa. *IDS Bulletin*, (34)3.

Stocking, M & Garland, G. 1995. Land degradation and soil conservation: Policy issues for a democratic South Africa, *Journal of Development Alternatives, Africanus*, (25)1.

Stocking, M. 1996. Soil erosion: Breaking new ground, in *The lie of the land: Challenging received wisdom on the African environment* edited by M Leach and R Mearns. Oxford: James Currey.

Sukume, C. 2004. *Zimbabwe's 1980–2003 land reforms: Lessons for southern Africa*. Harare/ Cape Town: Centre for Applied Social Sciences, University of Zimbabwe/ Programme for Land and Agrarian Studies, University of the Western Cape. (Discussion paper; no. 1.)

Vivian, J. 1994. NGOs and sustainable development in Zimbabwe: No magic bullets. *Development and Change*, 25.

Wekwete, KH.1991. The rural resettlement program in post-independent Zimbabwe, in *Rural development and planning in Zimbabwe*, edited by ND Mutizwa-Mangiza and AHJ Helmsing. Aldershot: Gower Publishing.

Williams, G. 1995. *Land reform: What is it for?* Presentation to the Workshop on Land Reform in the Western Cape, University of Stellenbosch Department of Sociology.

Wolmer, W & Ashley, C. 2003. Wild resources management in southern Africa: Participation, partnerships, ecoregions and redistribution. *IDS Bulletin*, 34(3).