

# LAND, AGRARIAN REFORM IN ZIMBABWE VIEWED FROM A TRANSFORMATIVE SOCIAL POLICY PERSPECTIVE

**Freedom Mazwi**

Sam Moyo African Institute for Agrarian  
Studies (SMAIAS), Zimbabwe  
fmazwi@gmail.com

**Rangarirai Gavin Muchetu**

Graduate School of Global Studies  
Doshisha University, Japan  
gavinmuchetu@gmail.com

**Musavengana Chibwana**

Department of Development Studies  
University of South Africa, South Africa  
musa.chibwana@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

Much of the scholarly work on Zimbabwe's land and agrarian reform has largely been premised on the "livelihoods", "political economy" and the "neo-patrimonial" approaches; much to the neglect of other frameworks. This article attempts to analyse Zimbabwe's post-2000 land reform experience from a transformative social policy perspective, utilising empirical data obtained from the 2013/14 Sam Moyo African Institute for Agrarian Studies' six-district-baseline survey. The article argues that although the Fast Track Land Reform Programme has met the redistributive element of the transformative social policy agenda, the productive, protection and social cohesion potentials of the programme are still to reach their maximum potential due to a number of factors. Although a fraction of surveyed households is accumulating, the majority of the peasantry is shown to be struggling due to fundamental, domestic macro-economic challenges; constrained capacity of the state and external factors such as international isolation, which the country continues to face. Primary data utilised for this article was collected by distributing questionnaires in 1090 households in the districts of Chipinge, Chiredzi, Goromonzi, Kwekwe, Mangwe and Zvimba, which represent the country's five agro-ecological zones. The data utilised was also collected from all the three settlement models (A1, A2 and Communal Areas).

**Keywords:** Fast Track Land Resettlement Programme; production; protection; social cohesion; social policy; social reproduction



Africanus Journal of Development Studies  
<https://upjournals.co.za/index.php/Africanus/index>  
Volume 47 | Number 1 | 2017 | #2168 | 17 pages

<https://doi.org/10.25159/0304-615X/2168>  
ISSN 0304-615X (Print)  
© Unisa Press 2017

## INTRODUCTION

Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP), which began with the occupation of white commercial lands in 2000 was radical in nature and challenged prevailing wisdom that the transfer of land could only be done under a free-market system (Moyo and Chambati 2013,1; Moyo, Chambati, Mazwi and Muchetu, upcoming). By 2010, land had been redistributed to over 150 000 urbanites, farm workers, Communal Area peasants and civil servants under the A1<sup>1</sup> smaller-sized model scheme; while an additional 20 000 beneficiaries were allocated middle-sized A2 farms (Moyo 2013, 39). This redistributive character of the land reform contradicts "land grabs", which have been spreading in many parts of Africa over the past two decades, and represents one of the biggest land reforms in the post-cold war (ibid). Studies on Zimbabwe's radical land reforms have mainly been approached from the "livelihoods", political economy and neo-patrimonial frameworks, much to the neglect of a social transformative social policy perspective (Chibwana 2016).

While Gumede (2014, 51) underscores the importance of land reform in developing countries, Moyo and Chambati (2013, 5) further argue that a fundamental change in agrarian relations (role of the peasantry, state, agri-business and merchant companies) should be prioritised for the peasantry to derive maximum benefits from agricultural production. For this to occur, we posit that the state has to play a proactive role in the formulation of policies and financing of the agricultural sector with the active engagement of the private sector. As the neo-liberal ideology of free-markets continue to drive the majority of the world's population into poverty and unemployment (see Gumede 2015; Amin 2012) the transformative social policy agenda has been elusive (Adesina 2011, 454). Latin American countries, which seemed to have adopted policies with strong elements of transformative social policies such as Brazil, Venezuela and Argentina have floundered of late, and are riddled with social unrest.

The article argues that when viewed from a transformative social policy perspective, the FTLRP has achieved the redistributive element of the social policy agenda, while other components of the transformative social policy; such as production, protection and social cohesion are yet to be adequately addressed, due to the capitalist relations prevailing in Zimbabwe, coupled with isolation of the country by Bretton Woods Institutions for about two decades. All these factors limit the production and accumulation potential of peasant farmers. Studies by Moyo (2005, 2007, 2009, 2011); Scoones, Mavedzenge, Murimbarimba and Sukume (2010); Murisa (2009) and Chiweshe (2014), although utilising different frameworks, did not address FTLRP outcomes from a social policy perspective. Although the FTLRP was conceived and implemented without the specific objective of addressing transformative social policy objectives, this study reveals

---

1 A1 was meant for poor resourced families who were provided with permits, land for cropping and shared grazing land while the A2 scheme was meant for resourceful farmers meant to produce on a commercial basis under long lease agreements.

that the majority of the households are engaged in production for auto-consumption, while a few households have been able to accumulate from incomes obtained through agriculture. The FTLRP provided opportunities for the beneficiaries to enhance their productive capacity, which will subsequently protect them from the vagaries of the market. As many studies on agrarian change suggest, agricultural development in a society governed by capitalist social relations tends to benefit the minority, while marginalising the majority who happen to be poor farmers (See Amin 2015; Karovkin 1992; Martiniello 2016; Shivji 1992); Zimbabwe's case is no different.

The study relied on primary data collected by SMAIAS<sup>2</sup>, utilising a questionnaire in the *Land Use, Food Security and Agricultural Production Survey*, conducted in six districts; Goromonzi, Zvimba, Chipinge, Chiredzi, Kwekwe and Mangwe, which represent all the agro-ecological zones in Zimbabwe. The baseline survey data provided in-depth information on farmer access to farmer organisations, networks and intra-farmer cooperation, which aided in inferences about the level of belonging, inclusion, participation, relationships, recognition and legitimacy (hence social cohesion and quality) among the farmers. The methodology also provided an understanding of the level of resettlement areas' social infrastructure and institutions; that enable farmer access to public goods and services. Furthermore, the data ensured deeper understanding of the land beneficiaries' productivity trends and accumulation trajectories; which are critical for transformative social policy. The primary data was complemented by secondary sources such as other literature on land reform, which highlight the redistributive and protective outcomes of land reform.

## THE NEXUS BETWEEN SOCIAL POLICY AND LAND REFORM

Social policy has come to be understood as “collective interventions directly affecting transformation in social welfare, social institutions and social relations” (Mkandawire 2007; UNRISD 2001). The definition is supported by Adesina (2007a, 1) who sees social policy as public efforts, which either protect or harm people in given geographic spaces. The above definitions take into consideration the minimum living standards of human beings in given territories. For Hagenbuch (as quoted in Titmuss 1974, 31), the hallmark of social policy is the “desire to ensure every member of the community has certain minimum standards and certain opportunities.” This standard is achieved through “elements of social policy”, which include the direct provision of social services by government such as education, health, pension, employment. Also critical as part of social policy is land *reform* progressive taxation and other redistributive policies (ibid). At the core of social policy is the need to guarantee that every citizen lives a life of dignity regardless of status, ethnicity, age, gender and any other distinctive feature.

---

2 Sam Moyo African Institute for Agrarian Studies based in Harare.

Despite the abundant literature on both social policy and land reform, there is a gap in knowledge regarding land reform as a social policy instrument. This is largely because of a biased and Eurocentric focus on social safety nets or social assistance; much to the neglect of the transformative role social policies should play; particularly in Global South countries. This shortcoming is highlighted by Mkandawire (2004, 1) who states that:

Social policy has always played redistributive, protective and transformative or developmental roles. Although these different roles always work in tandem and synergistically, the weight given to each of these elements of social policies has varied widely across countries and, within countries, over time. In the context of development, there can be no doubt that the transformative role of social policy needs to receive greater attention than it is usually accorded in the developed countries and much more than it does in the current focus on “safety nets.”

A similar point is underscored by Fine (2009, 2), who observes that social policy has been weakened by

“...over-generalising across ideal types which are insufficiently sensitive [both in method and empirically] to the differences in context and content of different social policies within and between both countries and programmes.”

It is this inadequacy of the social policy literature, together with its links with land reform, which this article seeks to address, by focusing on the relevant social policy elements such as land reform in Zimbabwe.

## PRODUCTION AMONG LAND BENEFICIARIES

For Adesina (2011), transformative social policy goes beyond “protection”, “vulnerability”, “destitution” and “short-term risk analysis” to also cater for production, protection, reproduction, re-distribution and social cohesion. The production element post-FTLRP has been utilised by many pro and anti-land reform scholars in framing the arguments around the outcomes of the FTLRP (See Hammar, Raftopoulos and Jensen 2003; Richardson 2005; Scoones, Mavedzenge, Murimbarimba and Sukume 2010). A thin strand of literature (Mamdani 2008; Moyo and Chambati 2013; Moyo and Nyoni 2013) has tried to expand on the debates beyond production by looking at other aspects such as the general political economy of land reform. On the other hand, much of the literature has focused on productivity declines—which accompanied the programme at national level—and in so doing, ignoring external factors such as the international isolation of the country and the severe and recurrent droughts in 2002 and 2008—which drove production to its lowest—in spite of the fact that production outcome is an important variable in measuring the success or failure of land reform, and other factors such as protection, social cohesion and accumulation amongst households as equally important.

At a macro-level, studies show that while serious productivity declines were witnessed post-FTLRP in 15 major crop commodities (see Moyo and Nyoni 2013; Richardson 2005), the period after dollarisation has witnessed a recovery in some crop commodities; most notably export-oriented crops such as horticulture, tobacco and sugar (Binswanger-Mkhize and Moyo 2012). An analysis of production trends amongst land beneficiaries at micro-level is equally critical as it highlights if land reform is an effective social policy tool in addressing household and national food security concerns.

Available data from the surveyed households reflect that the majority of the households have been able to produce crops for consumption; with some even venturing into export crop production as reflected in Table 1. Maize, groundnuts and sorghum feature prominently in the production patterns across the three settlement patterns, while tobacco and soya beans are the major cash and export crops. Across all the settlement types (and also districts/agro-ecological zones), households were mainly engaged in the production of maize, the staple food in Zimbabwe. Higher proportions of Communal Area farmers (97.2%) produced maize, followed by A1 households (94.8%), while less of the middle to large scale farming households were involved in maize production (76.7%) (Table 1). The limited production of maize by middle to large scale households is attributed to the fact that some of them produce cash crops for marketing and thereafter, utilise incomes obtained from such sales to procure food.

The land utilisation rates across all settlement types averaged 50.3 per cent in the 2013/14 agricultural season, a phenomenon attributable to capital constraints facing the newly resettled farmers (Moyo et al forthcoming). While the land utilisation rates might seem low, Moyo et al (forthcoming) argue that this figure is higher when compared to former Large Scale Commercial Farmers (LSCF) who, despite having settled on these farms for many years, with mechanisation and better access to agricultural credit, still had land utilisation rates of below 50 per cent. The current farmers have demonstrated how, even though they are operating under unfavourable conditions, characterised by limited access to private and public credit, they are still able to engage in meaningful agricultural production. What can be observed here is that the FTLRP has facilitated a key element of the transformative social policy agenda, geared toward enhanced food production.

## AGRICULTURAL INCOME

The ability or failure to generate agricultural income is a key variable used in the evaluation of the success or failure of agricultural producers. However, scholars from the Marxian tradition are quick to point out that for a farmer to be considered “capitalist”, he/she should be able to reinvest the income into agriculture (see Patnaik 1988; Sachikonye 1989). Since this study adopts a transformative social policy framework, this section looks at incomes derived from agriculture to assess the productive element of social policy. Apart from household food production, survey data reflects that households reproduce themselves through incomes obtained from agricultural and non-agricultural

**Table 1:** Major crops grown by settlement type

Type of crop	A1		A2		Communal		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<b>Main Foods</b>								
<b>Maize</b>	453	94.8	227	76.7	307	97.2	987	90.6
<b>Wheat</b>	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.1
<b>Sugar beans</b>	55	11.5	50	16.9	14	4.4	119	10.9
<b>Groundnuts</b>	170	35.5	67	22.6	137	43.4	374	34.3
<b>Small grains</b>								
<b>Millet</b>	29	6.1	3	1.0	48	15.2	80	7.3
<b>Sorghum</b>	97	20.3	5	1.7	96	30.4	198	18.2
<b>Rapoko</b>	13	2.7	2	0.7	8	2.5	23	2.1
<b>Oilseeds</b>								
<b>Soya beans</b>	27	5.6	41	13.9	1	0.3	69	6.3
<b>Sunflower</b>	22	4.6	3	1.0	5	1.6	30	2.8
<b>Key Exports</b>								
Tobacco	58	12.1	64	21.6	1	0.3	123	11.3
Cotton	42	8.8	0	0.0	9	2.8	51	4.7
<b>Estate Crops</b>								
Sugarcane	3	0.6	39	13.2	1	0.3	43	3.9
<b>N</b>	<b>478</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1090</b>	<b>100</b>

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

activities. An average of 63.9 per cent of the households from the six districts mentioned earlier participated in crop output markets from 2011 to 2013; while 36.1 per cent of the households were unable to dispose any of their produce onto the market.

Further data analysis on aggregated income obtained between 2011 and 2013 show that the incomes obtained from agricultural production are differentiated; based on settlement model, with large-size A2 farmers faring much better when compared to the peasantry (A1 and Communal Area farmers). This polarity is accentuated by differing levels in access to capital through contracts, banking institutions, formal employment and the instrumentalisation of political connections, which is more pronounced in A2 farmers as compared to A1 and Communal Area farmers (Moyo 2011). The findings of the survey as presented in Table 2 show that the differentiation in income levels is

also an outcome of agro-ecological zones in which farmers operate. For example, high potential districts of natural region 2, such as Zvimba and Goromonzi recorded higher annual average incomes of US\$2 605 and US\$2 244 annually, among A1 growers respectively, from the sale of both crop output and livestock. On the other hand, A1 farmers in a low-potential rainfall district such as Mangwe, located in natural region 5 pocketed an annual average income of US\$ 220 from similar sales. Farms in natural region 5 are ideal for livestock production; which requires a huge injection of capital to purchase breeds, vaccines, feed and skilled labour. With limited capital, and an objective to produce own food, the farmers engage in low productivity potential maize production, thus greatly affecting their annual incomes (Moyo and Nyoni 2013). Across the varied settlement models, A2 landholders had 57.9 per cent households who earned more than US\$1000 in comparison to 24.7 per cent of A1 landholders, while Communal Areas had the least proportion of households that earned a similar income (4.1%). The study thus validates the findings by Moyo (1995, 2011) that differentiation is an outcome of a settlement model and agro-ecological zone respectively. The findings also demonstrate that not all farming households have been able to achieve the productive element of social transformative policy; as it is affected by other factors such as access to capital and the agro-ecological region of farmers. These figures reflect that post-FTLRP; it's not all farmers who have been integrated into output markets, as there is a total of 36.4 per cent who did not obtain incomes from agricultural sales across all settlement models, as can be deciphered from Table 2.

## SOCIAL PROTECTION

Also critical to the social transformative policy is social protection, which goes beyond the cash transfers and other social assistance programmes to a more holistic approach, which encapsulates health, education and agrarian reforms; also broadly referred to as social security (Adesina 2011). From a case study conducted at a farm in Shamva, Tom and Mutswanga (2015) argue that social protection increased as a result of land ownership, which enhanced the productive capacities of the beneficiaries. In our view, tenure security is also a critical aspect to consider when looking at protection and should be considered equal to the other elements under protection, as it forms the basis for human development. Adesina (2011) also attaches greater importance to policies which support and protect vulnerable groups as fundamental for any social transformative social policy agenda. In that regard, access to health and education by farmers is reflective of a social transformative policy. This access is determined by the distance travelled to and from schools and health facilities; as well as the affordability of such services.



**Table 2:** Average total gross agricultural income from crop and livestock sales by settlement

Year	Income Range	A1		A2		CA		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
2011	0	147	30.8	80	26.9	170	53.8	397	36.4
	\$1 - 500	142	29.8	24	8.1	118	37.3	284	26.1
	\$501 - 1000	70	14.7	21	7.1	15	4.7	106	9.7
	\$1001 - 2000	52	10.9	28	9.4	11	3.5	91	8.3
	\$2001 - 3000	21	4.4	30	10.1	1	0.3	52	4.8
	> \$3000	45	9.4	114	38.4	1	0.3	160	14.7
2012	0	119	24.9	74	24.9	172	54.4	365	33.5
	\$1 - 500	142	29.8	21	7.1	113	35.8	276	25.3
	\$501 - 1000	66	13.8	22	7.4	18	5.7	106	9.7
	\$1001 - 2000	71	14.9	32	10.8	7	2.2	110	10.1
	\$2001 - 3000	32	6.7	28	9.4	3	0.9	63	5.8
	> \$3000	47	9.9	120	40.4	3	0.9	170	15.6
2013	0	136	28.5	79	26.6	172	54.4	387	35.5
	\$1 - 500	138	28.9	22	7.4	113	35.8	273	25
	\$501 - 1000	71	14.9	19	6.4	18	5.7	108	9.9
	\$1001 - 2000	51	10.7	27	9.1	6	1.9	84	7.7
	\$2001 - 3000	24	5	19	6.4	2	0.6	45	4.1
	> \$3000	57	11.9	131	44.1	5	1.6	193	17.7

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

## ACCESS TO EDUCATION AND HEALTH SERVICES

A large proportion of children in the resettlement areas were able to access education (71.6%), while 65.4 per cent of households were able to access health facilities. Although the percentage of households with access to education and health facilities seems to be higher; considering that upon the year of settlement there was little infrastructure in the resettlement areas, the quality of the basic social services is relatively low when compared to in communal areas and urban settings. This is further compounded by huge distances the children and peasants have to travel to obtain social services, in some instances. The macro-economic difficulties facing Zimbabwe have not spared the countryside, a factor which has affected the provision of social services in education



and health sectors where there are shortages of learning material and drugs respectively (Chibwana 2016).

**Table 3:** Access to basic social services

Social services	Settlement type					
	A1		A2		Total	
	No	%	No	%	no	%
Access to transportation routes	285	59.8	169	57.1	455	58.8
Access to schools	353	74.1	200	67.6	554	71.6
Access to clinics and hospitals	308	64.1	197	66.6	506	65.4
Retail services	367	77	200	67	568	73.4
Grinding mills	395	82.8	197	66.6	593	76.6

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

Access to transportation, which is key for marketing also remains low (58.8%); leaving greater room for development. Retail services (73.4% ) and grinding mills (76.6% ) were available to the majority of farmers (see Table 3). The limit in the number of social services in the resettlement areas requires the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) to embark on a deliberate policy of constructing basic infrastructure in rural areas. However, this can only take place if Zimbabwe has been re-admitted into the global economy by the Breton Wood Institutes.

## LAND TENURE

Scholars from the right such as Richardson (2005) and Tuppy (2007) critiqued the FTLRP on the basis that it dismantled freehold tenure, based on their narrow assumptions that state-based tenure is an anti-thesis to successful agricultural production (see Moyo and Chambati 2013). The destruction of freehold tenure was interpreted as converting land into “dead capital”, while others saw “political patronage” (see Zamchiya 2011 for example); implying that land beneficiaries lacked the “protection” element. Land reform beneficiaries were viewed as lacking tenure security and protection from land evictions, due to the “political” nature of the programme. While some cases of “land evictions” have not gone unnoticed, they have mainly targeted a few large-scale farmers; and in cases where they have targeted peasant farmers, they have been successfully resisted. According to Moyo et al (forthcoming), 95 per cent of households across all the three settlement models reported that they had not faced any eviction threats on their land; thus confirming that an element of protection in the social transformative policy has been catered for by the FTLRP.

The government promulgated the Statutory Instrument (SI) 53 of 2014 (Chibwana 2016); which replaced offer letters which it had given to the A1 farmers and 99-year leases that were issued to A2 farmers. With the latter, the farmers would hold the land indefinitely. Tenurial guarantees prompted the farmers to develop lasting structures since the SI provides for compensation to farmers for any development made, should the state consider taking the land back (ibid). Tenure security gives an assurance to beneficiaries of land reform that they will not be evicted after they have invested their time and resources on the land. Such an assurance motivated the farmers to erect quality houses, which immediately addresses the destitution challenge (Chibwana 2016).

## SOCIAL COHESION IN REDISTRIBUTED LANDS

Social cohesion involves “understanding the social infrastructure, institutions, customs and material and non-material relations that either constrain or enable the individual in whatever pursuit they are engaged” (Murisa 2007, 2). According to Dekker and Kinsey (2011, 6), the new farmers were coming from different contexts, cultures and backgrounds, but had to solve various problems of collective action together that relate to natural resources management, inputs for agricultural production, as well as the management of risk and uncertainty. There is considerable literature on the social dynamics, which prevailed in the aftermath of the FTLRP. Literature on the function of social policy has been produced by the following scholars, *inter alia*: Chiweshe 2014; Mkodzongi 2013; Moyo 2011; Murisa 2009; Scoones, Mavedzenge, Murimbarimba and Sukume 2010.

Social cohesion is reflected by farmer network groups that are developing in the resettlement areas. The results of the survey indicates that 23.3 per cent of the households indicated that they were members of farmer groups, while the majority (76.7%) indicated that they were not. The A2 sector had more households who were members of farmer groups (31.8%), followed by the Communal Area category (22.2%); and lastly, the A1 households (18.9%) (See Table 4).

**Table 4:** Membership to farmer groups for newly resettled land holders by settlement

Are you a member of a farmer group?	A1		A2		CA		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	90	18.9	92	31.8	70	22.2	252	23.3
No	385	81.1	197	68.2	246	77.8	828	76.7
Total	475	100	289	100	316	100	1080	100

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

The surveyed households indicated various benefits they derive from their membership to farm organisations. Input sourcing (48.6%) was the most common activity, followed by group marketing (31.0%) and credit sourcing (29.1%). Credit sourcing and inputs sourcing are activities pursued by farmer groups because of the limited credits provided by private and public institutions to fund agricultural development (see Table 5).

**Table 5:** Major benefits derived from local farmer groups by settlement type

Benefit	Land beneficiaries (households)							
	A1		A2		CA		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Asset sharing	14	10.9	22	20.4	1	0.8	37	10.3
Credit sourcing	48	37.2	44	40.7	12	9.9	104	29.1
Inputs sourcing	74	57.4	56	51.9	44	36.4	174	48.6
Grouping marketing	56	43.4	37	34.3	18	14.9	111	31.0
Defending land rights	23	17.8	45	41.7	1	0.8	69	19.3
Providing social support	16	12.4	44	40.7	11	9.1	71	19.8

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

Reflecting on the limited social cohesion, 19.8 per cent of households who were members of farmer organisations received different kinds of social support, while 10.3 per cent of such households benefitted from the sharing of assets within their organisations. Social support was received mostly by A2 households (40.7%) followed by A1 households (12.4%) and Communal Area households (9.1%). Asset sharing was more common among A2 households (20.4%) when compared to A1 households (10.9%) and communal areas (0.8%).

## COOPERATION AMONG RESETTLED HOUSEHOLDS

Upon settlement, farmers from various backgrounds engage in collective actions arrangements of a variety of activities; although this tends to be limited (Moyo, Chambati, Mazwi and Muchetu, forthcoming). These activities are of importance because they increase productivity, which is a critical element in social transformative policy, while also useful in increasing the social protection of households. The most common collective action pursued was the sharing of tools practiced by 26.6 per cent, followed by the sharing of animal drawn implements (22.9 %), reciprocal labour arrangements (19.2 %) and the sharing of tractor-drawn implements (17.7 %). Only 3.1 per cent were involved in joint agricultural production (see Table 6). Cooperation among different households was still low, owing to the fact that these are new resettlement areas; and

**Table 6:** Cooperation among newly resettled households A1 and A2

Areas of cooperation	Beneficiaries				District															
	A1		A2		Total		Goromonzi		Zvimba		Chipinge		Chiredzi		Kwekwe		Mangwe		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reciprocal labour	124	25.9	24	8.1	148	19.2	1	0.7	6	4.6	15	12.8	25	21.2	49	31	52	46.4	148	19.2
Joint agricultural production	19	4	5	1.7	24	3.1	4	2.9	14	10.7	0	0	1	0.9	4	2.5	1	0.9	24	3.1
Shared tools	158	33.1	48	16.2	206	26.6	20	14.7	69	52.7	23	19.3	17	14.4	46	29.1	31	27.7	206	26.6
Shared animal drawn implements	143	29.9	34	11.5	177	22.9	29	21.3	62	47.3	17	14.3	17	14.4	49	31	3	2.7	177	22.9
Shared tractor drawn implements	62	13	75	25.3	137	17.7	34	25	65	49.6	13	10.9	20	16.9	4	2.5	1	0.9	137	17.7

Source: SMAIAS Household Baseline Survey 2013/14, Questionnaire, N=1090

there is a possibility that once it is increased, there will be production and protection elements of the transformative social policy.

Cooperation among farmers was higher among A1 households in almost all study districts; except for the sharing of tractor- drawn implements. Thus, sharing included tools which, among A1 households was 33.1 per cent when compared to among A2 households (16.2% ); as well as the drawn implements which, among A1 households was 29.9 per cent, and lower among A2 households (11.5% ). Reciprocal labour arrangements were higher among A1 households (25.9%) as compared to A2 households (8.1%). The sharing of tractor-drawn implements was highest amongst A2 households (25.3%) when compared to A1 households (13%). These figures seem to suggest lower cooperation in the larger land sized A2 farms; and thus lower social cohesion when compared to A1 and the communal areas, which had relatively higher cooperation and sharing arrangements.

## CONCLUSION

The FTLRP has, to varying degrees, facilitated the realisation of some social policy outcomes such as redistribution, protection and production. These functions were, however, not achieved to the similitude magnitude. The most successful has been with regards to redistribution, where a new agrarian structure was largely made up of the peasantry, who benefitted from the FTLRP as shown in our introductory section. As this article has shown, there have been constraints related to the macro-economic outlook of the country, which tended to militate against the productive capacities of all farmers, leading to production for auto-consumption. As has been observed, equally important is how differentiated the production outcomes are, based on the agro-ecological zone and settlement model. To bring farmers from drier agro-ecological regions on par with farmers in high-rainfall agro-ecological zones, there is a need to invest in irrigation infrastructure, while more state support is required for farmers who are less resourced. The incapacity of the government to cushion its farmers with subsidies and equipment has left the former vulnerable and prone to the vagaries of the market and other factors such as droughts, since they cannot secure support in the form of loans from the banks, because of tenure issues.

The fiscal space of the state has shrunk significantly due to capital withdrawal under the sanctions that were put by neo-liberal powers. As a result, the government's handicap was exacerbated. While private capital inflows have significantly improved to US\$620 million, when compared to US\$6 million realised in 2000, the capital is mostly injected on cash crops; thus neglecting grain crops, threatening food security and sovereignty. That said, the FTLRP has a potential to transform the lives of the poor farmers, provided other aspects such as the financing of agriculture, protection (education and health) and social cohesion are attended to, as they will trigger increased productivity, engagements with output markets and further re-investments into agriculture; provided there are equitable relations between the state, capital and the peasantry.

## REFERENCES

- Adesina, J. O. 2007a. *Social Policy in sub-Saharan African Context in Search of Inclusive Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230590984>
- Adesina, J. O. 2011. "Beyond the Social Protection Paradigm: Social Policy in Africa's Development." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies/Revue canadienne d'études du développement* 454–470. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02255189.2011.647441>
- Amin, Samir. 2012. "Contemporary Imperialism and the Agrarian Question." *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* (SAGE publications) 1 (1): 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/227797601200100102>
- Binswanger-Mkhize, H., and Moyo, S. 2012. *Zimbabwe from Economic Rebound to Sustained Growth: Note II: Recovery and growth of Zimbabwe Agriculture*. World Bank, Harare.
- Chibwana, M. W. T. 2016. "Social Policy Outcomes of Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform Program (FTLRP): A Case Study of Kwekwe District." Doctoral Thesis, Pretoria: University of South Africa (UNISA).
- Chiweshe, M. 2014. *Understanding Social and Solidarity Economy in Emergent Communities: Lessons from Post Fast Track Land Reform Farms in Mazowe: Potential and Limits of Social and Solidarity Economy*. Geneva: UNRISD.
- Dekker, M., and B. Kinsey. 2011. "Contextualizing Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Long-Term Observations From the First Generation." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38:5, 995–1019. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.632089>
- Fine, Ben. 2009. "Social Policy and the Crisis of Neo-Liberalism." *The Crisis of Neo-Liberalism in India: Challenges and Alternatives*. Mumbai and International: Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) & International Development Economics Associates (IDEAs).
- Government of Zimbabwe. 2013. *Constitution of the Republic of Zimbabwe No. 81 of 2013*. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe printers.
- Gumede, Vusi. 2011. "The South African Developmental State in the Making." *The thinker* 25: 16–19.
- Gumede, Vusi. 2014. "Land Reform in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Should South Africa Follow Zimbabwe's Footsteps?" *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies*. 9(1): 50–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18186874.2014.916877>
- Gumede, V. 2015. "Editorial." *Africa Development* 15(3):1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1590/1414-462X201500090001>
- Hammar, A., B. Raftopoulos and S. Jensen. 2003. *Zimbabwe's Unfinished Business: Rethinking Land, State and Nation in the Context of Crisis*. Harare: Weaver Press.
- Karovkin, Tanya. 1992. "Peasants, Grapes and Corporations: The Growth of Contract Farming in a Chilean Community." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 19(2): 228–254. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066159208438479>
- Mackintosh, M., and P. Tibandebage. 2004. "Inequality and Redistribution in Health Care: Analytical Issues for Developmental Social Policy." In *Social Policy in a Development Context*, edited by T. Mkandawire. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523975\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523975_7)

- Mamdani, M., 2009. Lessons of Zimbabwe: Mugabe in Context. *Concerned African Scholars Bulletin*, (82).
- Marongwe, N. 2011. "Who was Allocated Fast Track Land, and What Did They Do With It? Se-lection of A2 Farmers in Goromonzi District, Zimbabwe and its Impacts on Agricultural Production." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (5): 1069–1092. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.636483>
- Martiniello, G. 2016. "World Thematics: Don't Stop the Mill' : South African Capital and Agrarian Change in Tanzania." *A TWQ Journal*. 1-20.
- Mkandawire, T. 2004. *Social Policy in a Development Context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230523975>
- Mkandawire, T. 2007. "Transformative Social Policy and Innovation in Developing Countries." *The European Journal of Development Research* 19 (1): 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09578810601144236>
- Mkandawire, T. 2011. "Welfare Regimes and Economic Development: Bridging the Conceptual Gap." In *Overcoming the Persistence of Inequality and Poverty*, edited by V. FitzGerald, J. Heyer and R. Thorp. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 9780230249707 [https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230306721\\_7](https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230306721_7)
- Mkodzongi, G., 2013. "Fast Tracking Land Reform and Rural Livelihoods in Mashonaland West Province of Zimbabwe: Opportunities and Constraints, 2000–2013." PhD Thesis. School of Social and Political Science. University of Edinburgh.
- Moyo, S., Yeros, P. and Jha, P. 2012. Imperialism and Primitive Accumulation: Notes on the New Scramble for Africa. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy* 1(2) 181-203. <https://doi.org/10.1177/227797601200100203>
- Moyo, S. 1995. *The Land Question in Zimbabwe*. Harare: SAPES Books.
- Moyo, S. 2004. *The Overall Impact of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme*. Harare: African Institute for Agrarian Studies.
- Moyo, S. 2005. "Land and Natural Resource Redistribution in Zimbabwe: Access Equity and Conflict." *African and Asian studies* 4 (1–2): 188–223. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1569209054547283>
- Moyo, S. 2007. *Emerging Land Tenure Issues in Zimbabwe*. Harare: African Institute for Agrarian Studies Monograph.
- Moyo, S. 2009. *Agrarian Reform and Prospects for Recovery*. Harare: SMAIAS Monographs.
- Moyo, S. 2011a. "Changing Agrarian Relations after Redistributive Land Reform in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (5): 939–966. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.634971>
- Moyo, S. 2011b. "Land Concentration and Accumulation after Redistributive Land Reform in Post-Settler Zimbabwe." 38 (128): 257–276.
- Moyo, S. 2011c. "Three Decades of Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (3): 493–531. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.583642>



- Moyo, S. 2013. "Land Reform and Redistribution in Zimbabwe Since 1980." In *Land and Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe: Beyond White-Settler Capitalism*, edited by S. Moyo and W. Chambati, 29–77. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Moyo, S., and N. Nyoni. 2013. "Changing Agrarian Relations After Redistributive Land Reform in Zimbabwe." In *Land and Agrarian Reform in Former Settler Colonial Zimbabwe*, edited by S. Moyo and W. Chambati, 209–264. Dakar: CODESRIA & AIAS. DOI: 978-2-86978-553-3.
- Moyo, S., and P. Yeros. 2005. "Land Occupations and Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Towards the National Democratic Revolution." In *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America*, edited by S. Moyo and P. Yeros. London: Zed Books.
- Moyo, S., and W. Chambati. 2013. *Land and Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe: Beyond White Settler Capitalism*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Moyo, Sam, Walter Spears Chambati, Freedom Mazwi, and Rangarirai Gavin Muchetu. Upcoming. Survey Report, Harare: Sam Moyo African Institute for Agrarian Studies.
- Murisa, T. 2007. *Social Organisation and Agency in the Newly Resettled Areas of Zimbabwe: The Case of Zvimba District*. Monograph, Harare: AIAS Monograph Series.
- Murisa, T. 2009. "An Analysis of Emerging Forms of Social Organisation and Agency in Newly Resettled Areas of Zimbabwe: The case of Goromonzi and Zvimba Districts." PhD Thesis, Grahamstown, South Africa, Rhodes University.
- Patnaik, U. 1988. "Ascertaining the Economic Characteristics of Peasant Classes in themselves in Rural India : A Methodological and Empirical Exercise." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066158808438365>
- Richardson, C. 2005. "The Damage to Property Rights and the Collapse of Zimbabwe." *Cato Journal*. 25(3). 541–566.
- Sachikonye, L. 1989. "The State and Agribusiness in Zimbabwe Since Independence." Thesis, Leeds: University of Leeds.
- Scoones, I, B., Marongwe F. Mavedzenge, F. Murimbarimba and C. Sukume. 2010. *Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Myths and Realities*. London: James Currey.
- Shivji, I. 1992. "The Roots of an Agrarian Crisis in Tanzania: A Theoretical Perspective." In *The Tanzanian Peasantry: Economy in Crisis*, edited by M. S. Forster and G. Peter, 124–149. London: T Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Titmuss, R. 1974. *Social Policy*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Tom, T., and P. Mutswangwa. 2015. "Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Resettlement Programme (FTLRP): A Transformative Social Policy Approach to Mupfudzi Resettlement (Shamva District)." *IOSR-JHSS* 20 (8): 51–61.
- Tuppy, M. L. 2007. A Four-Step Recovery Plan for Zimbabwe. CATO. UNRISD. 2001. *Social Development in a Development Context*. Project report, UNRISD.

Zamchiya, P. 2011. "A Synopsis of Land and Agrarian Change in Chipinge District, Zimbabwe." *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (5): 1093–1122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.633703>