



Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe

Working Paper 13

The Changing Patterns of Farm Labour after the Fast
Track Land Reform Programme: The Case of Guruve
District

Gumisai Tinotenda Mutangi

June 2010

Livelihoods after land reform in Zimbabwe

Working Paper Series

The land reform that has unfolded in Zimbabwe since 2000 has resulted in a major reconfiguration of land use and economy. Over 7 million hectares of land has been transferred to both small-scale farm units (the A1 model) and larger scale farms (the A2 model). The land reform has had diverse consequences, and there is no single story of what happened and its implications.

The Institute of Development Studies (University of Sussex, UK), the Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies (PLAAS, University of the Western Cape, South Africa), the African Institute for Agrarian Studies (AIAS, Harare), the Centre for Applied Social Sciences Trust (CASS Trust, Harare) and the Ruzivo Trust (Harare) came together to support a small grant competition aimed at generating new case study insights based on original and recent field research by young Zimbabwean scholars. The aim was to bring together solid, empirical evidence from recent research in the field. There were over 70 applicants, and 15 small grants were offered. The result is this Working Paper series. All papers have been reviewed and they have been lightly edited. In all cases however they remain work-in-progress.

Today policymakers are grappling with the question of ‘what next’? How can a new agrarian structure be supported, and a vibrant rural economy be developed? Yet such discussions are often taking place in a vacuum, with limited empirical data from the ground and overshadowed by misperceptions and inappropriate assumptions. We hope this series – together with the wider research work being undertaken by our organisations and partners – will help to enhance policy making through a solid evidence base.

As these papers clearly show, there have been highly varied impacts of the post-2000 land reform: on rural livelihoods, on agricultural production, on markets and the economy, on farm workers and employment, on the environment and on institutions and governance arrangements, for example. And these impacts have played out in very different ways in different places. These papers cover a range of themes and offer insights from across the country.

They add up to a complex picture, but one that offers key pointers for the way forward. They counter the excessively pessimistic picture often painted about Zimbabwe’s land reform, yet highlight important failings and future challenges. We very much hope that they are widely read and shared, with the insights made use of as Zimbabwe charts its way forward.

Professor Ian Scoones, Institute of Development Studies, UK

Professor Ben Cousins, Institute for Poverty Land and Agrarian Studies, South Africa

Professor Sam Moyo, African Institute for Agrarian Studies, Harare

Dr Nelson Marongwe, Centre for Applied Social Sciences Trust, Harare

Dr Prosper Matondi, Ruzivo Trust, Harare

The small grant competition was coordinated through the Livelihoods after Land Reform research programme (www.larl.org.za).

Summary

The Fast Track Land Reform Programme has greatly affected farm workers, although the effects are diverse depending on the region of the country. This study focuses on three farms in Guruve district in Mashonaland, and is based on a survey of 50 farm workers. Although some forms of new employment are emerging, the evidence clearly points to the fact that farm workers' livelihoods have suffered. There is less employment, and when it exists pay is poor. There are few services, and gaining access to food is difficult. To understand the plight of the former farm workers there is need to include them in problem identification and implementation of post-settlement support programmes, and the wider agrarian reform, since they are facing numerous challenges.

Contents

Summary	iii
Acronyms	vi
Introduction	1
The study area	1
The farm worker predicament after the FTLRP	3
Conclusion: Livelihood and survival strategies of former farm workers	11
References	13

Acronyms

BEAM	Basic Education Assistance Module
DNPWM	Department National Parks and Wildlife Management
FCTZ	Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe
FTLRP	Fast Track Land Reform Programme
GAPWUZ	General Agricultural Plantation Workers Union of Zimbabwe
GMB	Grain Marketing Board
HBC	Home-based Caregiver
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change
NEC	National Employment Council
PDL	Poverty Datum Line
ZANU PF	Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front Party

Introduction

As many scholars of land reform have argued, the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) has had a lot of effects on farm labour, ranging from loss of employment to displacement of people (Sachikonye 2003; Magaramombe 2004; Masiwa and Chigejo 2003; Marongwe 2002). The FTLRP has led to loss of jobs and income, while provision of services such as health and sanitation, HIV counselling, Home Based Care (HBC) and the construction of Blair toilets by advocacy NGO's such as the Farm Community Trust of Zimbabwe (FCTZ) were curtailed (Marongwe 2002). This has negatively affected the livelihoods of the workers and has resulted in most of them resorting to casual labour under a more flexible hiring and firing system (Sachikonye 2003). However, some got land under the programme but these constitute a small percentage of the total beneficiaries. Local chiefs and headmen as well provided small pieces of land to the former farm workers as will be shown below.

Although the programme intended to include farm workers (GoZ 1998) they were not adequately included. On the ground, the plan was abandoned due to political and ideological differences as war veterans and landless villagers started the farm invasions. Surprisingly the government supported the invasions to please the liberation war heroes and the landless villagers since they form the political base of ZANU (PF) as a party. The problem is that those who are working with these workers claim to know the real issues on the ground but only to realise that the policies they formulate are anti-farm workers. The purpose of this paper therefore is to explore how the programme affected the workers, paying particular attention to the efforts by the state and non-state actors to cater for the needs and demands of the workers during and after the programme. Different mechanisms employed by the workers to eke out a living from 2000 to now will also be looked examined to provide relevant empirical policy information to those who may want to work with these workers.

The study area

Guruve is divided into two sections Upper and Lower Guruve, with the former being the area of study. Although both areas are in the same natural region, Upper Guruve receives more rainfall than Lower Guruve, which experiences erratic rainfall, and there are communal lands only. As compared to Lower Guruve, Upper Guruve is more developed in terms of infrastructure and this development is closely linked to agriculture and mining, the two main economic activities. Most of the farms in Guruve are suitable for many crops such as tobacco, maize, beans, citrus and potatoes either as seasonal crops or as perennial. As for the shopping centres and other infrastructure, former commercial farmers used to provide these at their farms so shopping was not a problem for the farm workers. The farms are surrounded by communal areas hence former commercial farmers used to get casual labour from these areas. The area falls under the great dyke belt, which is rich in minerals, and many mines lie within the belt. Some of the mines which were already there before the land reform programme include Eureka and Impinge mines and new chrome mines were established after the land reform programme. Most people are also employed there as permanent workers and some as casuals. The farms selected for this study had many activities before the FTLRP and some of the activities were unique when comparing to the activities in most of the farms in Guruve.

The area under study falls in the natural region II, in Mashonaland province. As compared to other regions, it is good for tobacco (cash crop), maize (staple food), wheat, beans as well as cattle ranching. The best agricultural land in Zimbabwe is found in natural regions I and II. These areas were mostly

owned by the large-scale commercial farmers, of whom the majority were white. Historically people migrated from other countries as well as local areas to work in the commercial farms. These were the most affected by the land reform programme since the government was targeting commercial farms not plantations that are found in the natural region I in the Eastern Highlands. This implies that as compared to other regions, farm workers from this region were the most affected and those in plantations continued working but under poor conditions as well.

The case study farms

This study focused on a series of farms in Guruve district: Tenegeneg Art Farm, Hughes Farm and Kamsasa Farm, with the aim of exploring changes in land use and livelihoods, and particularly the shifts in farm labour and farm workers' livelihoods.

This paper is based on a limited field survey which was conducted with 50 respondents, with Tenegeneg farm having the largest number of respondents (20 respondents) since there are many workers who are still employed. Several methods were used to conduct the survey, which include focus group discussions, personal interviews and secondary sources of data. Although the workers from all the farms were more than 50, the information presented is representative of the farm workers at the three farms. Only information rich cases were selected and these are quoted in the paper. Furthermore, the experiences of these farm workers were similar and they seemed to concur with each other in the focus group discussions so most of the voices are covered in some quotes selected. Secondary sources of data, which include documents from local chiefs and headman, were used to know the total numbers of former farm workers who got land.

Tenegeneg Art Farm is located 18 km from the main road, which connects Harare and Guruve. It is divided into two sections with different activities, stone carving and tobacco production. Prior to the FTLRP, people who worked in these sections were also different but some worked both ways, doing stone carving as part-time job to supplement their incomes from tobacco production. They lived under the compound system where accommodation was provided by the farm owner but under separate settings. Those who did stone carving lived at their work site where they were provided with stands only and constructed their own houses but for those in tobacco production the farm owner provided accommodation.

Although it is a single farm, two different white farmers owned it. Initially a white farmer who specialised in tobacco production owned the farm until a farm worker (name supplied) discovered the portion of the farm with stones fit for carving. The then farm owner downed tobacco production tools and pursued carving full time. He also transferred the tobacco section to another white farmer (it is not clear whether he sold that portion or just gave it or leased it to the other white farmer). This setting prevailed up to 2000 when the farm invasions took place. After 2000, both farmers left and a black man (name supplied) now owns the carving section and the other section was divided into small pieces of land for resettlement.

When the farm invasions took place, there were some alterations to both farm productivity and patterns of farm labour. Both A1 and A2 farmers who employ labour on a contract basis occupied the farm. In January 2008, a Chinese mining company was established there, they have been mining chrome from then up to now, and they are employing former farm worker. Each person has his/her own stand where the products are displayed. Amongst the 150 workers, six are women.

Hughes Farm is located 12km from the main road to Guruve centre. It was divided into sections with the largest portion being allotted to tobacco production, followed by maize production and cattle ranching. The maize production section was left fallow from 1990 to 2000 because the soils were not suitable for tobacco. At this farm, people were employed in different sections but with the tobacco section having the largest number. From the information I got from a former employee who got a farm under the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) who worked as a paymaster, the farm employed 55 people as permanent workers with 15 as casuals. During the FTLRP, the farm was divided into small (A1) farms with each person getting 5 hectares. There are no A2's (small plots) at this farm and no one is practicing irrigation agriculture except the former white owner who was left there and is practising irrigation agriculture. Fifty-two households were settled at this farm and these produce mainly for subsistence because most of the new farmers clearly stated that since they were settled they have never sold anything to the Grain Marketing Board or any other company.

Kamsasa Farm is located 10km from the main road, which connects Harare and Guruve, sharing boarder with Hughes farm. One white commercial farmer who practiced cattle ranching, tobacco production and citrus production as the main activity owned the farm. This meant that there was need for a lot of labour force and this farm had more workers (around 100) than the neighbouring Hughes farm. Of all the farms under study, this is the only farm where workers were provided with decent accommodation, of which some are still using. Some left the farm and the new settlers are using the accommodation; this implies that some of the workers lost their jobs because of the programme. The farm was divided into small pieces of land (A1) and the citrus was given to a certain company (name supplied). As for the cattle, the former owner sold all of them hence there is no longer cattle ranching at the farm.

The farm worker predicament after the FTLRP

The survey looked at a number of facets of farm workers' predicaments post-FTLRP. These included patterns of employment, gaining access to land, the differential effects on men and women workers, service provision and access to food.

Patterns of employment

Before the FTLRP, the owner of the stone carving section (Tengenenge) was also the owner of the products because he used to pay the sculptors using the money from the stones. He could establish some relationships with the whites abroad and could come and buy the products. The sculptors clearly stated that there was a sales representative at the farm who was responsible for negotiations with the buyers even in their absence. Each sculptor was paid through his or her own product, they sculptor would get 30% of the money from the product. This has continued to be the trend in the post-FTLRP period with each sculptor being paid through his or her own product but the difference is only that the new owner now takes 35% of the total money from the product. Most of the sculptors used to work in the tobacco production section before the FTLRP but when the farm invasions took place these are no longer working in the tobacco production as the farm was divided into small pieces of land. They have remained as sculptors with some working as casual workers in the farms of the new farmers and new mines.

They also noted that things had not been working well because buyers are no longer coming the way they used to do, when asked why; one alluded to the fact that a black person who does not have *connections* with the white buyers now owns the place. This lack of connections meant that workers

were now in a precarious position since they could not sell their products; hence, they had to resort to other means of meeting the daily needs. The displacement of the white commercial farmers meant a displacement of the usual markets the workers used to have. Thus although the percentage they are getting now from the new owner is better than that which they used to get from the former farm owner, they noted that it was better before the FTLRP because the buyers were readily available. Furthermore, due to the violent political environment prevailing in the country, it is more dangerous for a white person to be seen in resettled areas. Of note also is the fact that from 2000 up to 2008 the country has been holding elections which were characterised by violence and intimidation and former commercial farmers were treated with suspicion and outright hostility hence this has affected the business of these workers.

One respondent said:

I was the one who used to teach new people about stone carving and new styles and I used to get an allowance from the owner, I can say I was a teacher here but all these benefits are no longer there.

From the way the respondent answered, one cannot deny the fact that people lost their jobs and this has altered their livelihoods. This reveals that the worker cannot use his skills now in the post- FTLRP period, and is no longer accessing some of the benefits he used to get from the white owner for his job as a teacher.

One of the respondents compared the pre-FTLRP to the post –land reform period noting the changes that have occurred due to the programme and said:

I do not want to lie to you, things were fine because it was obvious that our products will be bought, but right now you have to be stylish for your product to attract the buyer and we enter into negotiations with the buyer so if you do not have money you may end up reducing the price because if you do not, the family will starve.

In this informant's view the period before the FTLRP was much better than the post -land reform because the market was available for the products, but now there is no ready market for them to sell their products. The unavailability of a ready market for the products meant that they have to rely on the few buyers. The unavailability of markets is also closely linked to the violent political atmosphere that had characterised the country as highlighted above. In addition, the programme affected those who could not improve on their artistry since the new era only requires those who are stylish for the products to attract buyers. This implied that these workers were affected negatively because right now they cannot even predict their future; they are now using different methods to survive.

Those who are still employed as permanent workers in the department section were also interviewed and they alluded to the same fact that the FTLRP has affected negatively on their lives. All those in the administration department are also sculptors so they work as sculptors as well as administrators. One of them pointed out that it was better to be in the administration department because when products were not bought they relied on the money from administrative work. He noted that they get some groceries and salary from the new owner every month but sometimes these come very late as far as ten days after month- end. He said,

We get 10kg mealie meal, 2kg sugar, 750 ml of cooking oil and 1 kg of salt and the salary of 20 United States dollars (USD) per month, but this money is not enough and the mealie-meal is not enough as well because I have got a family of six.

Their salary is far below the Poverty Datum Line (PDL)¹, which is now pegged at 554 USD (National Employment Council 2009). In relation to the statistics, a family of six cannot buy basic goods that can take them for a month or even half way. Although many Zimbabweans are living below the poverty datum line, those in urban areas are better than the farm workers are, since some are getting something slightly above half of the PDL. Most of the workers in urban areas are getting something slightly above 150 USD, with some being given some allowances to supplement their salaries and their situation is better than former farm workers. From the information from NEC, it is clear that when calculating the PDL, the incomes of those in towns are the most used because the rural workers as well buy some of their basic commodities in cities and towns so differentiating the two still remain a problem.

Furthermore, 10kg of mealie meal is not enough for a family of six to eat for the whole month hence this has forced them to resort to some other means of making a living. The minimum wage bracket for the agricultural sector as from February to April was pegged at 10 USD and it was reviewed to 32 USD from May up to now, (NEC 2009). The 20 USD that the workers are getting as salary is also below the tax-free bracket announced by the government hence it is very difficult for them to survive. The workers however concurred that their situation is now better as compared to the period from 2000 to 2008 because the government has been using the minimum wage bracket under an inflationary environment that has characterised the country from 2000. Although all the parties including the labour organisations negotiate the minimum wage, the government has the final say. From 2000 the minimum wage was pro-government and anti-workers and their organisations negotiate for a better wage bracket. The government has not been taking labour organisations seriously because they were believed to be against the land reform programme. The minimum wage bracket which was announced by the government was only a way of pleasing the new settlers who were not able to pay the workers, thus to run away from the constraints of the minimum wage bracket, they resorted to working for food.

As for those from the other two farms, their employment patterns have changed drastically with most if not all those who were permanent workers now being casual workers. Most of the workers were permanent before the FTLRP but they are no longer permanent. Out of the 55 permanent workers who were employed at Hughes farm before the FTLRP, 11 are still employed permanently under the former white owner who is still at the farm because he was left with a small piece of land. These are employed as garden boys, security guards, drivers and millers. From the statistics the researcher got it is clear that most of the workers lost their jobs because of the land reform, although some got small pieces of land on the same farm. Although those who are left are permanent workers, their tasks are not specified hence they are liable to shuffling where one can be a driver today, a guard tomorrow and so on. They also alluded to the fact that they also do casual work to supplement their salaries.

There were 120 workers who were employed at Kamsasa farm before the FTLRP and now only 15 are employed as permanent workers in the citrus department with more than 50 being employed on a

¹ The PDL measures the income required to meet the basic needs of an average family in terms of composition and size. This is useful to understand the situation of farm workers in relation to the salaries they are getting. When calculating the PDL all workers are included and the salaries of the farm workers clearly show that they are earning nothing in relation to the PDL.

casual basis depending on demand for labour. Since citrus production is not an all-year-round activity, labour is only needed much in times of harvesting, grading and packing, such that most workers resort to casual work in the farms of the new settlers for extra income. One farm (Dearl) close to Kamsasa was divided into plots where irrigation agriculture is the main activity and these workers said that they prefer working in such plots since they enable them to generate money all year round. Some of the workers also left the farm and are now permanent workers under some black commercial farmers and they are being provided with accommodation on the new farmers' plots. Most of the workers on this farm are also employed as casual labourers in the Chinese company hence they always face the same problems faced by those at Tengenenge farm.

Acquiring new land

In relation to land, of the workers who were at Tengenenge farm no one got land under the FTLRP, unlike the situation in other farms like Hughes where nine former farm workers got land. This was contrary to what was planned by the government because its 1998 land policy document clearly stated that farm workers would also get land under the programme. The policy sought to resettle poor households in overcrowded Communal Areas, retrenched farm workers, special groups such as women, ex-combatants and agricultural graduates, (GoZ 1998). The case of this farm clearly shows that they were not considered as landless and they have resorted to land borrowing from some of the settlers who cannot utilise the whole of their plots. Land borrowing is when one is given land by someone who cannot utilise his/her land in return for cash, labour or the produce. One worker said,

We rent small pieces of land from those who got it but we face the problem of lack of inputs such as fertilizer but sometimes we harvest some maize but not enough for our families so we buy from those who would have harvested more.

This reveals that these workers have resorted to land borrowing in order to earn a living a process that increases demands on their labour and has both negative and positive returns. This increases their workload in that they have to do casual work as well as to grow their own food.

No farm workers were settled in most of the surrounding farms, except for those at Hughes farm because of the Headman who is also a former farm worker. The fact that the headman at this farm was a former farm worker has resulted in 15 former farm workers being resettled in what is commonly known as *kuma 5* meaning to say that they were given 5 acres as compared to 5 hectares which were given to new farmers/settlers. No farm worker was settled on the neighbouring farm (Kamsasa) as well as other surrounding farms. This is however different from other provinces where farms were set aside for farm workers. The FCTZ through stakeholder awareness workshops managed to influence three districts in Manicaland and Mashonaland East Province to set aside farms specifically for the resettlement of former farm workers. In Manicaland province, 166 former workers were resettled in Mutare rural district and between 80 and 90 were resettled in Mutasa district. In Mashonaland east, 122 former farm workers were resettled in ward 23 of Murehwa district, however they still face production constraints to fully support their livelihoods and social reproduction, (Chambati and Magaramombe, 2008). Considering the numbers, one cannot deny the fact of all the provinces Mashonaland central is the only province where few farm workers were resettled. The table below shows the number of farm workers who got land in different provinces, based on surveys early in the land reform process.

Table 1: Farm worker communities in the fast track program, July 2000-March 2001

Province	# of farms fast tracked	#. Of communal house holds Resettled	#. of farm worker households resettled
Mash Central	56	3 099	216
Mash East	110	9 001	630
Mash West	109	6 184	371
Total	257	18 284	1 217

Source FCTZ documents

In the 1980s resettlement programme former farm workers did get some land. Rutherford noted that some former farm workers were able to acquire rights to land in communal areas through local Chiefs and some were resettled in the first phase of resettlement in 1980. Most workers who are Zimbabweans still maintain ties with their rural relatives and they usually go back to their rural homes during the agricultural season to practice subsistence agriculture in order to mitigate impacts of food shortages. One of the workers who has his rural home in Mudhindo area in Guruve said that his family resides there and they only come to Tengenenge in winter. When asked those who do not have rural homes if they had any small pieces of land one referred to the stones as their fields, one said: We are in the field right now, these stones are our field.

These solely depend on the carvings for survival because of lack of other economic and social capital. This implies that those of foreign origins are hardest hit, as they have no land to cultivate. Coupled with the fact that the government is not providing social safety nets to these people, they only have returns from carving and casual work to depend on, for food returns that are inadequate to support their families.

Gendered effects

There were some women sculptors at the farm, and they agreed with their male counterparts that the FTLRP has greatly affected them. One of the women there who is regarded as the senior amongst them all directly said,

I used to make money with these stones, I even went abroad just because of the stones and when I came back I bought myself a kombi but these days things are not working out such that I sold the kombi for me to survive.

This means that female sculptors were also affected the same way as their male counterparts but although they (women) were affected, they acknowledged that their situation is better than that of men because western buyers prefer products done by women than men and even male sculptors acknowledged that women are better than they are. They also said that they cannot even send their children to school now because there is no permanent/consistent source of income under the era of multiple currencies.

Historically women were not considered for the posts of farm managers and paymasters, they were only there to provide manual labour in the fields under the supervision of a male farm manager. Since they had no experience and expertise they work as manual labourers for the Chinese, they are employed as

cooks and cleaners. In these positions they are lowly paid, also liable to firing at any time hence they have devised their own means to eke out a living. Most of the women at the farm noted that they resort to fishing as a means of survival; they said that they cannot even practice gardening because they do not have the land for gardening but they had small gardens prior to the FTLRP. They said that they practice fishing at the nearest dam they referred to as Mafiosi. One of them said: We usually go fishing in the Mafiosi dam so that we can have food.

They said that since the fishing is done on a small scale, they only eat hence this is not an income generating project. As for men, they said that during the off-season, they go hunting in a nearby game range to have food on the table. However it is against the laws of the government through the Department National Parks and Wildlife Management (DNPWM) to poach game in these reserves but for them to survive they continue to poach. They however noted that for them to survive on hunting, they usually sell the meat to other workers and new farmers to have money for other household needs. This means that although there maybe some constraints in relation to what makes people survive, people however always manoeuvre and find their way to survive.

Social service provision and access

As has been noted by other scholars (Mugwetsi and Balleis 1994), service provision from the pre independent period was biased towards urban centres. Colonialists only established health and education facilities in urban centres as these were the areas where the colonialists were concentrated. Although most former commercial farmers provided compound shops and other services for their workers, the only problem was in education and health provisions as most of these facilities were few or not provided at all. Most of the health services in these areas were the home based care programmes where untrained personnel provide health services and information/counselling. This has remained the norm in the post –land reform period with some changes but not adequate to resolve the problems of these workers.

As for education, the workers noted that the nearest school was far from their places of work. The only school is located very far away from all the farms under study and the respondents stated that distance is not the problem, but cited school fees as the major problem for secondary school children. However, they praised the inclusive government for providing free primary education for those in rural areas, which was done in June this year. This has relieved them of one burden, but they still need to raise school fees when a child has to proceed to secondary education. This has resulted in most of the children attaining only primary education, as most parents cannot afford those fees. They also acknowledged the efforts of the state under the Public Assistance programme for paying fees for the orphans through the Basic Education Assistance Module (BEAM). These services are provided to every orphan whether of a late farm worker or any person. Although they acknowledged this, they however noted some of the shortcomings of such a programme and said that its presence is erratic. They also noted that the programme is not all-inclusive, instead of catering for the underprivileged; it is catering for some of the children whose parents are well up and are not orphaned.

Although the school is there, there is the problem of lack of professional teachers as most of the qualified teachers are not willing to work in these resettlement areas for different reasons. Most of the teachers at this school are temporary teachers. The main fear of these qualified teachers is that of political violence as most of them are regarded as supporters of the Movement for Democratic Change (MDC), hence susceptible to torture in times of elections or in post election periods. The workers

revealed that many teachers were beaten in all the elections from 2000 up to now and most of them did not come back after the elections in March 2008 due to the post election violence.

The nearest clinic before the FTLRP was located about 60km away from the farms under study. The new clinic was established in 2007 when the government decided to use the house of the former commercial farmer at Kamsasa as a clinic. However, the workers clearly stated that they still face some challenges in accessing these services despite them being closer. The workers at Tengenenge compared the former owner to the new one, praising the former that he used to provide transport and assistance in times of illness. One of them said,

The owner of this area before the FTLRP used to provide transport in situations of illness but these days you have carry your ill person to the clinic at your own expense.

This reveals the difference between the old owner and the new owner with the workers praising the former who, despite of the clinic being very far from the farm, used to provide transport to the sick all the way to Guruve. The new owner does not even take them to the new clinic, which is only 18km away, a shorter distance than the 60km of before. Although the people complained about the attitude of the new owner, they acknowledged the efforts by the state to establish a clinic at Kamsasa farm in 2007. From the colonial to the postcolonial era, service provision has been biased towards cities and towns and this has persisted even in the post-2000 land reform era. Most farm workers could not access health services due to their absence in the commercial farms. They further revealed that they only accessed what is called community home based care (CHBC)² which is the provision of knowledge and drugs at the community level with untrained personnel.

In terms of medical provision, the situation at Hughes farm was similar to that at Tengenenge because the nearest clinic was in Guruve centre, which is more than 50 km away from the farm. Kamsasa clinic has now solved the problem of travelling long distances to access health services. The commercial farmers never provided health services but in times of disasters, they provided workers with transport to the clinic. The workers therefore praised the government for providing such services closer to their work places and residential areas. However, although such services have been provided, there is dire lack of professional staff and shortage of medicine. This can be attributed to the fact that the country has been experiencing brain drain for the past ten years as medical practitioners have been leaving the country for greener pastures. This implies that the health sector has been facing a lot challenges since 1999, and this has affected the lives of the general populace who were supposed to get these services.

The workers from Kamsasa also faced the same problem in relation to health provision since all had to travel to Guruve centre. Since the clinic was established at this farm, the workers never complained about the distance to the hospital but cited the problem of lack of money to access some of the services. They said that they have no permanent and secure employment hence they cannot afford some of the services which are offered at the clinic as well as lack of personnel that has affected the country from 2000 up to 2008. They also pointed out that prior to the land reform programme, their situation was better because the former owner used to provide transport to the hospital although it was some kilometers away from the farm. From what the workers from the other farms above said, it becomes

²CHBC is the provision of health services at local level with the old aged being the providers of these services and people consult these people for any health problem. However, these programmes are not adequate to meet the health needs of the local people.

clear that former white commercial farmers used to provide transport in times of illness which is now a thing of the past because even those who are employing permanent labour cannot provide such services. In addition, since most of these workers are no longer permanent workers, no one is prepared to provide in either cash or kind. Chambati and Magaramombe (2008) also found out that the newly resettled farmers are not able to provide the same services, which were provided by the former white commercial farmers even to those who are permanent workers.

From the data above it can be concluded that service provision has been a problem from pre-independence to the post-independent period with it being slightly solved in the post-FTLRP. However, the problem of lack of professional staff has continued to affect the effectiveness of health service provision. The workers clearly stated that the clinic at Kamsasa farm has two nurses only and the clinic is supposed to cater for both the workers and the settlers.

Access to food

Although food procurement has always been a problem for farm workers, the FTLRP has worsened their situation in that most of them are no longer receiving the monthly groceries they used to get from their former employers. As for those at Tengenenge farm, only those who are still working in the administration department are given these monthly groceries but all those who are not administrators are not receiving these. Before the FTLRP, all the workers used to get these groceries regardless of whether one was an administrator or not. This was also the case with all the commercial farms because all the former farm owners used to provide groceries and credit facilities for all their workers. The workers used to get some groceries and some cash in advance and the money will be deducted at the end of month. As has been noted above the administrators at Tengenenge farm were complaining about the groceries they were getting saying that it was not enough to sustain them.

When asked the permanent farm workers at Hughes farm how they are surviving under the new system they said that their life has changed and said that they no longer get some of the grocery they used to receive every month saying that now it is not on a monthly basis. One respondent, who is a tractor driver said,

We used to get grocery at the end of every month but we no longer get those on a monthly basis because the former owner no longer stays here so he only brings groceries whenever he comes.

Of note is the fact that although the workers were being ill treated in the period prior to the FTLRP, the programme has worsened their situation. Chambati and Magaramombe (2008) point out that there are various benefits provided to farm workers as part of their remuneration for their labour services in addition to the wages and these included housing, fuel, food rations, land to grow crops, annual leave, funeral assistance and protective clothing. However, few new settlers are providing these services in the post FTLRP period.

All the workers are now in to casual labour for them to survive and they are getting food in return for their labour not money. They prefer food not money because the money they get from casual labour is not enough to buy them some of the basic commodities. Although they work as casuals, they state that they only do so during the agricultural season hence they face more problems during the off-season when there is less or no agricultural income. Those who practice irrigation agriculture in this area are

very few because of financial constraints although they are a lot of dams in the area under study so it is very difficult for them to get money all year round.

These workers are also not getting any assistance from the state as is done in communal areas. The relationship between the state and non-governmental organisations (NGO's) in Zimbabwe has been that of mistrust because the government felt that the NGO's will be extending their power to the rural populace which was the stronghold of ZANU PF. Successive droughts and political instability has been affecting the country since 2000 but no food handouts were provided for these workers because they were also viewed as being in support of the former white commercial farmers. Chambati and Magaramombe, (2008) notes that NGO's such as Save the Children UK wound up its operations and handed over aspects of its programme to the FCTZ in 2002. From the information that I got, not even a single humanitarian organisation has operated in these areas because when I asked about any help in times of drought one of the people who worked in the administration department said; "Even in times of droughts we have never received any help from independent organisations".

Those who were provided with food aid were those in communal areas only and new farm owners who were from some communal areas used to receive the assistance from NGO's. Chambati and Magaramombe (2008) concluded that ironically during the droughts of 2002 and 2004, despite the humanitarian principle of aid based on need, very few donors including the UN agencies such as the WFP were initially willing to support humanitarian activities in newly resettled areas.

Conclusion: Livelihood and survival strategies of former farm workers

Farm workers used different mechanisms to cope with the changes caused by the FTLRP. The government is offering no help to these workers since the implementation of the programme in 1999. The workers employ different mechanisms depending on the types of activities at the farm but most of them are being employed as casual workers in the new mines established after the programme, some as casual workers in the farms of those who got land. For them to have a relish they resort to fishing and poaching in the reserves. As compared to other areas such as Kadoma, there is no informal gold panning in Guruve, thus survival strategies for former farm workers should not be seen as uniform but vary depending on region.

Although it was a noble idea to resettle people on the commercial lands, others were sidelined in the process. Farm workers were not adequately considered in all the land reform programmes from 1980 up to the recent one. Coupled to this, union members, especially leaders of such unions like GAPWUZ, are not welcomed in these areas and this has left workers more vulnerable as they do not have anywhere to air their grievances as workers. Furthermore, although these workers do have union representatives they usually reside in urban areas and it is very difficult for the workers to report their cases. This was the situation of farm workers even before the FTLRP and this is furthered by the general belief that the workers are foreigners hence they are treated as slaves.

The workers were also supposed to receive land under the land reform programme but they were not adequately considered as landless. The government instead of following what was stipulated in land policy document it went on to resettle people without taking farm workers seriously. Although some got land, like those at Hughes farm, they still face the problem of accessing inputs and they are not receiving

any help from either the state or non-state actors. As has been shown there are few former workers who got land in Mashonaland central as compared to other provinces.

As workers, they are under the LRA but they said they do not even know its provisions as these are not availed to them and if they are provided, they still face challenges in that most of them cannot read and write. The government and labour organisations should therefore make sure that the provisions of the LRA popularised to these workers so as to know their rights. Although these workers have been experiencing this even before the FTLRP, their situation is now worse because they are not tied to one employer, thus anyone who needs labour can hire at any time.

From the field survey evidence, one cannot deny the fact that farm workers have been affected socially, politically and economically. Socially because families were disintegrated, politically because they are now subject to violence because they are said to be in support of the whites and economically because they now have insecure employment. The data shows that most of the workers lost their jobs; some no longer have accommodation because the new settlers drove them away and they are using the houses that used to be for the workers.

The absence of social safety nets after the FTLRP is also a problem in most of the resettlement areas. Most of the NGO's which acted as safety nets left these areas long back due to political and ideological differences. Although the state has constructed some schools and clinics in these areas, they are understaffed because most trained personnel are not willing to work in such areas for fear of being victimised. The government is offering nothing to solve the wholesale destruction of the livelihoods of these workers.

References

Chambati, W. and Magaramombe, G. (2008). 'The abandoned question: Farm workers'. in S. Moyo, K. Helliker and T. Murisa, (eds). *Contested Terrain; Land Reform and Civil Society in Contemporary Zimbabwe*. Harare: AIAS.

Government of Zimbabwe. (1998). *Land Reform And Resettlement Programme Phase 2; A Policy Framework and Project Document*. Harare: Government Printers.

Magaramombe, G. (2004). 'The impact of land redistribution on commercial farm workers'. in M. Masiwa, (ed). *Post-Independence Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Controversies and impact on the Economy*. Harare: GM and S Printers.

Masiwa, M. and Chigejo, O. (2003). *The Agrarian Reform in Zimbabwe: Sustainability and Empowerment of Rural Community*, Zimbabwe: IDS-UZ Publications.

Marongwe, N. (2002). *Conflicts Over Land and Other Natural Resources in Zimbabwe*. Harare: ZERO.

Rutherford. B. (2008). 'Zimbabwean land redistribution: Globalisation and neoliberal narratives and transnational connections'. In J. Mensah (ed). *Neoliberal and Globalisation in Africa; Contestations on the Embattled Continent*. United States: Palgrave, Macmillan.

Rutherford, B. (2001). *Working on the Margins: Black Workers, White Farmers in Post-Colonial Zimbabwe*. Avondale: Weaver Press.

Sachikonye, L .M. (2003). 'Land reform for poverty reduction? Social exclusion and farm workers in Zimbabwe.' A Paper Presented For a Conference on 'Staying Poor: Chronic Poverty and Development Policy'. Organized by the IDMP, Manchester.

Full list of Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Papers

- Mujeyi, K. (2010). 'Emerging agricultural markets and marketing channels within newly resettled areas of Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 1*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Mandizadza, S. (2010). 'The Fast Track Land Reform Programme and livelihoods in Zimbabwe: A case study of households at Athlone Farm in Murehwa District'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 2*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Mbereko, A. (2010). 'An assessment of the outcomes of "fast track" land reform policy in Zimbabwe on rural livelihoods: the case of Gudo ward (Mazvihwa communal area) and Chirere area (A1 Resettlement area)'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 3*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Mashava, R. (2010). 'Confronting water challenges in a micro-irrigation scheme in the Umzingwane Catchment of Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 4*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Chingarande, S.D. (2010). 'Gender and livelihoods in Nyabamba A1 Resettlement Area, Chimanimani district of Manicaland Province in Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 5*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Marimira, S.C. (2010). 'Institutions, leadership and service delivery in new Resettlement Areas of Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 6*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Zikhali, P. (2010). 'Fast Track Land Reform Programme, tenure security and agricultural productivity in Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 7*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Chamunorwa, A. (2010). 'Comparative analysis of agricultural productivity between newly resettled farmers and communal farmers in Mashonaland East province'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 8*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Mujere, J. (2010). 'Land, graves and belonging: Land reform and the politics of belonging in newly resettled farms in Gutu, 2000-2009'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 9*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Murisa, T. (2010). 'Farmer groups, collective action and production constraints: Cases from A1 settlements in Goromonzi and Zvimba'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 10*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Matondi, G. (2010). 'Traditional authority and Fast Track Land Reform: Empirical evidence from Mazowe District, Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 11*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Muchara, B. (2010). 'Implications of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme on markets and market relationships for livestock, cotton and maize products in Mwenezi District of Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 12*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Mutangwi, G. (2010). 'The changing patterns of farm labour after the Fast Track Land Reform Programme: The case of Guruve District'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 13*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Chigumira, E. (2010). 'My land, my resource: Assessment of the impact of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme on the natural environment, Kadoma District, Zimbabwe'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 14*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.
- Moyo, P. (2010). 'Land reform in Zimbabwe and urban livelihoods transformation'. *Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe Working Paper 15*. Livelihoods after Land Reform Project. South Africa: PLAAS.