



# Livelihoods after Land Reform in Zimbabwe

## Working Paper 15

Land Reform in Zimbabwe and Urban Livelihoods  
Transformation

*Philani Moyo*

Department of Sociology and Industrial Sociology, University of Fort  
Hare, South Africa.

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](http://www.larl.org.za)).**

# Summary

This paper examines changes in livelihoods of the urban working classes, urban informal economy traders, the unemployed and urban poor who were allocated land under the A1 model during the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. Data collected in poor high density residential areas—Makokoba and Mzilikazi—in Bulawayo between August 2006 and April 2007 and in August 2009 indicates that a cross-section of men and women working as lowly skilled industrial workers, informal traders and some unemployed urban poor were beneficiaries of the land reform programme. For most of these beneficiaries, this is their first time to have direct access to land as they previously had no access to land in their overcrowded villages of birth. This new access to land has transformed their urban livelihoods.

Some beneficiaries are producing staple food crops for subsistence purposes which they transfer to urban areas for household consumption with their urban based families. Those who produce small surpluses are selling it in the city raising income for other household expenditure; some are also bartering surpluses for an assortment of basic household commodities. The livelihoods of some urban women who were not direct beneficiaries of the land reform programme have also been indirectly transformed since they are the main entrepreneurs behind the thriving barter trade in the A1 farming communities.

The social class of these beneficiaries who have had their livelihoods transformed suggests that contrary to some widely held beliefs, it is not only politicians, powerful businessmen and elites who benefited from the land reform programme, but, the urban working classes and poor benefited as well. However, there are gender imbalances. There is a predominance of men in the A1 farmers cohort suggesting that most urban female headed households' livelihoods were largely not transformed by the land reform programme.

# Contents

<b>Summary</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Bulawayo: Research Context and the Environs</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Research Methodology</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Livelihoods Transformation for Urban Based A1 Farm Beneficiaries</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Barter Trade and the Transformation of Urban Women’s Livelihoods</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>9</b>



# Acronyms

FPL	Food Poverty Line
FTLRP	Fast Track Land Reform Programme
HDAs	High Density Areas
NR	Natural Region
TCPL	Total Consumption Poverty Line
ZIMVAC	Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee

# Introduction

This paper explores the impacts of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) on the livelihoods of a range of urban peoples in Bulawayo, based on fieldwork between August 2006 and April 2007, and then in August 2009. It addresses the urban-rural and rural-urban dynamics of the land reform which have not been adequately examined so far. The paper identifies that a variety of urban based people that include urban working classes, urban informal economy traders, the unemployed and urban poor were allocated land under the A1 model during the FTLRP. What is unique about these beneficiaries is their spatial location since all live in the city and the fact that it is their first time to have direct access and 'ownership' of land in a rural setting. Through this new access to land, they have been able to transform their livelihoods. The beneficiaries are producing food for their own household consumption. The contribution of this rural production to food security and healthy nutrition is probably its most important asset. Therefore, the A1 farms offer poor and low income urban consumers access to food outside of urban food market channels through own production.

In addition to production for their own consumption, significant amounts of food are produced for other categories of the urban population. In some seasons, the urban based farmers produce surpluses which they sell in urban food markets raising income for household expenditure. Urban areas offer wide commerce opportunities for these farmers; not just in terms of trading in unprocessed farm produce but also in terms of processing these into quality food manufactures with added value retailing at higher prices. This is primarily because large cities such as Bulawayo function as a wholesale hub and have the market and manufacturing capacity to turn raw agricultural produce into more specialised food products.

A1 farming communities also provide economic opportunities to urban based entrepreneurial women. Some of these women are engaged in barter trade with residents of the A1 farms. They trade basic household consumables and second hand clothing for food which is transferred to the city for household consumption or sell in urban markets. Notwithstanding these positive impacts of the FTLRP on the livelihoods of some urban groups, there is however a dearth of research in this area. Lack of research on this theme is partly based on a lack of full understanding or appreciation of the diversity of beneficiaries under A1. While it is true that most beneficiaries under A1 were from rural areas—justifying increased research focus in these areas—it is erroneous to ignore urban based beneficiaries in land reform impact assessments as they are also an important cohort which needs examination in order to fully understand and appreciate whether and how the FTLRP transformed people's livelihoods.

The main conclusions that emerge from an examination of A1 farm production activities and spin-off food marketing and barter trading activities is that the FTLRP has so far played an important part in addressing food insecurity and poverty reduction among urban poor and low-income working class groups. Evidence from urban based A1 farm beneficiaries suggests that their livelihoods have been transformed due to their new 'ownership' of land. They are not only directly producing food for household consumption but some are partly producing for informal commercial purposes. At the same time, some A1 farming communities are now centres of barter trade. The rural farmers are barter trading their food produce for consumables supplied by urban women who conduct business in these remote A1 farming communities which lack basic social, commercial and retail amenities. Before going into further detail about this transformation of the urban poor and urban low-income groups' livelihoods, there is need to illuminate the research context, community of Bulawayo and its environs.

# Bulawayo: Research Context and the Environs

Research for this paper was conducted in Makokoba and Mzilikazi townships in Bulawayo. Bulawayo is the second largest city in Zimbabwe and is located 435 kilometres from the capital Harare in the south western part of the country. Similar to most of Zimbabwe's cities, Bulawayo's formal residential structure is divided into high, medium and low density residential areas based on property values, size and population density. In general terms, high density areas (HDAs) are predominantly densely populated, have smaller property sizes with lower real estate value compared to medium and low density areas respectively. Makokoba and Mzilikazi are HDAs. Relative to other HDAs in Bulawayo, these two townships are home to most of Bulawayo's poor, needy, deprived and disadvantaged urban populace (Habakkuk Trust 2003) and have been so since the colonial era. Makokoba was constructed in 1894 and was the first African township meant to accommodate poor male migrant workers (Kaarsholm 1999). With increasing labour demands of the urban industrial economy, colonial authorities established Mzilikazi township in 1946 as another township for poor male migrant workers (Kaarsholm 1999). Therefore, since the colonial era these two townships have remained home to poor low-income earners in Bulawayo (Kaarsholm 1999).

The two townships are also Bulawayo's most run-down and crowded HDAs. Often a whole extended family lives in a one or two bedroom house (Nkomo 2003). The reasons for this overcrowding are obvious since when these two townships were initially constructed by colonial authorities they were meant to accommodate migrant male single workers not families. However, since independence these townships have been home to thousands of African families. Consequently, housing and sanitary conditions in most sections of these two townships are largely squalid.

All A1 farm beneficiaries who are the subject of this paper were resident in these two townships. However, they were not allocated these smallholder farms in Bulawayo province, but in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South provinces which are predominantly the feeder rural provinces for the city of Bulawayo. Using Vincent and Thomas (1960) and the Zimbabwe Surveyor General's (1998) division of Zimbabwe into 5 agro-ecological regions based mainly on the quantity of rainfall, soil quality and the type of agricultural production these regions can support, Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South provinces are in natural regions IV and V. Compared to natural regions (NR) I, II and III; NRs IV and V have poor land quality and erratic rainfall patterns. Despite this relatively poor soil quality and unreliable rainfall patterns, subsistence crop cultivation is a key part of rural livelihoods in NRs IV and V. In line with this rural livelihoods economy in Matabeleland North and Matabeleland South provinces, some A1 beneficiaries, including all who were part of this research were smallholder subsistence farmers.

## Research Methodology

A qualitative approach was used in this research. A qualitative approach was the most appropriate in such a study due to the fact that it seeks answers to questions by examining various socio-political settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings. What also made it suitable is the fact that it attempts to understand human behaviour and institutions by getting to know the persons involved and their values, rituals, symbols, beliefs, and emotions (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2000, Denzin and Lincoln 1998) and further involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. Through this approach which examined respondents in their natural settings, attempting to make sense

of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of meanings the people brought to them (Denzin and Lincoln 1998:3), a total of 6 A1 farmers were identified in a sample of 61 households which had been systematically selected as part of a larger PhD research project on urban food insecurity, coping strategies and resistance in Bulawayo conducted in 2006-07. Four of these A1 farmers were resident in Makokoba with the remainder in Mzilikazi. The other 8 households which complete the sample for this study were purposively selected using the snow balling technique in August 2009. Four were selected in Mzilikazi and the other four in Makokoba. Triangulation, which refers to the use of two or multiple methods of data collection that are employed independently of one another but are focused as tightly as possible upon the particular research questions being investigated to achieve broader and often better results (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 2000; Denzin and Lincoln 1998; Jones 1996; Brewer and Hunter 1989) was used to collect data in the 2006-07 cohort. The primary research instruments that were used then are in-depth semi-structured interviews, key informant interviews, case studies and non-participant observations. In-depth semi-structured interviews were the primary data collection instrument in the 2009 cohort.

## **Livelihoods Transformation for Urban Based A1 Farm Beneficiaries**

There is no doubt that questions and debates remain about who benefited most from the FTLRP in terms of farm size, number of farms, fertility of land on allocated farms and the level of productivity on these farms. While that is likely to remain the case for a long time, empirical evidence from fieldwork conducted between August 2006 and April 2007 in Bulawayo supplemented by further data collected in August 2009 (again in Bulawayo) indicates that differentiated groups of the urban poor and low-income earners—regardless of political affiliation or persuasion—such as informal market traders, unemployed, lowly-paid industrial workers, civil servants, war veterans, pensioners were beneficiaries under the A1 model. The FTLRP therefore broadened access to land to various social segments across the urban and rural divide. The FTLRP has thus partially reversed machinations of settler colonial rule from 1890 to 1979 which sought to turn most of the peasantry into full-time industrial workers disconnected from the land (Yeros 2002; Moyana 2002). It has reconnected some urban based low-income earners and the urban poor with the land thereby redressing what land policies in Zimbabwe had failed to do since 1980. As I further argue below, the FTLRP has given them a valuable asset that goes beyond being a means with which to make a living or build livelihoods. Land, a component of natural capital (Carney 1998; Scoones 1998; DFID 1999), has given meaning to their world and afforded them capability to act.

A distinctive factor about the 14 A1 farm beneficiaries who were respondents in this research is their spatial location. All of them applied for land in their rural districts of birth (in Matabeleland North and South) during the FTLRP and were duly allocated. They were, however, not resident on their A1 farms in the rural areas. They all lived in Bulawayo suggesting that a new socio-economic group of urban based semi-absentee landlords was created by the FTLRP. These urban poor and working class urban based semi-absentee landlords are different from colonial era industrial workers who existed in a dual economy. The colonial era industrial workers resided in working men quarters in cities specifically to supply labour to the colonial economy whilst their families remained in their rural homes. They therefore retained close family ties and paid regular visits to their homes in rural areas. The cohort of A1 beneficiaries under discussion here no longer subsisted along dual economy lines. They were urban based with their families whilst 'owning' A1 land in the rural areas. They had all ventured into subsistence farming on their allocated smallholder pieces of land. During the planting, weeding and

harvesting season family members travelled to their farms to undertake the required agricultural work. When they were away in the city, they temporarily hired unemployed young men based in the rural areas popularly known as *abafana benkomo* (literally translated to cattle-herders) as farm caretakers in return for a variety of goods such as second-hand clothing, shoes, trainers and blankets.

The majority of the respondent households (12 in total) were practising mixed subsistence farming, i.e. rearing a few cattle, goats, donkeys and sheep while simultaneously doing food crop cultivation. A variety of crops ranging from the staple maize, wheat, finger millet, groundnuts, roundnuts, pumpkins, water melons and sweet reeds were produced on these A1 smallholder farms. The amount of harvests varied from season to season, due to, among other factors, erratic rainfall patterns, lack of finance to purchase proper hybrid maize seed, wheat and sorghum seeds suitable for their agro-ecological regions and non-application of the required fertiliser, herbicides and pesticides due to lack of the required capital. The contribution of this A1 farm production to food security and healthy nutrition is probably its most important asset. This was confirmed by the majority of respondents as demonstrated in the examples below:

Compared to last year my harvest was not that good this year. I only managed to harvest five bags of maize (one bag is equivalent to 50kgs), 2 buckets of round-nuts (one bucket is equivalent to 20kgs) and one bag of groundnuts this year. But last year I had nine bags of maize, four buckets of round-nuts and three buckets of groundnuts (Interview with Mr Thobani Ngulube, 20/08/2009, Mzilikazi).

I am a farmer in Nyamayendlovu and this is helping me...Last season I harvested four bags of maize and one bucket of groundnuts. That maize helped me a lot as I went twice to my new farm to collect it and bring it here to eat with my family...It was not much but it helped my family a lot (Interview with Mr Lovemore Ncube, 21/12/2006, Makokoba).

With minor variations across households, these examples closely resemble the average size of harvests by most of the respondent households. Even though these food crop harvests were by no means abundant; this demonstrates that these urban based A1 farm beneficiaries were directly producing food for household consumption. This rural food production was a response to inadequate, unreliable and irregular access to food in urban markets since at the time Zimbabwe had acute national and household food insecurity. Viewed from that perspective, the contribution of these food transfers from A1 farms to the food security of these urbanites becomes even more perceptible and paramount. Thus, A1 farming improved both food intake (through production entitlement) and the quality of food consumed since these urban based A1 farmers directly produced and ate fresh food. Since all previously held no land in the rural areas, this suggests that their livelihoods were transformed due to their new 'ownership' of land in the A1 communities. Physical production of food by poor and working class urbanites in A1 farms has also diversified their livelihood strategies. This production entitlement has expanded livelihood portfolios for these Zimbabweans living in predominantly cash driven exchange entitlement based urban economies. A1 farm 'ownership' also offers these poor and low income urban consumers access to relatively affordable food outside urban market channels through own production.

The transformation of livelihoods for these urban based A1 farmers also involved seasonal splits of some households. Seven nuclear urban households reported splitting during the planting, weeding and harvesting period; wives and children were sent to the A1 farm to do the agricultural work while male partners remained in the city either formally working or trading informally. Whether a household was split or not, a common factor across all households is that food transfers from A1 communities to the

city were pronounced. With the decline of the urban income advantage at the height of Zimbabwe's economic, political and social crisis between 2002 and early 2009, far more food was brought in from A1 farms, which greatly enhanced urban residents' vested interest in maintaining their social and economic links to these rural communities. This increased reliance on these food transfers does not only demonstrate the transformation of urban livelihoods for A1 farm beneficiaries but it also points to the fact that the livelihoods for some low-income urban households and urban poor in Bulawayo resultantly straddled two different production systems—the urban and rural. They are no longer exclusively reliant on cash income earned in the urban setting for their consumption needs but direct food production in the A1 communities is now also central to their livelihoods. This suggests that access to land for food production under the A1 model partly addressed poverty reduction among some urban poor and low-income groups.

The importance of these urban groups directly producing food for consumption purposes in A1 farms also has to be viewed against Zimbabwe's growing urban poverty levels and the consequences of this on urban food security. Even though Zimbabwe's rural areas remain the locus of poverty compared to urban areas (GoZ 2003; GoZ 2004), there is evidence that since 2000 urban households, especially those in high density areas, proportionally became poorer due to the deteriorating macro-economic environment, characterised by hyperinflation, negative GDP growth and shrinking formal job opportunities (GoZ 2003). By the end of 2003, 72 percent of urban households in Zimbabwe were living below the Total Consumption Poverty Line (TCPL) and deemed to be poor (Potts 2006; Tibaijuka 2005, Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee (ZIMVAC) 2003; Munro 2003; IRIN 2004). This figure had nearly doubled since 1995 (ZIMVAC 2003; IRIN 2004). This 72 percent under the TCPL included 51 percent deemed to be very poor, meaning that these were living under the Food Poverty Line (FPL) hence they could not afford to buy enough food, let alone anything else (Potts 2006; Tibaijuka 2005, ZIMVAC 2003; Munro 2003). Within the high density areas (such as Makokoba and Mzilikazi); 77 per cent of households were under the TCPL and 57 per cent under the FPL (Potts 2006; Tibaijuka 2005, ZIMVAC 2003). In these areas, where the majority of Zimbabwe's urban people live, the proportion below the TCPL had thus roughly trebled in twelve years (Potts 2006; Tibaijuka 2005, ZIMVAC 2003). Taken together, these indices demonstrate an extraordinarily rapid decline of urban living standards and increase in urban poverty in Zimbabwe. Such an increase in urban poverty made urban food insecurity primarily a problem of access by the urban poor. This is primarily because in urban settings, lack of income translates more directly into lack of access to food than in a rural setting. In such a context, A1 farms are therefore providing a complementary strategy to reduce urban poverty and food insecurity among beneficiary households. They are playing an important role in enhancing household urban food security. At a general level, food production in A1 farms by these urban groups complements communal areas smallholder agriculture, medium and large scale commercial farming's contribution to national food security and increases the efficiency of the national food system through increased food production in the rural hinterland.

There is however need to reiterate that this paper is not claiming that rural-urban food transfers are a new phenomenon in Zimbabwe resulting from the FTLRP. Traditional rural-urban food transfers along dual economy lines have always been part of some urban residents' livelihood strategies since the colonial era. Attention is being drawn to the fact that rural-urban food transfers driven by a new class of low-income earners and poor A1 semi-absentee land owners has emerged in Zimbabwe. Although closely related with traditional rural-urban food transfers, the key difference is in the spatial location of the land owners, who are also the farmers and consumers of the food transfers. What is also distinctive about these A1 beneficiaries is the fact that they all indicated that they had no direct access to land in rural areas before the FTLRP. Their livelihoods have thus been diversified due to their new ownership of

land. This suggests that production entitlement is a new phenomenon for some poor and low-income urban residents in Zimbabwe. The FTLRP can therefore be classified as a momentous programme in the livelihoods of some urban households since it enabled them to expand their livelihood portfolios.

In parallel to the household food security benefits, A1 farm 'ownership' has positive economic impacts on beneficiary households. Growing your own food saves household expenditures on food. Since urban poor people in developing countries generally spend a substantial part of their income (between 50 & 70%) on food (Ruaf Foundation 2009), by farming their own food, these urban based A1 beneficiaries are therefore saving money. Further economic benefits are enjoyed by those households transferring surplus farm produce to the urban areas for sell. This was being done by some of the households, with one respondent stating that; "I normally bring surplus maize from my farm to sell here at the market. I do raise some money to buy other things" (Mr Hlalani Ncube, interviewed on 15/12/2006, Makokoba). Another respondent noted that:

...Last year I had nine bags of maize, four buckets of round-nuts and three buckets of groundnuts. I brought some round-nuts here and sold them in the neighbourhood (Interview with Mr Thobani Ngulube, 20/08/2009, Mzilikazi)

This suggests that while a large part of the agricultural production on A1 farms is for self-consumption, surpluses are being traded. Fresh farm products are being sold on roadsides in the urban hinterland and within HDA neighbourhoods. The importance of this marketed produce both in volume and economic value should not be underestimated in terms of its contribution to household incomes. Living in a cash-driven urban economy permits these A1 beneficiaries with surpluses to take advantage of diverse urban economic opportunities while also awarding them a huge competitive market place for their produce. While that is currently the case, with improved access to sufficient farming inputs and better farming techniques in the A1 farming areas, there is huge potential for these A1 farmers to increase their surpluses which will not only make them raise more income but further contribute to national food availability and security.

The above evidence clearly demonstrates that access to land has transformed livelihoods of some urban based A1 beneficiaries. Although A1 farmers do not have title deeds which could guarantee them tenure security, their access to state land gives them a livelihood resource they can rely on in the medium to long term. This A1 farm 'ownership' by urban based individuals has also expanded rural-urban and urban-rural linkages with increased flows of people, farm inputs, farm produce and capital at different interconnected levels between urban areas and A1 farms. In addition, A1 farm 'ownership' also offers a new source of employment for urban groups such as the unemployed, unskilled, semi-skilled and poor in search of alternative forms of livelihood outside the urban hinterland. These A1 farming activities also have potential to stimulate the development and expansion of related micro-enterprises that can generate employment and income for other people. For example, the production of necessary agricultural inputs, the processing, packaging and marketing of farm produce are potential spin-off enterprises that may partly owe their continued existence and profitability to the birth of new A1 farmers. It can also be argued that with improved transport, communication, health, educational, recreational and social infrastructure, A1 farms can also be an attractive destination for beneficiaries considering relocation or retiring from the city to pursue agricultural production in a rural economy.

# Barter Trade and the Transformation of Urban Women's Livelihoods

The FTLRP has also transformed urban based women's livelihoods through barter trade. This research identified four entrepreneurial women who were barter traders. All four women had been previously unemployed and not involved in informal economy activities. Through their barter trade system, they were buying very cheap low quality readily available items on the market such as washing and bathing soap, toothpaste, salt, second-hand clothing and taking these to the A1 farming communities for barter trade. They bartered these items for the staple maize, wheat, sorghum, groundnuts, round-nuts and beans which they then transferred to the city for sell and household consumption. As two of the women put it:

There are no shops in the Fort Rixon resettlement areas as you know. So I buy things like bathing and washing soap, toothpaste, salt and clothes and take them there. These items are in demand there, so I give them what they want and they give me groundnuts and maize in return...I bring the maize and groundnuts here for sell and some to eat with my family (Interview with Mrs Ntombhele Mlalazi, 22/02/2007, Mzilikazi).

I started doing this exchange business in Umguzu two years ago. I go to the farms and stay there for some days looking for people to exchange my second-hand clothes and washing soap with. Although it's not an easy business, I usually get customers who are willing to give me maize in return for my goods. I then sell the maize here in town. (Interview with Miss Priscilla Dube, 21/08/2009, Makokoba).

Through barter trade, these women are thus partially contributing to their household food needs. This partial contribution to urban household consumption requirements was even more significant before 2009 when levels of urban food shortages and food insecurity were severe than they are now. The generation of income for other household expenditure through selling some of the food commodities acquired through barter is also noteworthy. In an urban economy, where most transactions for basic commodities and services require cash, the contribution of income raised through barter for these purposes cannot be overemphasised. This partial contribution of barter trade to these urban women's income and consumption requirements further confirms that some urbanites' livelihoods now straddle the rural-urban divide since they depend on food commodities produced in A1 farms. This reiterates the thesis that the FTLRP indeed transformed some urban working classes and urban poor's livelihoods.

Although this research only identified unemployed women as barter traders, it is not being suggested that they were the only urbanites in Bulawayo who used it as a strategy for livelihood diversification prior to and subsequent to the FTLRP. In any case, besides the gender and unemployment similarities of these four households, all their biographic and wealth characteristics, household heads educational levels and household sizes varied. The only underlying common characteristic of all four households is that barter trading is part of livelihood diversification which they ventured into from 2002-03 onwards. Therefore, for these households barter driven by A1 farm produce is a relatively new strategy in their livelihood portfolios.

## Conclusion

This paper has focused on the positive livelihoods transformational effects of the FTLRP on urban based A1 farm beneficiaries and some non-beneficiaries. It has drawn on empirical experiences of urban low-income workers, informal traders, unemployed and urban poor who were beneficiaries under the A1 model. It has also drawn on the testimonies of urban women who were not A1 beneficiaries but are realising positive livelihood changes due to the land reform programme. The findings indicate that the urban based A1 farm beneficiaries are largely producing staple food crops in their farms and transferring this to the city for consumption with their urban based families. This production entitlement is positively contributing to the food security of these urban households. Even though the significance and contribution of such direct food production to the livelihoods of these urban A1 farm beneficiaries was more apparent at the height of Zimbabwe's food insecurity between 2002 and early 2009, their livelihoods have been transformed in the medium to long term. In parallel with these consumption benefits, some A1 beneficiaries who manage to produce small surpluses are selling this in the city thereby raising income for other household expenditure. This income is valuable for their exchange entitlement in an urban economy where most services and commodities are transacted in cash. At the same time, barter trade has become prevalent in the A1 farming communities. Some farmers with little surpluses are bartering food produce for basic commodities and consumables. Through such barter the rural A1 farmers are accessing basics that are not readily available in their remote farming communities which lack basic social, commercial and retail amenities. On the other hand, this barter trade has transformed the livelihoods of urban women entrepreneurs who supply the basic commodities and consumables in exchange for staple food produce. These women are not only able to access food that they transfer to the city for household consumption, but some are retailing some of it in the city raising income for other household expenditure.

# References

- Brewer, J. and Hunter, A. (1989). *Multimethod Research: A Synthesis of Styles*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Carney, D. (1998). 'Implementing the Sustainable Rural Livelihoods Approach'. In D. Carney (ed). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: What Contributions Can We Make?* London: DFID.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds) (1998) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. California: Sage Publications.
- Department for International Development. (1999). 'Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets'. London: Department for International Development. available at: [http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance\\_sheets\\_pdfs/section2.pdf](http://www.livelihoods.org/info/guidance_sheets_pdfs/section2.pdf). accessed on 10 September 2009.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, C. and Nachmias, D. (2000). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. Sixth Edition. New York: Worth Publishers.
- Government of Zimbabwe. (2004). *Zimbabwe Millennium Development Goals: 2004 Progress Report*. Harare: Government of Zimbabwe.
- Government of Zimbabwe. (2003). *2003 Poverty Assessment Study Survey: Final Summary Report*. Harare: Ministry of Public Service, Labour and Social Welfare.
- Habakkuk Trust. (2003). 'The Food Situation in Bulawayo—A Case Study of Bulawayo Urban High Density Areas'. available at [http://www.kubatana.net/docs/foodse/habakkuk\\_food\\_byo\\_0306.pdf](http://www.kubatana.net/docs/foodse/habakkuk_food_byo_0306.pdf). accessed on 20 August 2009.
- IRIN (2004). 'Zimbabwe: Urban Residents Battle with Rising Prices'. 17 August, available at: [http://www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=42717&SelectRegion=Southern\\_Africa&SelectCountry=ZIMBABWE](http://www.irinnews.org/report.asp?ReportID=42717&SelectRegion=Southern_Africa&SelectCountry=ZIMBABWE). accessed on 29 November 2009.
- Jones, R.A. (1996). *Research Methods in the Social and Behavioural Sciences*. Sunderland: Sinauer Associates. Inc., Publishers.
- Kaarsholm, P. (1999). 'Siye pambili—which way forward? Urban development. culture and politics in Bulawayo'. In B. Raftopoulos and T. Yoshikuni (eds). *Sites of Struggle: Essays in Zimbabwe's Urban History*. Harare: Weaver Press.
- Moyana, H.V. (2002). *The Political Economy of Land in Zimbabwe*. Gweru: Mambo Press.
- Munro, L. T. (2003). 'A Social Safety Net for the Chronically Poor? Zimbabwe's Public Assistance in the 1990s'. available at [www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/conferencepapers/Munro.pdf](http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/conferencepapers/Munro.pdf). accessed on 1 December 2009.
- Nkomo, C (2003) 'Makokoba Township'. available at <http://www.guruve.com/gallery/artists/charlesnkomo/Y004.html>. accessed on 26 August 2009.

Potts, D. (2006) 'Restoring order? Operation Murambatsvina and the urban crisis in Zimbabwe'. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol 32, No 2, pp273-291.

Ruaf Foundation. (2009). 'Why is Urban Agriculture Important'. available at: <http://www.ruaf.org/node/513>. accessed on 22 December 2009.

Scoones, I. (1998). 'Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: A Framework for Analysis' *IDS Working Paper 72*. available at: <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/wp72.pdf>. accessed on 10 June 2007.

Tibaijuka, A. (2005). 'Report of the Fact Finding Mission to Zimbabwe to Assess the Scope and Impact of Operation Murambatsvina by the UN Special Envoy on Human Settlements Issues in Zimbabwe'. available at, [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/zimbabwe\\_22\\_07\\_05.pdf](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/zimbabwe_22_07_05.pdf). accessed on 22 December 2009.

Vincent, V., and Thomas, R.G. (1960). *An Agricultural Survey of Southern Rhodesia: Part 1: Agro-Ecological Survey*. Salisbury: Government Printers.

Yeros, P. (2002) 'Zimbabwe and the dilemmas of the left'. *Historical Materialism*. Vol 10, No 2, pp.3-15.

Zimbabwe Surveyor General. (1998). *Natural Agro-Ecological Regions of Zimbabwe*. Harare: Government Printers.

Zimbabwe Vulnerability Assessment Committee. (2003). 'Zimbabwe Emergency Food Security and Vulnerability Assessment Report No 3'. available at: <http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000470/index.php>. accessed on 20 November 2009.

## **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.