



Midlands State University
Established 2000

Our Hands, Our Minds, Our Destiny

FACULTY OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

THE HISTORY OF NYAFARU FARM AS A SITE OF POLITICAL STRUGGLES FROM
THE 1960s UP TO 2016

SHADRECK KUDZAI MABVUDZA

R136163J

SUPERVISOR: DR. T. MASHINGAIDZE

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement of Bachelor of Arts in History

Honours Degree in the Department of History

DECLARATION

I SHADRECK KUDZAI MABVUDZA, Registration Number (R136163J) do declare that this dissertation is my work and no one wrote on this topic before. The information from published and unpublished sources used in the research has been clearly acknowledged. As a result, this dissertation was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Bachelor of Arts Honours Degree in the Department of History at the Midlands State University.

Student's Signature:

Date:

Supervisor's Signature:

Date:

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my lovely and caring parents, young brothers and my only and one sister and not forgetting my former Secondary School Headmaster Mr Maoko and Primary teacher Mr Chekwa together with their families.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration	i
Dedication	ii
Table of contents	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Acronyms	vi
Glossary of terms	vii
Abstract	viii
Introduction	1
Research problem	6
Objectives	7
Research questions	7
Historical background	8
Literature review	11
Sources and methodologies	17
Chapter layout	19
Endnotes	21
CHAPTER ONE	22
THE GENESIS OF POLITICAL STRUGGLES AROUND NYAFARU FROM 1960 TO 1980.	22
1.0 Introduction	22
1.1 The Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and its influence on the political struggles around Nyafaru in 1960 to 1980.....	22
1.2 The Origin of the Political Struggles around Nyafaru in 1966	24
1.3 Women’s participation in the Tangwena Struggle	29
1.4 The participation of Tangwena People in the Armed Struggle 1970-1980.....	32
1.5 Conclusion.....	33
Endnotes	34
CHAPTER 2	36
NYAFARU FARM AND THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED IT TO BE THE SITE OF POLITICAL STRUGGLES AFTER INDEPENDENCE.....	36
2.0 Introduction	36

2.1 Formation of Nyafaru Development Company (NDC) and the Negative impacts of Colonial Policies on its Agenda	36
2.2 Post-Independence Era and the Mixed Views of the New Government to the Tangwena’s Plight	40
2.3 Corruption in NDC as a Factor in Political Struggle on Nyafaru Farm	43
2.4 Conclusion.....	46
Endnotes	47
CHAPTER 3	48
THE POLITICAL SQUABBLES AMONG THE TANGWENA PEOPLE OVER THE NYAFARU FARM FROM 2000 -2006.	48
3.0 Introduction	48
3.1 The Tangwena People Against the Nyafaru Development Company.....	48
3.2 Women in the Political Struggle of 2003 -2006.....	52
3.3 Similarities Between Nyafaru farm Political Struggles (2003-2006 and the FTLRP of 2000).....	55
3.4 Conclusion.....	58
Endnotes	60
CHAPTER 4	62
THE LEGAL BATTLE BETWEEN TANGWENA PEOPLE AND NYAFARU DEVELOPMENT COMPANY FROM 2004-2016.	62
4.0 Introduction	62
4.1 From Indirect to Direct Battle in the Court: The First Court Cases on the Public Violence	62
4.2 The Second Court Case on Land Rights	67
4.3 The “Rekai Kudzingwa Declaration”: The Tangwenians Road to Independence on their Land.....	69
4.4 Conclusion.....	72
Endnotes	74
CONCLUSION.....	75
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	78

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To achieve success in academic world there are requirements needed, not apart from the guidance and mentorship of key people in the field of specialization. Therefore, I would like to pass my gratitude to my all weather Supervisor Dr T. Mashingaidze due to his guidance and mentorship provided in writing this research. I would also acknowledge all the history department staff for providing me with influential support and assistance throughout the academic success and research. I also owe my gratitude to my parents for financial support throughout my academic duration and my former Secondary School Headmaster Mr B. Maoko and Mr Chekwa for providing me with information for this dissertation. Lastly, it is worth enough to give thanks to my academic friends like Mr Chaponda, Desire Chakanetsa, Tatenda Tserai, and Ivy Muringai for helping me with advices during the research period and editing my work.

ACRONYMS

BSAC	British South Africa Company
DCN	District Commissioner for Nyanga
ESAP	Economic Structural Adjustment Programme
FTLRP	Fast Track Land Reform Programme
LAA	Land Apportionment Act
MDC	Movement for Democratic Change
MPs	Members of Parliament
NDC	Nyafaru Development Company
NF	Nyafaru Farm
NPS	Nyanga Police Station
NSDC	Nyafaru School Development Committee
NSS	Nyafaru Secondary School
RDC	Rural District Council
SDCs	School Development Committee
TADA	Tangwena Development Association
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Union
ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe African National Union – Patriotic Front
ZIMASSET	Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio-Economic Transformation
ZIMBOARD	Zimbabwe Particle Board Company Mutare
ZRP	Zimbabwe Republic Police

GROSSARY OF TERMS

Gomo RaMugabe: The name of mountain near Nyafaru Farm called by the Tangwena people after Mugabe with assistance of Chief Rekai Tangwena escaped the settler troops through it during the armed struggle.

ABSTRACT

The project intended to review the political history behind the Nyafaru Farm that led it to be the site of the political struggles in the Tangwena community from the 1960s to 2016. From the study, there are three main political factors identified that contributed to brought Nyafaru Farm as site of political struggles in Tangwena. Firstly, the land rights contradictions between the Tangwena people and the white farmer Hanmer during colonial era in 1966. The Tangwena people claimed that they have the ancestral land right on the Tangwena land, while the white farmer argued that the land was a European land, using the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 as his land right. The political struggles of evictions depending on the period started during that time up until 2016. Secondly, the formation of the Nyafaru Development Company became the backbone of the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm because it linked the farm with the political struggles. Nyafaru Development Company directors became inconsiderate on the farm during the post- independent era, which was against their main objectives from the inception of the company and against the Tangwena's land right. Lastly, the result was the struggle for the eviction of the company and its directors from the farm and also put the farm with its activities to an end to avoid any possible oppression in future through that farm, which was achieved on 07th September 2016 after fourteen years of struggle. The qualitative methodology was applied whereby the author used interviews, focus group discussions and observations.

INTRODUCTION

The research project is intended to review the political history of Nyafaru Farm (NF) that made it a chess board of the political struggles in the Tangwena community from the 1960s up to 2016. The political struggles in the Tangwena community started from the colonial era and stretched to 2016 post-independence era, the farm was the playing ground of political struggles. For example; during colonial era, the struggles between Rekai Tangwena and the colonial government and the armed struggle; post-independence era, the Nyafaru Development Company (NDC) against Tangwena Development Association (TADA) struggles. Therefore, the research seeks to unravel the role played by the farm as political spring board for the nationalist movements. It also look at how the liberators turned to be the oppressors of the Tangwena people. For the Tangwena people the farm was the cardiac system which when taken out from them they could not live, VOA2005 quoting herdsman Pabwe. The political history that facilitated the Nyafaru farm to appear in all these political struggles as the playing ground.

The farm was established by colonial settlers Charles and William Hanmer in the 1950s at the center of the Tangwena community in Nyafaru Highlands. William benefitted from the Land Apportionment Act (LAA) of 1930 which alienated the African lands to the Europeans including the Tangwena community. For that reason, as the owner of the farm he coerced the Tangwena people to work in his farm as compensation for living on the European land. Few years after the establishment of the farm, Kinya, by then the chief of the Tangwena people passed away in 1964 and he was to be succeeded by Rekai Tangwena according to the Tangwena people tradition. Rekai Tangwena was strongly against the colonial rule on his ancestral and to get rid of him, the settler government rejected Rekai Tangwena as the Chief of The Tangwena people; he was regarded as self-styled one.

The struggles between Chief and the colonial regime commenced in the 1966 when the white farmer Hanmer with assistance from the government tried to evict the chief and his people to the nearby rocky area by then called Holdenbury Trust Land (today called Machena). Horrible measures of eviction were imposed on the Tangwena people by the colonial government like, prosecutions, use of Bulldozers to demolish their homes and the use of dogs to threaten them to comply with the government laws. However, Rekai Tangwena together with his people endured a series of the evictions by the colonial regime because the land was their heritage from their forefathers. For Chief Rekai Tangwena and his people it was impossible to let that right robbed from them by the foreigners.

During Rekai Tangwena and the colonial government's political struggles the seeds of political struggles at Nyafaru Farm were sown. Rekai Tangwena and his people argued that the land was given to them by their ancestors long before the coming of the whites while the white farmer Hanmer and the government argued that the land was designated 'European area' by the Land Apportionment Act of 1930. The Tangwena people learnt from those struggles that the foreigners who were interested in taking advantage of their land over them is their real enemy, this continued to the post-colonial era.

At the mid of the struggles over the Nyafaru area the NF welcomed the new directors Guy Clutton-Brock and Didymus Mutasa from the Cold Comfort Farm, the cooperative near Harare. These new directors were against the colonial rule in the country and also at the farm. Guy as the director facilitated the formation of a cooperative at Nyafaru Farm that helped the Tangwena people to fight against the colonial rule on their ancestral land. The Nyafaru Development Company (NDC) was formed to assist the Tangwena people in their struggle for land. The Tangwena people welcomed these new directors on their land with warm hands thinking that they are the real saviors

on their struggles. Nyafaru Development Company later on became the backbone of the political struggles at NF in the post-colonial era as the directors by then Molven Mahachi and Didymus Mutasa drastically changed the company's intended objectives and became inconsiderate.

In the early 1970s the armed struggle for independence continued nationwide with the central slogan that "land to the blacks". This slogan drew the attention of the Tangwena people so that they vehemently supported the move as their last option to return back to their robbed land from the white minority. The Tangwena people by then were living in the bushes and caves after their homesteads were brutally and continuously demolished by the government troops to force them away from their land to the suggested reserve. The company assisted the Tangwena people together with the guerrillas in the battle field. The Nyafaru Farm became the springboard of the war because it became part of the recruiting center of the guerrillas, food and clothes were provided by the company to the Tangwena people and guerrillas in the war and used as the networking center for the guerrillas in the battle field and those who trained in Mozambique. It was again at the farm where the President R. G Mugabe and E. Tekere were assisted by Chief Reikai Tangwena and his people to escape the white troops to Mozambique.

After independence the Tangwena people were given back their ancestral land by the new elected government, as the new President R. G. Mugabe argued that it was for their contribution in the war. However, for the Tangwena people it was a victory of their battle that they fought for a long time from the 1960s to 1980, to gain back their ancestral land which was robbed by the white foreigners. The different views of the new government of Mugabe and the Tangwena people over the land right witnessed just after the Tangwena people settled on their land. The government came up with the settlement pattern of linear village to resettle the Tangwena people with the confidence that it owned the land and the Tangwena people would comply with the programme. Contrary,

the Tangwena people were arguing that they were independent on their land, so they preferred to follow their former scattered homestead which they used to before the coming of the whites. The Chief and his people strongly resisted the government's policy of linear village for their traditional scattered homesteads.

At the same time the Company by then with black directors Mahachi and Mutasa started to work with the Tangwena people up until 1995. After a decade and a half the directors working together with cordial relationship with the Tangwena people, they started to turn against the will of the Tangwena people by trying to convert the farm for their personal gains and they became the enemies of the Tangwena people together with their cooperatives. In 2000 Mutasa used the FTLRP as a scapegoat to take total control of the farm for his personal gains. The Tangwena people realized that the farm was the colonialism egg left by the colonialist in Tangwena trying to hatch neo-colonialism on their independent ancestral land. Therefore, they took up arms to get rid of the neo-colonialism and brought to an end the Farm activities on their land in 2003-2006.

After the company directors failed to resist the pressure from the community based cooperative Tangwena Development Association (TADA), they resorted to legal battle. This was a way of using political stamina that minister Mutasa had in the ZANU PF ruling government against the community dwellers. The director, who was Mutasa and his farm manager Pearson Kasu took the case to the court. This put to end violence at the farm in 2005 and marked the legal battle which ended in 2016. The legal battle continued until the minister lost his political powers in the ZANU PF through expulsion from the party in 2014 on the allegations that he was involved in a plot to oust President Mugabe from the power. The Tangwena people utilized that advantage to gain back their farm from the Company. This was facilitated by the political factors in ZANU PF whereby the expelled candidates were being tracked by the ruling party in every area of their interests and

being expelled from party and ministerial posts. Comrade Mandiitawepi Chimene officially handed over the Tangwena land to its people in October 2016. According to ZANU PF it was a diplomatic way to undermine former Minister Mutasa and a political campaign to gain back support from the Tangwena which was being eroded by Mutasa's activities while the Tangwena people saw it as their victory of destroying the colonial egg (Nyafaru Farm) left on their land by the colonialist.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The Nyafaru Farm proved to be the chess board where most of the political struggles in Nyafaru took place. Tracing back from the colonial era, the area experienced many political struggles for instance, the political struggle between Reikai Tangwena and the colonial regime over the evictions of the former from their ancestral land by the later to reserves, the armed struggle that took place during the 1970s. In the post-colonial era, the continuation of the struggles with the new actor who replaced the colonial government, that is the new government of the majority just after independence in 1980, the 2003-2005 political struggles at the farm and also the legal battle from 2005 to 2016 over the control of the Nyafaru Farm. Therefore, these struggles opened up the area to be studied to trace the political history behind Nyafaru Farm that made it to be the suitable area for or attracted the Tangwena political squabbles to be mainly centered on it.

OBJECTIVES

1. To trace the genesis of political struggles around Nyafaru from 1966-1980.
2. To unveil the nature of Nyafaru Farm and factors that influenced it to be the site of political struggles after independence from 1980-1999.
3. To unpack the political squabbles among the Tangwena people over the Nyafaru Farm from 2000-2006.
4. To explore the legal battle between Tangwena people and Nyafaru Development Company from 2004-2016.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. How the political struggles around Nyafaru Farm originated from 1966-1980?
2. What was the nature of the Nyafaru Farm and what factors that influenced it to be the site of political struggles after independence from 1980-1999?
3. Which were the political squabbles among the Tangwena people over the Nyafaru Farm from 2000-2005?
4. How the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm continued as a legal court case from 2004-2016?

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Tangwena people originally lived in Mozambique long before the coming of the whites. It was there that they evolved into a strong competition with the Portuguese over the resources and land, by then under their paramount chief Makombe. The coming of the Portuguese triggered some clashes with the Wanhewa people of chief Makombe and gradually sent some of them (the tribe later known as the Tangwena) westwards into what is now Zimbabwe. They occupied an area stretching from the Zambezi to the Macheke River, some 200 miles across. Therefore, Sakara the first Tangwena chief ruled the area extending from the Portuguese East Africa to Zimbabwe (the then Rhodesia).²

The Tangwena forebears have clearly lived there for many years long before the Whiteman were known in Zimbabwe. The history of the tribe extends back probably over 400 years ago through the Rozvi and Mutapa Empires to the Sixteenth century. From there, the Nyangani Ranch became the ancestral home of the Tangwena people. The hierarchy of the chiefs who ruled the Tangwena people was as follows; Sakara – Chivaura – Nyamadziwa – Kubinha – Tsatse – Gwindo – Dzeka – Mudima – Kinya and Re kai.⁴

As the scramble for territories on the African continent increased, the period around 1800 saw a rapid influx of white fortune seekers and consequently some clashes between the various white sections. These land conflicts led to the 1884 Berlin Settlement where the idea of permanent boundaries between countries was discussed and led to the division of the African nations into countries with clear boundaries. This division affected the Tangwena people because it became impossible for their chief to extend his rule into either Zimbabwe or Mozambique. Sakara could not opt to settle in Mozambique because his superior enemies, the Portuguese were gaining an

upper hand there. So he lost the Mozambique part of his territory and remained with the fertile lands in the mountainous region near the eastern boarder of Zimbabwe

The first interaction between the Tangwena and the white people can be traced back to the 1900s following the pioneer invasion of lands in Melsetter (Rusape), Umtali (Mutare) and Inyanga (Nyanga) areas. These white settlers were then known in the Gairezi Ranch plateau during Dzeka's reign when a number of the white people arrived in Nyanga district to scout for grazing land. They were offered the hilly and mountainous areas overlooking the Gairezi River which were not suitable for cultivation of crops. Chief Dzeka Tangwena and his people were always happy to keep the white settlers up in the mountains if they did not interfere with them. The Tangwena people welcomed these new settlers as they saw them bringing opportunities for employment in the cattle herding they introduced on these highlands.

Later on, with his insatiable desire for land, C. J Rhodes passed-by in Nyanga district on his way to Port Beira in Mozambique and admired the eastern highlands climates. He then alienated a large portion of lands in eastern highlands, including Tangwena lands to be his farms for the sake of leaving his legacy. After his death, the land remained alienated while the Tangwena people were labor tenants to the white farms. In the 1950s, the Hanmer brothers (Charles and later William) arrived in the Gairezi Ranches and took control of the areas now known as Dazi and the rest of the area which was inhabited by the Tangwena people. William Hanmer claimed land around Nyafaru where he started farming activities and cattle ranching. He also took advantage of the availability of cheap, if not free labour from the Tangwena people.

The white colonial government then tempered the white grip on black land by declaring some areas of the country "White areas" by the enactment of the Land Apportionment Act of 1930. This Act designated the rest of the area where the Tangwena people lived as "European", thereby alienating

the Tangwena from their ancestral heritage. The Tangwena people living on the land had the option of being converted into labour tenants to provide their labour power as payment for living on the land belonging to the new settlers. Thus Chief Tangwena and his people were forced to provide labour (Chibharo) in the farm, in return to being allowed to remain on 'Hanmer's land'.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Taking into assessment the Zimbabwean political struggles today, the result will be to a greater extent that land question and the mixed views of the government policies are the major causes. In this section the squabbles at Nyafaru Farm are to be reviewed relating them to the selected literature from Chitsike, Nyawo-Shava et al, Ncube, Matondi, Magaisa, Moore, Govo et al, Mandondo, Austin and Ramphal on the land question in Zimbabwe. Eg Mandondo 2000 or Magaisa 2007

Magaisa mainly argued that, The land question in Zimbabwe is dating back from the colonial period to post-independence era is all about the use of law, force and history.¹ That is to say, by then the ruling government used law, force and history to disadvantage the whole population. On the Tangwena people, for example, Magaisa argued that, the struggle for eviction on their land during colonial period was “vivid illustration of the application of force and law expropriation which created victims and intensified resentment that fuelled the war of independence”.² “The law sought to legitimize land expropriation and segregation of Africans from the white settlers”.³ Even in the post-colonial era the government also used the law to disadvantage and segregate the government elites from the Zimbabweans and the Tangwena people in particular over the land Issues.

Austin is of the view that, wealth in Zimbabwe is not obtained from anything apart from the land, as he pointed out that. “Wealth in Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) was not to be found in a mineral bonanza of gold or diamonds, but in land.”⁴ Austin acknowledged the Tangwena case to substantiate the above statement. “The Tangwena area, in the mountains of Inyanga is rich agricultural land and not surprisingly 250 000 acres of it was sold in 1905 (without the knowledge of the inhabitants) by the British South Africa Company to the Anglo- French Matabeleland Company”.⁵

Consequently, with the realization of the Tangwena people that their land was sold to a white farmer unaware they fought courageously, to gain back their wealth from the white settlers until 1980. From this point of view, the land to the Tangwena people was their wealth and they were not going to survive without their ancestral land.

Many scholars researched about political struggles in Zimbabwe acknowledged the contribution of land question in the country. Ncube argues that at independence in 1980, the government of Zimbabwe tried to put across some reforms especially in the rural local government 'largely inspired by the state's modernization initiatives and the need to create a framework for expanded delivery of services to the peasant communities in order to redress the imbalances of colonial neglect.⁶ These reforms 'sought to undermine the authority of the traditional institution in judicial and land matters in the communal areas'.⁷ That is to say, Ncube's basic argument is that, the conflicts in Zimbabwe are as a result of the new government's tendency of sidelining the traditional leaders, chiefs, head man and village heads, on land issue. This institution in the Zimbabwean culture tracing it from pre-colonial societies, they were the ones with full control of the land and during the colonial period the British's indirect rule also acknowledge them though with limited powers on allocating land. In the post-independence era the new government tried to disconnect the powers of the traditional leaders from the land issues.

Govo et al also argued in the same line with Ncube by postulating on the issue of land politics in Zimbabwe that, "contestation between traditional authority and modern governance structures is a result of the perpetuation of the colonial legacy of exploiting traditional systems for political ends".⁸ To substantiate their argument they went on to say, by excluding the traditional leaders from land ownership/authority, "the traditional leaders are likely to influence their communities not to comply to the local government policies and development agencies in community areas".⁹

Some scholars on the matter of political struggles in Zimbabwe as a result of land question they do acknowledge that the exclusion of the traditional systems on land is the major cause of the continuation of political struggles on the land. Govo et al also argued that, there was the sour relations between the new Rural District Councils (RDC) and the traditional leaders as the latter are defied the laws from the former and continued to allocate the land in their communities.¹⁰

Mandondo was quoted by the above scholars saying that, “Communal Lands Act of 1982 took away powers of the chiefs to allocate land, a prerogative vested in them by Smith regime during the 1960s through the Tribal Trust Lands Act of 1957”¹¹ and also Mlambo and Raftopoulos work was again used by Govo et al in their work, they noted that, these scholars showed that the Communal Lands Development Plan of 1988 left the traditional leaders with little more than a spiritual functions as they were not made part of the planning of communal lands.¹² Thus, the continuation of political struggles on the land according to these scholars resulted from the contradicting government new policies and the traditional leader’s perceptions over the land issues. Therefore, with this argument to accept the traditional leaders in the government’s institution will reduce the political struggles over the land in Zimbabwe.

Taking into consideration these works on the Tangwena political struggles, the failure of the colonial and later on new black majority government to acknowledge Chief Reikai Tangwena and his people’s ancestral land right and that they have the power to do what they deem necessary on their land led to continuous political struggles. Similarly to what Govo argued that, the villagers also resist the RDC’s laws and continued to refer land matters to their traditional heads¹³, the Tangwena people also resisted the government’s policies over their land together with their chief throughout. Therefore, this research traced the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm as a case study

to substantiate the issue of sidelining the rights of the vital institution or group in the government's institutions.

Nyawo-Shawa et al also argued that, since the alienation of the good lands by the white minority and the creation of the poor lands (reserves) for the black majority, independence gave the land "land question a new force".¹⁴ The attainment of independence towards the Tangwena people was a total independence to do whatever they want over their ancestral land, however, the new government in 1980 came as another force to took the struggle ahead from where the colonialist left. Nyawo-Shawa et al also noted that, "there is the impression that, during the liberation struggle, the land question was more of a political issue than anything else"¹⁵ Land was politicized even in the Tangwena struggles from the 1960s, to the extent that they joined the armed struggle as a way of "fighting exploitative governmental agrarian policies, fighting for ancestral land, fighting for the power with which land ownership came".¹⁶

Due to the Lancaster House Agreement of 1979 which stated the willing buyer willing seller the government after independence failed to fulfill much on the land question to the land hungry Zimbabweans.¹⁷ Nyawo-Shawa et al noted that, agriculture was the backbone of the country from 1980 and to address the land question among the Zimbabweans was to disturb the economy of the country.¹⁸ Therefore, the snail pace on the land issue by the government abused the Zimbabweans as acquiring land was a priority. The Tangwena people were not interested in anything apart from their total freedom over their ancestral land which the new elected government after independence failed to fulfill.

"It was about land in the beginning, it was about land during the struggle, it has remained about land today. The land issue in Zimbabwe is not ancient history. It is modern history."¹⁹ The issue

of land question in Zimbabwe will never be the past history but shall continue until the Zimbabweans gained back their ancestral land from the government. Similarly, the issue of land started from the colonial period, to armed struggle and even today. Matondi postulated that, the alienation of land by the new settlers during the colonialism era became the long term cause of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme of 2000.²⁰ It was also triggered by the compulsory land acquisition and the “general social pressure for land reform and specifically the pressure brought to bear on government by various classes of land claimants”.²¹ Therefore, the issue of land according to Chitsike, “has been sacrificed on the altar of political expedience”²², it will continue until all the Zimbabweans gained again their full control and access of the land.

Donald Moore is the prominent scholar who researched well on the Tangwena people, the area of the case study to be used in this research. Moore in general argued that the Tangwena people suffered for their territory, race, place and power from the colonial period up to the post-colonial period, as portrayed by the title of the book “Suffering for Territory, Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe”.²³ He highlighted that, the ancestral land right within the Tangwena people and their chief Re kai Tangwena was the major cause that led them enduring the colonial era and resisting the mixed government policies on their land.²⁴ The mixed government policies on the Tangwena people highlighted by Moore were that, the government at independence gave the Tangwena people back their land as remuneration to their contribution in the armed struggle and later on took the land to be the state property. Moore noted that, the new government of Zimbabwe had converted their land from white ranch into a state resettlement scheme, which they threatened the Tangwena people by eviction if they ‘defied this new spatial order’.²⁵ In this case Moore specialized on the whole Tangwena land political struggles thus include the Nyafaru, Tsatse, Magadzire, Dazi and Nyamutsapa villages. This research narrowed the case to specifically

research on the Nyafaru Farm, an area within Nyafaru village because it proved to be the chess board of all the political struggles in Tangwena community.

Moore also blamed the land rights to a greater extent as the major cause of the struggles in the area. His research also covered the ground from colonial period up until 2005 and the events that took place in Nyafaru village from 2003 to 2016 needs more research as he did not reviewed them. Therefore, the research will cover the ground up until 2016 tracing the political struggles that took place at Nyafaru Farm in detail.

Though Moore tackled almost everything about the Tangwena people, this research on narrowed the case to specifically look at the context behind the Nyafaru Farm that proved it to be a site of political struggles in Tangwena people that started in 2000 up to 2016. In short, the research concentrated on the political squabbles at Nyafaru Farm and how Nyafaru Farm became a playground of these political squabbles in trying to address the silences and gaps of the aforementioned researches.

SOURCES AND METHODOLOGIES

Interviews were the first priority in gathering information required in the research project. The interviews were engaged with the community members who were active in the time frame of the research topic from 1960s to 2016, especially those who participated prior to independence political struggles and post-independence struggles around Nyafaru. In the case of two rival parties the interviewees from both sides were considered in the research to come out with credible information. The methodology responded to my objectives by verbal interviews whereby the participant explained the history and events as the eye witness during that period of time. Evidence or information that was gathered to a greater extent it helped in the research because some of the information produced was from the first persons who participated in the events and also the fact that both sides of two rival parties were considered also prove the credibility of the study. However, the methodology faced a challenge that, some of the members from these two rival groups with information did not cooperate, sticking on the enmity that is still fresh.

Focus group discussion was also used in the research to counter the disadvantages of the interviews. The community members especially those who participated in the struggles from both sides were engaged in the focus group discussions where questions and answers were raised. This gave the researcher room to analyze the ideas from different people and group. Also the history of the political struggles from the period marked by the topic in these focus group discussions was clearly reviewed as the elders were able to remind each other events and dates that took place. On the other side the methodology resulted in some exaggerations of some events and an element of secret resulted as the members feared that they leak party's privacy information.

Another methodology used was the observations on the ground. The researcher also attended some of the meetings that were held in the farm from both sides and observed the situation on the ground.

The methodology helped the research in the way that the information was credible because it was from the eyewitness.

The secondary sources that were used in the research were from the journals, court cases documents, and letters and text books. The journals were accessed on internet and the text book by Moore was constantly used in this research. This was because Moore researched very well on the Tangwena people's way of life from colonial period to 2004. The journals were referred to in the research as a comparative of the central arguments in them and the central arguments of the research. However, some of the current court cases that were to cover chapter four were restricted to be disclosed because the cases were still burning issues. Therefore, the researcher resorted to interviews with the main actors in the courts for the information.

CHAPTER LAYOUT

The central aim of the research in the chapter one is to review the genesis of the political struggles around Nyafaru from 1966 to 1980. This will help to be able to find the political history behind Nyafaru Farm to be a site of the political struggles especially in post-independence. The influence of the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 to the political struggles at Nyafaru, the origin of the political struggle around Nyafaru during the colonial era and also the participant of the women in the political struggle will also be reviewed in this chapter. The overall aim of this chapter is to trace the context of the Nyafaru Farm and the Tangwena people during colonial era, so that one can be able to understand how the Nyafaru farm came to be a site of political squabbles in Tangwena area.

Chapter two, the nature of Nyafaru Farm and factors contributed for the farm to be the site of political struggles in post-colonial era will be unveiled. The research will commence by tracing the formation of the Nyafaru Development Company (NDC) during the colonial as it later became the backbone of the political struggles at NF. The post-colonial period and the mixed government policies on the Nyafaru land and the corruption in the NDC as factors for the political struggles on the NF will then unpacked. The chapter concludes by exposing the corruption of the NDC at the farm that led to the sour relations between the company and the Tangwena people.

Chapter three will focus on the political squabbles among the Tangwena people over the NF from 2000-2006. It will commence by unpack the impact of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme of 2000 on the Tangwena political struggle. This resulted into the formation of two rival groups between the Tangwena people themselves, the Nyafaru Development Company who were for the minister's interests and Tangwena Development Association (TADA) who were against the minister's personal interests. More so, the research will then review the contribution of the

Tangwena women in the struggle and it will leads the research to unveil the similarities between the causes and the course of the Tangwena political struggle and the FTLRP of 2000. Lastly, chapter four reviewed the two legal battles between the Tangwena Development Association and the Nyafaru Development Company over the Nyafaru Farm. The chapter concludes by reviewing the road to independence of the Tangwena people over their land that attained on the 07th of September 2016.

ENDNOTES

1. A, T, Magaisa, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History's, Multiple Victims*, 2010, p.1.
2. *Ibid*, p.5.
3. *Ibid*, p.6.
4. R, Austin, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, the Unesco Press, Paris, 1975, p.31.
5. *Ibid*, p.32.
6. G,T, Ncube, "Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008", *African Journal of History and Culture*, vol 3 (6), 2011, p. 89.
7. *Ibid*, p. 90.
8. N, Govo, N, P, Dzimir and R, R, Molapo, "The Politics of Land in Zimbabwe's Communal and Resettlement Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe", *J Soc Sci*, vol 43(1), 2015, p.40.
9. *Ibid*, p. 40.
10. *Ibid*. 40
11. A, Mandondo, "Situating Zimbabwe's Natural Resources Governance System in History", in N, Govo, N, P, Govo and R, R, Molapo, "The Politics of Land IN Zimbabwe's Communal and Resettlement Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe", *J Soc Sci*, vol 43(1), 2015,p. 91
12. A, Mlambo and B, Raftopolas, "Becoming Zimbabwe", in N, Govo, N, P, "Govu and R, R, Molapo, *The Politics of Land IN zimbabwe's Communal and Resettlement Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe*", *J Soc Sci*, vol 43(1), 2015, p. 92.
13. N, Govo, N, P, Dzimir and R, R, Molapo, "The Politics of Land in Zimbabwe's Communal and Resettlement Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe", 2015, p.40.
14. V, Z, Nyao-Shava, and S, L, Barnard, *The Trajectory of Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Post- independence Era 1980-2000*, p.39.
15. *Ibid*, p.39.
16. *Ibid*, p.40.
17. *Ibid*, p.40.
18. *Ibid*, p.65.
19. R, Ramphel, Quoted in A, T, Magaisa, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History's Multiple Victims*, 2010, p.2.
20. P, B, Matondi, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, Zed Books Ltd, New York, 2012.
21. *Ibid*.
22. F, Chitsike, *A Critical Analyses of the Land Reform Programme in Zimbabwe*, 2nd Fig Regional Marrakech, Morocco, 2005.
23. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, Duke University Press, Durham &London, 2005.
24. *Ibid*.
25. *Ibid*.

CHAPTER 1

THE GENESIS OF POLITICAL STRUGGLES AROUND NYAFARU FROM 1960 TO 1980.

1.0 Introduction

The chapter traces the background history of the political struggles around Nyafaru from the 1960s to 1980. It was during this period when the seeds of political struggles in Tangwena village in general and Nyafaru Farm in particular were planted. The chapter commences by reviewing the influence of the Land Apportionment Act of 1930 to the origin of political struggles around Nyafaru. The Act exacerbated the racial segregation on land and also gave the new settlers legal rights over the fertile African lands. Consequently, the Act's rights to the whites faced resistance from Tangwena people when the new settlers, Hanmer brothers tried to implement it on Tangwena people's ancestral land. The clashes over land rights between the Tangwena people and the Hanmer brothers led to the origin of the political struggles that started in 1966. The white farmers with support of the colonial government evicted the Tangwena people from their ancestral land to reserves, while Tangwena people strongly resisted to be robbed off their ancestral land by the foreigners. In the struggles, the contribution of women cannot be ignored since they played a pivotal role. The chapter will end up by analyzing the role of Tangwena people in the armed struggle that ended at independence in 1980.

1.1 The Land Apportionment Act of 1930 and its influence on the political struggles around Nyafaru in 1960 to 1980.

In 1890 the Pioneer Column entered Zimbabwe which was gradually conquered and occupied by the British South Africa Company (BSAC). The European fortune seekers from south spread eastwards and northwards conquering, agreeing with or overrunning the tribal groups. In the case

of Inyanga area, according to Austin, the 250 000 acres of the Tangwena country, found in the mountains of Inyanga were sold by the British South Africa Company to the Anglo-French Matabeleland Company in 1905. The latter ceded to the Gaeresi Ranch Company a portion of land.¹ In line to that, Magaisa noted that in “1918 a judgment was passed by the Privy Council of the House Lords in the case of In Southern Rhodesia...². This justified the expropriation of land from Africans on the basis that lands were *Terra Nullius* (not owned by any person)” and they argued that the Africans were ‘uncivilized’ to own land.³

In 1923 the Rhodesian constitution allocated Reserves to Africans who wanted to live the so-called ‘tribal communal life’ without interference. The remaining area more than half of the colony was left open for use by the white races who wished to join in the developing modern economy. This was the genesis of land segregation in Rhodesia which indicated that Rhodesia had “failed to think white and black into an economic whole”⁴ For example, as noted by Kramer in his document *The Policy of Centralization*, which asserts that part and parcel of land segregation was firstly implemented in Shurugwi (Selukwe) Reserve in 1929.⁵

In 1930 the Land Apportionment Act was passed and the Act declared most of the open areas in which the African people lived to be ‘European Areas’, for exclusive use by the Europeans as such thus alienating Africans from owning their land. The act allowed the new settlers to evict Africans from the ‘European Areas’. Throughout the colony, Africans in the European Areas were evicted to Reserves which were introduced in 1923 by the Rhodesian government.

As the Tangwena area was alienated, Africans who lived there for many generations were defined in the Act as squatters (who were the Tangwena people) in white owned lands.⁶ This came as a result of a safeguard given to those who had been on the land before it was declared European land by the Act and also these people were termed Squatters by the Act. Moore noted that, the Section

93 of the Act declared that these could only be removed by proclamation by the Governor, the Queen's representative, the highest authority in the colony.⁷ The Tangwena were therefore to a considerable extent protected by the Act. The Tangwena land was sold "without the knowledge of the inhabitants"⁸ to a private ownership by the BSAC. Thereafter, without any legal obligation in the case of most, the people came under pressure to pay rents or to enter into labour agreements, thus playing the role of slavery on their ancestral land. According to Moore, the land was however, remote, virtually unused and inaccessible, so the Tangwena people continued their normal life little troubled.⁹

1.2 The Origin of the Political Struggles around Nyafaru in 1966

From 1930 the process of evicting Africans from the so-called European Areas went on throughout the country but not until 1964 did it began to affect the Tangwena people. The Hanmer brothers were the white men in the Tangwena soil who settled in the mountainous fertile lands of the area and practiced farming activities in the 1950s. Due to the fact that the Tangwena people were protected by the Act of 1930, William Hanmer opted to coerce the Tangwena people to provide labour in his farm (a portion of land he gained eastward from his brother Charles) as compensation to live on his farm. However, the government began to face the so-called land owner Mr William Hanmer with the alternative of either evicting the Tangwena people or getting himself prosecuted for allowing them to live on his land.

Hanmer issued notices to Tangwena people whom he did not offer labour contracts in his farm to evict and those offered the contracts remained.¹⁰ Meanwhile, following the death of chief Kinya in 1965, Rekai was chosen chief in his place in the same year.¹¹ The District Commissioner for Nyanga (DCN) refused to acknowledge the chief unless he either agreed to sign a labour agreement with the Hanmer brothers or accept the eviction from the so-called 'European land' to reserves.

Rekai Tangwena refused all the offers and the District Commissioner for Nyanga took away from him the red robe, the helmet and the half-moon neck-chain worn by colonial Rhodesian chiefs, according to Moore.¹² That is why at the eve of independence, Tangwena said, “they took from me the chain or dare that made me look like a donkey, that Smith used to show which of the chiefs were his donkeys”¹³ He said he did not mind because his fore fathers lived a prosperous life but they did not even know of the chain. . Thereafter, the Commissioner for Nyanga openly denounced him, “you are no longer a chief, but a self-styled chief ... because you are troublesome”.¹⁴ From there on, as reported in the Rhodesian Herald, Rekai Tangwena was known nationally as a “self-styled chief”¹⁵.

Ncube noted that the African traditional leaders during colonial rule were the major agents of the colonial government. They were used as the intermediators between the Africans and the colonial government. In his article, he argues that, the traditional leaders at independence were sidelined by the government because of that position during colonial period.¹⁶ In the case of Chief Rekai Tangwena however, he refused to have a coalition with the colonial regime throughout the colonial period. He waged a political struggle with the colonial regime until the independence of Zimbabwe.

In 1965, the new directors, Guy Clutton-Brock and Didymus Mutasa were welcomed at the farm; whose mere cooperation confronted governing objectives of racial segregation.¹⁷ At Nyafaru, Guy sympathized with the Tangwena people and provided advices on their struggles against the segregatory rule by the whites. Rekai Tangwena began to mobilize his people to resist “chibharo” (slavery) in Hanmer’s farm. This direct challenge to the whites worsened the relations between Tangwena people and the white farmer Hanmer, thus precipitating an inevitable dispute over the

land and labour. Against this unfair treatment by the whites, Tangwena people were determined to defend their right to stay in their ancestral land.

Though Rekai was threatened by the oppressive state, he proved himself to be a man of great integrity, courage and strength in character. In 1966 Rekai received the first letter from the landowner giving him one month notice to leave his home and the land which his fore-fathers had occupied for many generations. He disregarded the notice and in 1967 he was prosecuted in Nyanga court on the charge that he, being an African did wrongfully and unlawfully occupied land in an European area. The following is a conversation extract between Rekai and the prosecutor at Nyanga court in 1967;

PROSECUTOR: Where do you stay?

REKAI: I live in my own country.

PROSECUTOR: You do not have a country for it was bought many years ago.

REKAI: Who did you give the money to, and where is my father's signature?

PROSECUTOR: We bought the land and you must know it is a European Area.

REKAI: No!!!... Where is your father?

PROSECUTOR: In England.

REKAI: If your father dies and you find me in England saying this English land is mine, will you be pleased? ¹⁸

From this conversation, Rekai Tangwena clearly selected himself out from the colonial agent as Ncube noted on chiefs during the colonial era. Almost the whole country he rose up as the chief

with strong courage and belief that the Africans were the real residents of the African soil. Though he defended himself well he was found guilty and fined 30 pounds, or 30 days in prison.¹⁹ He did not however, move with his people. Again he was arrested, charged, convicted and fined for many times by the white farmer assisted by the colonial regime, although he was being defended by able counsel. According to him in a documentary, he noted that the government of Ian Smith prosecuted him ten times at Nyanga court the same year after the 1967 prosecution.²⁰

He also explained that during that period the white settlers wanted to offer him sixty pounds per month and he responded by a question, is that sixty pounds able to satisfy all the Tangwena people?

²¹ That was a clear indication that Rekai was not interested in personal gains or property, but he was strongly interested in his ancestral soil and his people. Even Moore also mentioned the latter on words of Tangwena to the District Commissioner in 1970, “I am not bought. I want my land not money. Land is more valuable to me than money. Land will keep me and my children’s children. Cash will only keep me and my wife. I am a chief with people.”²²

Throughout the colony, all the Africans who were on the European Areas were evicted either with or without resistance. Chief Rekai Tangwena and his people however, strongly resisted eviction from their ancestral land. This led Austin to note that many Africans have protested at similar moves, none with such dignity and determination,²³ like the Tangwena people. Having occupied the land before it was alienated to the European owner, Tangwena people were thus protected by Section 93 of the LAA, “unless the Governor should make a proclamation”.²⁴ The matter could have ended peacefully there, landowner, Governor, Government and people knowing from the ruling of the high court that the Tangwena people had a legal right to occupy this land in perpetuity and could be evicted only by order of the governor. Clearly, those who designed the land act were to an extent concerned for justice in such case. The Quinton Commission in 1960 composed of

members of parliament of all parties, had studied the problems of resettlement and had produced a unanimous report.

The report stipulated the dangers of removing people from their traditional lands, the grave disadvantages of the social and economic development of the country of so doing. It recommended the freeing of all land from racial restrictions, the repeal of the Land Apportionment Act and no more movements of Africans from the land they were already occupying. The report also observed that the people were for more import than land and that "... the immediate welfare of people living at a low level of poverty must not be by-passed."²⁵

However, in spite of this, for reasons unknown but which were proved to be racial, that the Africans were living with rights in the so-called the 'European Area', the colonial government was not prepared to let the Tangwena people remain on their land. They took the only remaining course which appeared open to them. From an interview the participants noted that, in February 1969 His Excellency Clifford Walter Dupont, made a proclamation direct that sixty-six men of Tsatse's kraal, including the chief, Rekai Tangwena , together with their families and properties should permanently deported from their land and move to Machena, a small rocky area in the Holdenby Trust Land.²⁶

After this proclamation, strong measures were progressively brought to bear on the Tangwena people. Chakamwe noted that, the authorities crafted a dubious piece of legislation which allowed them to evict Tangwena Rekai and his people from their land by force.²⁷ This included destroying of the Tangwena people's houses, another offer to Rekai Tangwena that, if he moved he would be recognized as chief by the colonial regime and provided with a salary, house, offices, and beer hall. In June they collected all the Tangwena people's cattle counted up to 473.²⁸ Rekai and his people resisted the pressure and offers from the government because what was important to them

was their ancestral soil. Tangwena people continued to build and repair destroyed houses and plough their lands for the coming rainy season. The colonial government including the District Commissioner for Nyanga together with the landowner Hanmer also gave the Tangwena people and their chief a notice to permanently leave their land on September 18, 1969.²⁹

By September 18, 1969 the final date, no one had moved from the land to reserves. The atmosphere was tense and saturated with sadness, as if the land was in mourning.³⁰ The people had gathered round the chief's kraal, some coming from towns, some prayed and others were silent, thoughtful, worried and determined.³¹ On that day nothing happened, the District Commissioner for Nyanga did not turn up. The following day the District Commissioner for Nyanga moved in on trucks along the new dirty road made at the cost of 3, 000 pounds to evict the Tangwena people from their land.³² During the same day the troops armed with bulldozers were deployed into the Tangwena village to destroy and burn their houses.

1.3 Women's participation in the Tangwena Struggle

According to the participant in an interview she noted that,

When we were waiting for the District Commissioner for Nyanga on the September 18th Rekai told us that, we do not have any other weapon that is worth to fight back the colonial government other than our women. If the white people arrived with their weapons to evict us from our land, let women be at frontline demonstrating against them and men behind the women. He (Chief) said that this will avoid the extermination of our men by the colonial troops.³³

From the interview cited above it can be noted that women played a vital role.

The District Commissioner for Nyanga and his messengers on that day arrested Rekai and carried him bodily to a truck after women wailed and clung around their chief stripping off their clothes in despair and anger.³⁴ Cde Jesina Tangwena, the chief's sister in an interview recalled, "In that struggle the District Commissioner for Nyanga was hit and he fell into a calabash".³⁵ The police

carried Rekai Tangwena to Machena, the rocky place appointed. Women tried to defend the chief fearlessly and stripped their clothes. The naked Tangwena women backed by their husbands marched twenty miles from Tangwena kraal to Nyanga District Office, demonstrating for the release of their chief unaware that he was not arrested to Nyanga.

On their way to Nyanga while naked they met two roadblocks first at Nyafaru Bridge, as they used the new dirty road created by the colonial regime. The troops failed to stop them on that bridge. The second block which was tough for the Tangwena people was at Gaerezi Bridge, where trucks and armed troops blocked the Tangwena women and their men. At their arrival, the naked Tangwena women found it difficult to pass through the bridge, “one of the wives from the Tangwena’s family who was pregnant jumped into the water and crossed to the other side. All other women and men followed her to cross the river”.³⁶ The troops gave-up blocking the Tangwena people. About 160 marched twenty miles naked to the DCN’s office at Nyanga.

At their arrival at Troutbeck Hotel the pregnant woman who led the Tangwena people to cross at Gaerezi River, was bitten by the white troops’ dogs and sent to the hospital in Nyanga. This event did not stop the Tangwena women and their husbands to proceed with their march to Nyanga.³⁷ When they were near the District Commissioner for Nyanga’s office in Nyanga many dogs were released to attack them, “many women were bitten by the big dogs but no one ran away to the extent that police withdrew their dogs because they feared to kill women who were bitten naked”.³⁸ The Tangwena people were then detained at Nyanga Police Station (NPS) for two days. While in police cells Didymus Mutasa (one of the directors at Nyafaru Farm) helped Tangwena people with food and on the other hand he went on to defend the Tangwena people calling for their release.

On their return from Nyanga, the Tangwena people heard that their chief was in Machena, the rocky area aforementioned. To their surprise the Tangwena people found their huts burnt and

destroyed by the bulldozers and their property was moved to Machena.³⁹ Rekai on the same day returned on foot from Machena and met his people at his homestead. In an interview Nelson postulated that, finding their property moved (the Tangwena people), some walked back again twenty miles to complain to the police in Nyanga. They were detained, however, for a few days on suspicion of starting a veld fire that destroyed the wattle plantation belonging to the Hanmer brothers, on the Troutbeck ranch.⁴⁰ After some days the police took them back to Gaerezi with their land rover truck.

The Tangwena ran into the bushes to hide. They live in the bushes like animals for some years before crossing to Mozambique where they became war refugees during the armed struggle. Moore noted that, Rekai Tangwena in November 1970 claimed more than 1000 men, women and children living like baboons in hiding.⁴¹ When the Tangwena people were in hiding in the same year their children were taken by the government as a way of punishing the Tangwena people and the Swiss donor funded and African educators constructed a temporary building to educate them.⁴² The Tangwena people started to reconstruct the destroyed homes including those of their chief over the night. To their surprise the settlers work-up early in the morning and found the huts built with hot ashes that indicated the presence of people during the night.

The District Commissioner for Nyanga and the troops armed with bulldozers from Nyanga Polices' Station moved again into the Tangwena people's homesteads and destroyed their homes three times while the Tangwena people were in a hide. In the early 1970s the struggle for independence was becoming tense countrywide, the guerillas were sent by the ZANU leaders to assist Chief Rekai Tangwena and his people to fight against the white regime.⁴³ Meanwhile the Tangwena people with their chief were still living in the bushes after their homes were destroyed. Finally, in 1975 some of the Tangwena people crossed boarder to Mozambique where they became wartime

refugees in the Musambidzi village and many of them joined the armed struggle together with their chief, according to the participant.⁴⁴

1.4 The participation of Tangwena People in the Armed Struggle 1970-1980

In the 1970s when the ZANU leaders assisted the Tangwena people with the guerrillas to fight against the colonial rule, the Tangwenians utilized the opportunity as their last hope to gain back their land from the colonial rule by joining the armed struggle. According to history the Tangwena people participated unconditionally in the armed struggle for independence started during the colonial era. The Nyafaru area became the springboard for the freedom fighters where recruits and training of some freedom fighters were done. Mutswapo, noted that, the Tangwena girls and women were used to feed, provide shelters and clothes for the guerrillas who were fighting the colonial regime. Also, the able bodied boys and men were recruited into the war and some of them assisted the guerrillas by carrying the baggage, helped them to cross the river Jora to and from Mozambique where they were trained and came back to fight.⁴⁵

Moore acknowledged that, even his Excellent R.G Mugabe together with the late Comrade E. Tekere once passed through the NF during the armed struggle.⁴⁶ At NF they were assisted by Chief Rekai Tangwena to fight against the white troops who attacked them in a building at the farm. Meanwhile, the Tangwena managed to access the farm because the Nyafaru Development Company was committed to support them in the struggle. In an interview, a participant who participated in the struggle noted that, Chief Rekai used his spiritual possessions and mysteriously provided mist that covered them to the extent that the white troops failed to see them.⁴⁷

Chief Tangwena, Mugabe, Tekere and other freedom fighters who were at the point, broke the window at the back of the building and passed through to the nearest mountain. The mountain today is called (*Gomo RaMugabe*) the mountain of Mugabe due to the events of that day. From the

mountain they crossed the river *Jora* which also marked the border line from Zimbabwe to Mozambique, where Mugabe was appointed to be the president of the party Zimbabwe Africa National Union (ZANU) and organized the freedom fighters at Chimoyo.⁴⁸

Finally, Zimbabwe attained its independence in 1980 after a decade in the war with the colonial masters. The Tangwena people's dream of taking back their land became a reality to them as they joined and participated in the war specifically for their ancestral land and removing the colonial master on African soil.

1.5 Conclusion

From the overall discussion, the political struggles in Tangwena area have historical events from the colonial era. The root came in this way, the Tangwena people having the graves of their ancestor and being the first people to stay on the land long before the whites, they had a permanent ancestral land right on the land. On the other hand, the white settlers being the victorious race in conquering the Africans in the First Chimurenga and the passing of the land Legislatives that alienated the African land to the whites. They also believed that they had a permanent land right over the black race. These clashing perceptions over the land led to the origin of the political struggles in the Tangwena community that stretched to the post-colonial era.

The Tangwena people strongly resisted to be robbed their ancestral land right by the opportunistic foreigners who were taking their weaknesses to be their strength. This element continued within the Tangwena people up until 2016 as it shall be reviewed in the following chapters. Thus, the period from 1966 to 1980 important to this study because it planted the seeds of post-colonial political struggles in Tangwena in general and Nyafaru Farm in particular.

ENDNOTES

1. R. Austin, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, The Unesco Press, Paris, 1975, p.32.
2. A, T, Magaisa, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History's Multiple Victims*, 30 June 2010, p. 3.
3. *Ibid.*
4. R, D, Gilchrist, "Rhodesia's Place in the Native Problem", *Journal of the African Society*, vol 32 (126-129), 1993, p 135.
5. E, Kramer, "A Clash of Economies: Early Centralization Efforts in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1929-1935", *Afriacan e-Journal Project*, Michigan State University, 1998, p 15.
6. A, T, Magaisa, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History's Multiple Victims*, 2010, p.5.
7. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, Duke University Press, Durham & London 2005, p. 193.
8. R. Austin, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 1975, p. 32.
9. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p.40.
10. R. Austin, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 1975, p. 32.
11. Interview with Mr. P. Pabwe, the Nyafaru village head who supported the TADA, 21st of October 2016.
12. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 41.
13. J, Fredrickse, *None but Ourselves*, Zimbabwe Publishing House, Harare, 1982, p 83.
14. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
15. N. n, *Rhodesia Herald*, 18 August 1969, p 1.
16. G, T, Ncube "Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008", *African Journal of History and Culture*, vol 3 (6), 2011.
17. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 184.
18. D, Pulse, *Reconstruction*, American Friends Service, Philadelphia, 1983, p 4.
19. *Ibid*, p 14.
20. R, Tangwena in a documentary by Dambudzo Marechera titled *The House of Hunger*, 1992.
21. *Ibid.*
22. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 205.
23. R. Austin, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, 1975, p. 32.
24. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 205.
25. G, C, Brook, "No Good Reason has been Given for Moving Tangwena and his People", *Rhodesia Herald*, 14 July 1969, p 6.
26. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
27. Chakamwe Chakamwe, "Remembering the Heroic Fight of Chief Tangwena", *The*

Patriot, 30 October 2014.

28. R, Tangwena in a documentary by Dambudzo Marechera titled *The House of Hunger*, 1992.
29. Interview with Mr. N. Mutsiwawo, the man who worked at Nyafaru Farm from 1975 to 2004, 20th February 2017.
30. Interview with Mrs. S. Mabvudza, the woman who participated in marched of the Tangwena women naked to Nyanga, 12th of January 2017.
31. *Ibid.*
32. *Ibid.*
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Ibid.*
35. Interview with Mrs. J. Tangwena, Rekai's Sister who participated in the Tangwena's political struggles, 14th of August 2016.
36. *Ibid.*
37. Interview with Mr. M. Mabvudza, 20th of October 2017.
38. Interview with Mr. M. Mabvudza, 20th of October 2017.
39. Interview with Mr. P. Pabwe, 21st of October 2016.
40. Interview with Mr. N. Mutsiwawo, 20th February 2017.
41. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 197.
42. *Ibid*, p. 196.
43. Interview with Mr G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
44. Interview with Mrs. S. Mabvudza, 12th of January 2017.
45. Interview with Mr. N. Mutswapo, 13th of January 2017.
46. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p.215.
47. Interview with Mr. G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
48. *Ibid*

CHAPTER 2

NYAFARU FARM AND THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED IT TO BE THE SITE OF POLITICAL STRUGGLES AFTER INDEPENDENCE.

2.0 Introduction

This chapter will trace specifically Nyafaru Farm and how it was linked to the political struggles around Nyafaru. In trying to analyze these factors, the chapter will then unveil Nyafaru Development Company (NDC), a cooperative that was formed in 1970 by the new Nyafaru Farm directors, Guy Clutton-Brook and Didymus Mutasa with the support of the foreign donors.

The company was formed with the aim of supporting the Tangwena people on their struggle against the colonial regime. With the intensification of the armed struggle the Hanmer brothers left their farms leaving the company into full operation helping the Tangwena people in the armed struggle. The chapter will then unveil the mixed policies by the new elected government after independence over the Tangwena people. These policies maintained the idea of ancestral land right among the Tangwena people and marked the continuation of the political struggles into the post independent era. The chapter concludes by looking on reasons why the Nyafaru Development Company became the enemy of the Tangwena people after a long journey being good friends.

2.1 Formation of Nyafaru Development Company (NDC) and the Negative impacts of Colonial Policies on its Agenda

The Nyafaru Farm as noted earlier was founded by the Hanmer brothers, (Charles and William) in the 1950s. The Nyafaru Farm is located at the center of the villages in the Tangwena community. Though these brothers benefitted from the Land Apportionment Act of 1930, to access Nyafaru area they took advantage of the permission given to the first Europeans in Tangwena land by Chief Dzeka who asked grazing land for their cattle in the early nineteenth century. In 1964 towards the

end of Kinya's reign William located himself at Nyafaru and started to practice farming activities at that land.¹ Towards the end of that year Kinya died and left the throne to Rekai. When William arrived at Nyafaru land, he was aware that the Tangwena people were protected by the Land Apportionment Act article 98 which declared that, Africans who were at the land designated European land before the coming of the whites must not move from their land.²

William in the first place used that as an opportunity to gain labour from the Tangwena people to work in his farm. The Tangwena people were being coerced to work in the farm. Due to the fact that, Hanmer after discovering that the population on his land is growing and also receiving pressure from the government to evict Africans from the so-called 'European land,' he chose to offer some of the Tangwenians contracts in his farm and evict the remainder. Therefore, those who were offered contracts were regarded by the latter group as collaborators of the whites.³ This was against the Tangwena Chief and his people on their ancestral soil and it led the chief to resist the colonial rule, especially that of William in the farm. Chief Rekai Tangwena influenced his people with the support of the Nyafaru Development Company directors to resist the eviction.⁴ This led to the political struggles discussed in the first chapter, between the colonial government and Rekai Tangwena (from 1966-1974), as William tried to evict the Tangwena people from their ancestral land.

During that period of Tangwena political struggles with the colonial regime Guy Clutton-Brook sourced for funds from his friends abroad to introduce the cooperative that will help the Tangwena people fight against land alienation at Nyafaru. "John Oram donated the property to a multiracial cooperative society whose members enlisted friends and distant supporters soliciting capital from whites in Switzerland, England and Southern Africa to launch Nyafaru Development Company (NDC), at Nyafaru Farm".⁵

The cooperative included whites and black management board included Guy Clutton-Brock, Stanley Keeble, Didymus Mutasa, Newton Nyamupingidza, Moven Mahachi, Shem Marunda and Ebn Mukombiwa.⁶ These directors came-up with some objectives to form the NDC, as their main objective was to help the Tangwena people from the white bondage. Maoko noted that, these objectives were very import because they were the major foundations that led Nyafaru Farm to be the site of the political struggles after independence up until 2016.⁷

Muomba highlighted four objectives that drive the farm managers to formulate the cooperative in an interview. Firstly, they planned to assist the Tangwena community in their land struggle with the Smith regime.⁸ As the cooperative was for the black people in general and the Tangwena people in particular, the management board intended to help the Tangwena people from the bondage of colonialism, especially William's rule on the Tangwena people. At that moment, Zimbabweans were in the battle field fighting for their independence from the British colonial rule. Over all, the cooperative was meant to fight to free Zimbabwe from the colonial rule in the country and particularly at Nyafaru Farm. Moore added inline to that, "during the apartheid, Nyafaru integrated blacks and whites spatially, socially and politically becoming a node of antiracist nationalism".⁹

Secondly, they wanted to practice farming activities with the Tangwena folk.¹⁰ The Nyafaru Farm was supposed to benefit the Tangwena people in general. The people around the Farm were to be assisted with food, employment and training of new farming methods by the management board at Nyafaru Farm. By so doing, this was to promote the welfare of the Tangwena people as it was affected by the political struggles of Reikai Tangwena and the Smith regime.

Thirdly, they wanted to assist development in the Tangwena area.¹¹ In Tangwena, the Farm was the only light for development in the community because there was no any other business that was done in the community to promote development in the area. Therefore, the directors envisioned to

promote developments in the community in two ways, funding any development and create attractive conditions for developments in the Tangwena area.

Lastly, they anticipated creating a learning and health center for the Tangwena people.¹²The vision was to educate the Tangwena community and improve their health status. During that time there was no school or health center nearby. Hence, it was a great development and privilege to the Tangwena people and their children. These facilities were specifically meant to benefit the Tangwena people. At the same time the Farm was at the center of the community, so schools and clinic were to be at the right location.

As noted earlier on, the cooperative was formed towards the armed struggle. The Hanmer brothers left the area in the early 1970s when the struggle for independence commenced. This was a great chance for these new directors to come-up with the aforementioned plans, though they were not yet confident enough that the Europeans left the land permanently. For that reason, the cooperative was formed, implemented and started to fulfill its objectives. However, other objectives failed to be fulfilled from the start because of some reasons as noted by Muomba, that the armed struggle was in progression, most of the Tangwena people were in Mozambique where they were wartime refugees and the proximity of Nyafaru Farm to Mozambique assisted many freedom fighters during the war. The first and successful objective they implemented was helping the Zimbabweans in general and Tangwena people in particular from the colonial rule. The Nyafaru Farm was used as a springboard for freedom fighters in and out of Zimbabwe.¹³

The company directors became the enemy of the Rhodesian government because they helped to recruit the freedom fighters for training in Mozambique, housing, providing cloths and feeding the Tangwena community which was a problem to the Rhodesian government. Moore pointed out that, Guy and Keeble barred from Rhodesia by the government of Smith because of supporting the

Africans against the white regime¹⁴. The company, however, insisted with its struggle to free the Tangwena people and Zimbabwe in general from colonial rule though white directors were exiled. The Tangwenians who collaborated with the whites during colonial era at that time led by Pearson Kasu joined the Nyafaru Development Comoany.¹⁵ For the company, assessment of the workers who included the Tangwena people and those who collaborated with the whites was not important.¹⁹ Finally, the Africans gained their independence in 1980 after a long and fierce struggle.

From this point of view it is clear that the farm directors did not fulfill much during armed struggle due to unfavorable conditions for the implementation of their objectives. They only had to wait until independence that was gained in 1980 to start implementing their objectives.

2.2 Post-Independence Era and the Mixed Views of the New Government to the Tangwena's Plight

After a decade of fierce and horrible armed struggle, the Zimbabweans found their road to independence at Lancaster House Conference in 1979 and finally gained independence in 1980. The colonial flag brought down on the 18th of April 1980 replaced by the Zimbabwean flag. Though the event indicated the independence of the country from the white oppressors, to the Tangwena people it was a great achievement in their long struggle against the white regime. Meanwhile, the Tangwena people were in Mozambique where they were the wartime refugees.

After independence the government sidelined the traditional leaders into formal institutions for three aspects noted by Ncube; "because of their perceived pre-independence role as functionaries of colonial oppression, because some elements within the new government viewed traditional institutions as antithetical to their modernization project to transform rural societies and because

of other elements in the new government perceived traditional institutions as centers of alternative authority to that of the formal state".¹⁶

Though it sidelined them, President R.G Mugabe, the newly elected president of the majority, announced that the Tangwena people and their chief shall be given back their land.¹⁷ Rekai Tangwena was considered the Chief of the Tangwena people and later on he was appointed the Senator in the ZANU PF government because he did not cooperate with the colonial government like other traditional leaders. President Mugabe was acknowledging Rekai Tangwena as a traditional chief who contributed most to the independence of the country together with his people in the struggle against the white oppressive regime. Also was appreciating the help they offered to him at Nyafaru Farm when he was attacked by the white troops until he crossed to Mozambique. Almost countrywide, the Tangwena people were the privileged people who gained back their original ancestral land.

Other Africans in reserves were resettled in the new lands created by the resettlement programmes introduced by the new government and some remained in the reserves until today.¹⁸ The agents from the government were dispatched to Mozambique where the Tangwena people were wartime refugees to notify them to return back home, as the country attained its independence.¹⁹ A year after independence the Tangwena people arrived in Tangwena village and they all gathered at Nyafaru Farm for a month and others for more. Nelson noted that, Chief Rekai Tangwena at their arrival refused to stay at the Farm with his people due to the fact that it was a place used by his longtime oppressors. After making sure that his people were well settled at the Farm, he left accompanied by some men to his original home stand and rebuilt his demolished houses.²⁰ A month later, the Tangwena people started to return back to their scattered original stands of their ancestors.

The families who remained at the farm were those who did not accompany the Chief and others to Mozambique. To some extent, some of these families were the ones regarded as the ‘collaborators’ with the whites. They were the workers at the farm for a longtime. The families included, the Mabvudza family, Mandipe family, Nzvenga family and Kasu family. As a compensation for working in the farm, the Nyafaru Development Company offered three families stands around Nyafaru Farm. The government has already planned for the linear villages, a settlement pattern to be implemented in Nyafaru before the Tangwena people returned from Mozambique. The settlement pattern by the government was intended to promote development in the area. Moore noted that, “beyond the Nyafaru all the land in Kaerezi was officially state property and administered by the resettlement officer”.²¹ This was in line with Ncube’s argument that the land powers were taken from the traditional chiefs to the local government,²² as Chief Rekai lost land allocation powers to the local government.

“In the name of government, the administrator allocated three use rights; residential stand, a three hectare field and a shared grazing commons”.²³ The land that was allocated for residents was 100 meters by 50 meters plots in a concentrated linear villages.²⁴ The Tangwena people, however rejected the settlement pattern due to the fact that they were uncomfortable to live in linear villages. Moore went on to postulate that; the resettlement scheme in the Kaerezi in 1990 was unlike other resettlement schemes in three respects; firstly, many Kaerezians claimed ancestral rights over the Tangwena land and some considered local land rights as a post-colonial reward for their wartime contributions to national liberation.²⁵ That is to say, they were not going to accept any other changes that will contradict with their perceptions over their land. Secondly, unlike most schemes, Kaerezi was in Zimbabwe’s most preferred agro-ecological zone, a high rainfall belt running along

the mountainous eastern highlands and lastly, Kaerezi shares a boarder with Nyanga National Park, a major international tourist attraction.”²⁶

All the above factors discussed by Moore, influenced the struggle between the government and the Tangwena people. There was a comparison of the policies by the new government after independence and those of the colonial regime. The Tangwena people found similarities of the policies because the structuring was also similar to that in the reserves created by the colonialists. They strongly opposed the government policies of resettlement out of memorizing what they experienced during the colonial era. The struggle between the Tangwena people and the government took a decade and a half after independence.

Apart from the differences between the government and the Tangwena people, the Nyafaru Development Company at Nyafaru Farm was working tirelessly to fulfill its objectives. The directors at that time were Moven Mahachi, Didymus Mutasa and Pearson Kasu respectively. Moven Mahachi as the leader of the company in the first place offered himself as the servant of the Tangwena community without corruption. The school and the clinic were built just after independence to fulfill the objectives of the company. These facilities helped the Tangwena community to a greater extent after independence to the extent that the community experienced change and continuity in terms of development.

2.3 Corruption in NDC as a Factor in Political Struggle on Nyafaru Farm

President R.G Mugabe in 1996 assigned Didymus Mutasa (the secretary and speaker of parliament of Zimbabwe) to allocate Nyafaru Secondary School stand for the Tangwena people.²⁷ The school was first proposed to be built near the Primary blocks that are a kilometer from the Nyafaru Farm compound in the northeastern side. Mutasa changed the plan and marked the stand in the Nyafaru Farm yard near the compound. To authenticate his allocation he used a girl child from Muomba

family as an assurance that the Tangwena people were permanently given the land to build their Secondary School.²⁸ This was also done when the Tangwena people gathered at the stand where Mutasa offered them the farm.

To the Tangwenians, the offer to them was the benefit of their contribution to the struggle for independence and they felt that they were truly free on their ancestral land. The plan was against Molven Mahachi and other farm workers, because the school was going to disturb the farming activities of the farm, so they had proposed the school to be built where it was firstly suggested to be built. Maoko in an interview noted that, Mutasa did that move as a way of playing down Mahachi because they were in struggle on who was to benefit more on the farm. Mutasa was interested in personal gains on the farm while Mahachi was interested in the benefit of the Tangwena people.²⁹ Due to pressure from Mutasa, Mahachi later joined hands together with Mutasa and started to loot the farm equipment for personal gains. Pearson Kasu the farm activities manager at Nyafaru Farm was the agent of these directors. At that stage the objectives of the company started to contradict with the farm directors personal aims of wanting to sell the whole farm for their personal gains.

Though the company had achieved a lot in fulfilling its objectives, the directors started to turn against their effort they have made. The company under the leadership of Mahachi started an extensive planting of new Eucalyptus trees which were vehemently opposed by the Tangwena people on the grounds that they were water guzzlers which would dry up the streams they heavily depended on for livelihood.³⁰ Moreover this extensive plantation system was a direct encroachment onto the Tangwena's grazing land. The land around Nyafaru Farm is the Tangwena's watershed, all rivers flow from this area.

The farm was also used as a relay center for aid to the Tangwena people since 1980. With the passage of time in the late 1990s this aid found its way into private markets and it benefited only a few who stayed in the farm. The NDC directors represented by Mahachi, Mutasa and Kasu looted all the properties at the farm for their personal gains. For example, the cattle from Oxfam, four tractors, an ambulance and 504 land rover truck and other handouts which were destined for the community like, clothes ended up being sold to the community.³¹

Along the way Mutasa and Mahachi continued to have conflicts over the benefits from the farm. Mutasa suspected that Mahachi was benefiting from the eucalyptus trees of Mutare Company, ZIMBOARD (Zimbabwe Particle Board Company Mutare) and proposed to sell the land.³² Mahachi was strongly against Mutasa's idea of selling the land. From that suspicion Mutasa declared the total disposal of Nyafaru Farm properties as he was the chair of the Cold Comfort (the cooperative near the capital city where he formerly been with Guy Clutton-Brock) and NDC for his personal gains.

The wanton misuse of the community properties by the farm management represented by Mutasa and Mahachi created sharp antagonism between the company and the Tangwena people which in a way precipitated the fall of the farm. The above factors discussed about the inconsiderate of the Nyafaru Development Company led to the divorce of the marriage between the Tangwena people and the company. The matter was worsened by the Fast Track Land Reform Programme of 2000 that was used by the farm directors as a scapegoat to legally privatize the farm. This will be discussed in detail in the following chapter.

From the above discussion the Nyafaru Development Company became the backbone of the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm from 2000 up-to 2016.

2.4 Conclusion

As the issue of land right among the Tangwena people became a seed of political struggles around Nyafaru Farm, it was watered by the formation of Nyafaru farm in general and Nyafaru Development Company in particular to germinate. From the discussion above, the Nyafaru Development Company took the political struggles from the broader community to become the Nyafaru Farm issue. The Tangwena people became dependent on the company from its inception because it marketed itself to the Tangwena people as the savior in their ancestral land by coming up with clear objectives that were in line with their own. The case went wrong just after independence when the new government took-up from where the colonial regime left on the Tangwena case. The government tried to suspend the ancestral right of the Tangwena people over their land and forced them to resettle in linear village which was against their scattered homestead method. This led again to resistance by the Tangwena people towards the government policy of resettlement.

The matter was exacerbated by the corruption of the NDC directors on the farm. They started to take everything from the farm for their personal benefit that was totally against the wishes of Tangwena people. Indeed, the relationship of the Tangwena people and the company became inevitably sour and they were then accelerated by the Fast Track Land Reform Programme, (to be discussed in the next chapter) to be more violent.

ENDNOTES

1. Interview with Mr. N. Mutswapo, the man who participated in the Tangwena struggle with the colonial regime, 18th of February 2017.
2. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
3. Interview with Mrs. L. Mabvudza, the woman who participated in marched of the Tangwena women naked to Nyanga, 18th of February 2017.
4. Interview with Mr. N. Mustiwawo, 20th February 2017.
5. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 184.
6. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Interview with Mr. G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
9. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 184.
10. Interview with Mr. G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 200.
15. Interview with Mr. K. Mutape, the TADA member, 1st of February 2017.
16. *Ibid.*
17. G, T, Ncube “Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008”, 2011, p 22.
18. Interview with Mrs. G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
19. Interview with Mrs. S. Mabvudza, 12th of January 2017.
20. Interview with Mr. N. Mustiwawo, 20th February 2017.
21. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 38.
22. G, T, Ncube “Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008”, 2011, p 23.
23. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 39.
24. *Ibid*, p. 39
25. *Ibid*, p. 39.
26. *Ibid.p.40.*
27. Interview with Mr. G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
28. *Ibid.*
29. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 3

THE POLITICAL SQUABBLES AMONG THE TANGWENA PEOPLE OVER THE NYAFARU FARM FROM 2000 -2006.

3.0 Introduction

The chapter reviews the most political struggles that were experienced at Nyafaru Farm from 2000 to 2006. The case of political struggles at Nyafaru Farm to be reviewed from the broader approach, started from the Fast Track Land Reform Programme. The land reform was used by the NDC director Mutasa as a scapegoat to privatize the Nyafaru Farm arguing that it was part of indigenization Programme. After the Tangwena people realized that, Mutasa was replacing Hanmer by using the government's land legislative to recolonize them on their ancestral land, they took up arms against him in 2003. At the same time, the Tangwena people realized that the farm was an egg laid by the colonialist on their land that was trying the hatch another oppressor to bring again oppression on their ancestral land. Therefore, to evict the Nyafaru Development Company from the farm and put to an end all the farm activities was their last option. Women like during the colonial era's struggles, they played a pivotal role in this struggle. The chapter then concludes by discussing the similarities between the main causes and the course of the Tangwena struggles to the 2000 land reform programme because the struggles to some extent shared the same causes and course.

3.1 The Tangwena People Against the Nyafaru Development Company

The year 2000 ushered in another era in the Tangwena's politics. The year marked the implementation of the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) by the government. It was an urgent respond of the government to the pressure it faced from the "land hungry Zimbabweans".¹ A little land has been transferred to the land hungry Zimbabweans twenty years

after independence, industries closed and led to retrenchment of the workers, food insecurity and it steered the strong demand of land in the communal areas.²

The causes of the FTLRP are as many as the scholars argued, among them as noted by Hove et al were, the empty promises made at the Lancaster House Agreement 1979 that allowed the gradual land transfer hinged on willing seller-willing buyer, the effects of the implementation of the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme (ESAP) in 1991, the formation of the opposition party Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) and later on the influence of the war veterans.³

The government to sustain its political powers was forced to urgently respond to this situation and in 2000 the President authorized the war veterans to carry-on the land acquisition by force from the white farmers. For example, as noted by Moore, “that year, so called war veterans invaded a 7000 acre Chimanimani estate owned by Roy Bennet who, in 1994, had been one of only three white MPs and member of opposition MDC”.⁴

The land reform programme had some side effects in the country in general and in the Tangwena community in particular. In the process, the policy of indigenization emanated as the government tried to justify their move of land reform programme to the citizens. Indigenization policy was an attempt to give back the land to the landless Zimbabweans as it was portrayed. However, the policy paved the way for corruption in the government’s elites, as they became the more beneficiaries of the large and many lands from the forcefully evicted white farmers.

Back to the Tangwena case, the land on demand was the NF which was by then directed by the NDC led by Mutasa by then state security minister. The Tangwena people were the sole owners of the farm and they were the ones who were running it and benefiting from it because the Whiteman William Hanmer left it during the armed struggle.

They were hinged on two land rights they strongly believed on; the ancestral right and the right they were given by the President at independence.⁵ The corrupt and inconsiderable NDC directors were looking for the alternative to take control over the farm from the Tangwena people. Following the death of Molven Mahachi in an accident in 2001, together with the implementation of the Indigenization policy, Mutasa finally found his way to privatize the NF for his personal gains.⁶ Mutasa as the one of the government elites he tried to use the indigenization policy to pursue his personal interests over the NF, after he found how the Tangwena people were strong in defending their land rights.

Due to the blunders which were made by the company directors as aforementioned in the above chapter that led to the antagonism between the company and the Tangwena people, the people took up arms to drive the company out of the NF. Other Tangwenians argue that, at that time the collaborators who were at Nyafaru farm from the colonial era became again the traitors in this situation because, instead of joining in taking arms with others against the company they collaborated with the company against the Tangwena people.⁷ The company led by Mutasa found support from the farm manager Pearson Kasu and his fellow leaders who were the supervisors of every activities on the farm. Therefore, a number of the workers in the farm corruptly benefited from the farm were coerced by that situation to strongly support Mutasa and his company. Some of the families among the collaborator workers were those offered stands on the farm's territory.

In 2003 the situation in Tangwena became very tense and violent over the control of the NF. That year the Tangwena people formed the cooperation party called the Tangwena Development Association (TADA), which was composed of the members against the NDC and it was led by teachers, village intellectuals and traditional leaders.⁸ Here the case differs from the way Ncube argued on the political struggles in Zimbabwe that, the political struggles in Zimbabwe are

masterminded by the sidelined traditional leaders.⁹ This is because, the teachers who were the community members of Tangwena community and the community intellectuals were the leaders of the political struggle. The traditional leaders were seen as the consultancies in the struggle.

The TADA cooperative dismissed the NDC company workers at NF with violence. It has been noted that the youth in the cooperative drove in the compound a Mahindra tractor of a member in the cooperative to carry the properties of the NDC workers to their homestead.¹⁰ The NDC workers were first tortured through beatings by the youths before leaving the Farm to their homes. From the Farm, only in-house and some of house valued properties were allowed to be moved away except domestic animals like hens, turkeys, goats and sheep. After evicting the NDC farm director Pearson Kasu and his followers from the farm, the TADA elders took control of the farm and used it as their base for meetings to strategize the struggle.

The NDC supporters accepted eviction from the compound, but they resumed their works in the farm from their homestead. It was in November the rainy season, so in the farm there were a lot of crops, tree nurseries and fruits orchards. Thus, wheat at its flowering stage, eucalyptus and apples respectively. Their base became the only one big shop that was in the farm hundred meters away from the farm compound, where they also met to strategize for the struggle. The farm became the chess board for the Tangwena political struggle until 2016. The NDC members at the farm with support from the Minister and also the company director Mutasa started to continuously expand the eucalyptus trees in the grazing lands of the Tangwena people and even extending into the stands of the TADA members.¹¹ To counter the NDC activities, TADA took that as an opportunity to start building the secondary blocks at the stand Mutasa formally gave to the Tangwena people, when their relations were cordial.

Meanwhile, in the stand there was wheat at its flowering stage, but that was not considered by the TADA party, they build two blocks on it.¹² According to the NDC member noted that, the situation in the Tangwena community alerted the government that the area has to be protected by the police to avoid unnecessary deaths and violation of human rights by the TADA group. The police agents were send to monitor the land for a week at the Farm.¹³ However, this did not change the status quo at the ground. The NDC was left undisturbed by the police, while the TADA party was strongly escorted by the well-armed police to avoid them from disturbing the NDC works. To the TADA members realized that, as noted by the TADA member, it was a diplomatic method by their enemy Mutasa, who was using his political stamina he had in the government to win the case.¹⁴ They resorted to the strategy of their late, Chief Rekai Tangwena that, women must be at forefront of the struggle to avoid extermination of men or tough war. The Tangwena women rose up while the men were supporting them from behind.

3.2 Women in the Political Struggle of 2003 -2006

Women in general, in the wars are the most respected and protected people by the international laws globally. Rekai Tangwena managed to monopolize this loophole and maximally utilized it in his struggle against the colonial regime during the colonial era. This protected his people especially men from being exterminated by the well-armed colonial troops, while his people were unarmed. Today that knowledge is still alive in the minds of the Tangwena people so that in this case they used it in their struggle with the NDC. The participant in the TADA association once said laughing, “we think Chief Rekai used his spirits as the spirit medium during his time to make the women his soldiers to defend his interests, that is still the case in every Tangwena political struggles even today”.¹⁵ A number of women in the TADA association were heroically and they started to fight against the NDC members in the farm while men were in the camp. The weapons used by these

two parties to fight against each other were nob carries and small logs from the surrounding fences and at some point axes were used though to a lesser extent.

At some point the TADA women strategized for the conflict by dividing themselves into small groups to attack the NDC members. One of the women called it “the cow horn formation of Tshaka”.¹⁶ The youth boys were used to get-rid of NDC members trying to escape and returning them in the battlefield with TADA women. As noted by the elderly NDC man who participated in the struggle, “The TADA evil youths were supplied in the bushes around us to arm bush everyone who tried to escape from the TADA women...”.¹⁷ Thus the TADA women were at the battlefield against the men and women from the NDC.

The NDC leader Mutasa took the case to the court whereby he sued the TADA elders in 2004 for the allegation that they violated human rights at Nyafaru Farm. However, the case was forged by the minister Mutasa to undermine and intimidate the Tangwena people. As Moore noted that he had received a letter describing the jailed of Sagumbo, Simba and other Kaerezians on falsified charges.¹⁸ The supporters contributed and raised bail for the Tangwena elders who were jailed for seven days in (NPS) cells.

There were other elders who were alleged to have been involved in the violation of human rights by the NDC left at Nyafaru when others were taken to NPS. A land Cruiser police vehicle arrived at the Nyafaru Farm’s compound from NPS to take the alleged elders to the cells. To their surprise they met three Tangwena heroines at the base who were at that time cooking for the elders at the farm. One of the women she postulated that, “we vehemently resisted the request of the police to take our elders to police station, rather we asked them to take us because we were the ones who were at the frontline of violations”.¹⁹ The women defended their elders until the police drove back to Nyanga empty handed. The Tangwena people were sued for two times at NPS on charges that

were forged by the minister Mutasa, but they won all the cases as they were represented by their committed lawyer Toto.

At the same time, the TADA youth and the builders were constructing the two Secondary school blocks in the farm. As noted earlier the wheat was of no import to the TADA, it was brought down to the ground. The Tangwena people especially the TADA party were defending their aforementioned two land rights which were violated by the former Minister Mutasa and some of what the TADA members called the collaborators (some of the Tangwena people who joined the NDC).²⁰ This struggle reminded many of the Tangwena people about the past especially to those who participated in the political struggles of Reikai Tangwena and the Smith regime. The TADA followers became fearless to fight against Mutasa because he was a Minister, as they memorized their successful struggles against the colonial regime.²¹

In 2004 Mutasa visited the Nyafaru Farm to try to solve the situation that was on the ground. He met the Tangwena people at the stand where the Secondary school blocks were built by the TADA builders. The day was weird to Mutasa because the Tangwena people especially women managed to confront their enemy face to face. From an interview with the participant involved in that event, Mbuya Tangwena (Reikai's wife) possessed with the spirits started shivering when Mutasa was speaking. She approached him at the pulpit shivering and lifted him in the air with a collar, the police with the support unity police failed to stop her from approaching Mutasa.²² Moore also acknowledged that "Mbuya Tangwena openly criticized Mutasa, by that time appointed minister of anticorruption, for being involved in a shady deal that leased land on Nyafaru, where he remained the absentee shareholder, to an outside timber concession".²³ Mbuya Tangwena also demanded to see Mutasa and Mugabe together so that they can tell her either the Tangwena land

was no longer their own or had it been sold. She also vowed that her people and she were prepared to die for the Tangwena land until they became independent on it.²⁴

This was a clear sign to Mutasa that the Tangwena people were not going to allow the foreigners on their soil to override them by any means. Again it was to their surprise that the man whom they trusted and worked together with during the colonial era and one and half decades after independence was the one they were calling their enemy due to his inconsiderate. The Tangwena people were even ready to fight even the government police and army for their land as they declared that the Nyafaru Farm “was and still is, the Tangwena people’s ancestral land”.²⁵

3.3 Similarities Between Nyafaru farm Political Struggles (2003-2006 and the FTLRP of 2000)

The violent political squabble between the TADA and NDC at the NF stretched from 2003 to 2006 when Nyafaru Secondary School blocks for form one to four were opened. The Tangwena people in the struggle were not even interested in any property or any agricultural mind to take over the farm activities, rather land and have independence on it were the urgent factors they fought for. The NDC were protecting their activities, properties and personal interests on the farm. The case might be equated to the Zimbabwean struggle over the land from colonial era to post-colonial particularly the FTLRP of 2000.

In this case the Zimbabweans fought for their land for a long time from the colonial regime and attained independence. The snail’s pace of the new elected government at independence on the urgent issue of the “land hungry Zimbabweans” led to radical changes.²⁶ The delay by the government led the Zimbabweans to lost their “tempo” in the implementation of the resettlement programme, so that the Zimbabweans especially the war veterans exerted pressure to the government.²⁷ Consequently, the government resorted to the FTLRP whereby all white farmers

were forcefully and violently removed from their farms by the Zimbabweans led by the war veterans and ZANU PF youths. Thus the land matters most to the Zimbabweans, so they were more interested in gaining back their ancestral land that they fought for in the armed struggle. The Tangwenians shared the same feeling as the Zimbabweans in their case. Tangwena land according to them, as their chief and his wife always lamented that, it is their ancestral land and they will never retire to fight against any means of oppression on it.²⁸ As the Tangwenians became aware that the government official Didymus Mutasa was taking advantage being the director of the NDC at NF to recolonize them on their land, they resorted to a chaotic way to evict the company from their land.

During the course of the implementation of the FTLR policy the war veterans and youths used different methods to take control of the farms. Matondi asserted that, “the arsenal used in the occupations also included the use of physical violence, putting political pressure on the law enforcement agencies (especially the ZRP) not to take action against the occupiers, negotiations, incessant demonstrations at farm gates (singing, engaging in press-ups and all-night vigils close to the homes of the white owners), using youths as the shock troopers, killing and maiming livestock”,²⁹ destroyed the house’s windows in those farms and some inserted sugar in the farming machines in the farms. Similarly, the Tangwena struggle of 2003-2006 was some of the methods used by the TADA members to fight the NDC oppressors.

The killing of all domestic animals at the farm became the order of the day in the struggle. In an interview, one of the key participants noted that, “when the TADA youth were packing the properties of the NDC workers in the tractor, we assigned other youths to chase ‘domestic birds’ (NDC workers hens and turkeys) around the farm. The type and number of the ‘birds’ determined

by the number of people at the scene, at other time if there was a large number of people they were to hunt ‘domestic Impala’ (goats or sheep).³⁰

The building of the school in the already grown wheat by the TADA was also another method used to sabotage the flow of the NDC operations in the farm in order to evict them from their land. Inline to that, Matondi noted that “in Mazowe, a symbolic gesture of intention through the pegging of land by occupiers ...were used in order to demonstrate their seriousness, some occupiers built huts in addition to pegging. This was interpreted as a more serious threat and a symbol of permanency”.³¹ Though the Tangwena people started to build their school in the farm, they were not pegging the wrong land but their land from Mutasa. They were clearly indicating to NDC leader Mutasa that by building school, they are truly and permanently the owners of the land to the extent that they can do what they deemed necessary.

In the farms that were managed by the white farmers there were the African workers who were benefiting from the farm and a number of them without anywhere they called their rural area. Thus, there was nowhere to go if they evicted from those farms. FTLRP ushered in a tragically life to these vulnerable families in the farms because they were left without any means of living and nowhere to reside on. The workers in the NDC were evicted from the farm to their permanent homesteads while a few of them were forced by the situation and changed the group to follow the TADA for the sake of seeking stands to live because they had nowhere to go. Land matters most to the Zimbabweans even today Zimbabweans will never be comfortable without land. Many scholars who wrote about political struggles in Zimbabwe mentioned land as the key cause of political instability in the country. Similarly, the Tangwena people will never retire in any means to fight if threatened on their ancestral land.

The Tangwena people from an assessment during the research were more interested in the gaining of their total independence from the inconsiderable NDC leaders and nothing else. It can be evidenced by many factors identified; the Tangwena people led by TADA during the political struggle they destroyed, the crops in the farm, apple orchards, eucalyptus nurseries and seedlings, and they did not even maintain the houses at the farm. Even today there is none of the farming productive activities practiced in the farm except education and health facilities which are running in the farm land for the community. Therefore, the Tangwena show that the issue of land to them is nonnegotiable.

In case of the NDC leader Didymus Mutasa, he strategically followed the method used by other officials in the FTLR of indirect approach to acquire farms as indicated by Matondi. He argued that, during the land occupation in the FTLR there were two approaches (direct and indirect) used to occupy farms. Firstly, “those who expected to become beneficially landowners and who viewed their occupation as leading to the piece of land they occupied being officially handed to them, took direct approach” and lastly, “some who were interested in land did not have the courage to occupy that land themselves and adopted an indirect approach by using the war veterans and youths”.³² Mutasa used Pearson Kasu and his followers to fight for him to gain control over the farm. However, though a number of officials who followed that path of indirect approach during the FTLR succeeded, Mutasa failed the case on the ground. He then resorted to another plan to fulfill his interest over the farm which is taking the case as a legal case. The expectations by the minister were to use his political muscle in the case against the Tangwena people.

3.4 Conclusion

To sum-up, the issue of ancestral land right to the Tangwena people’s case always run parallel with the government’s land right starting from the colonial era. In this case, the new elected

government of independent Zimbabwe came up with the policies that contradicted with the land right of the Tangwena people again and the Tangwena people failed to entertain these policies. The NDC worsened the case as its directors turned against the Tangwena people ancestral land right. As a result, the Tangwena people to get rid of repression over their land, they took-up arms to evict the company and its directors and also to put to an end the farm and its activities replacing it with community based facilities like, school and clinic.

END NOTES

1. P, B, Matondi, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, Zed Books Ltd, New York, 2012, pp. 23-4.
2. *Ibid*, p 23.
3. M, Hove, and A, Gwiza, "The Fast Track Land Reform Programme and Food Insecurity: A Case of Zimbabwe from 1992 to the Present", *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol 2(8), 2012, p.284.
4. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2005, p. 310.
5. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
6. *Ibid*.
7. Interview with Mr. S. Mukanya, the cooker at the base of TADA party, 5th of February 2017.
8. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
9. G, T, Ncube "Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008", *African Journal of History and Culture*, vol 3 (6), 2011.
10. Interview with Mr. S. Mukanya, the cooker at the base of TADA party, 5th of February 2017.
11. Interview with Mr. J. Mabvudza, the adviser in the NDC, 5th of February 2017.
12. *Ibid*.
13. *Ibid*.
14. Interview with Mrs. J. Tserayi, one of the TADA heroines in the struggle, 6th of February 2017.
15. Interview with Mr. M. Mabvudza, the participant in the Nyafaru Farm from 1966 to 2016, 20th of October 2016.
16. Interview with Mrs. P. Nyamupangedengu, one of the TADA heroines in the struggle, 10th of February 2017.
17. Interview with Mr. J. Mabvudza, 5th of February 2017.
18. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 311.
19. Interview with Mrs. J. Tserayi, 6th of February 2017.
20. *Ibid*.
21. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
22. *Ibid*.
23. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe*, 2005, p. 311.
24. *Ibid*, p. 311.
25. *Ibid*, p. 311.
26. P, B, Matondi, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, 2012, pp. 23-4.
27. *Ibid*.
28. Interview with Mr G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
29. P, B, Matondi, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, 2012, pp. 23-4.
30. Interview with Mr. S. Mukanya, 5th of February 2017.

31. P, B, Matondi, Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform, 2012, pp. 23-4.
32. *Ibid*, p 24.

CHAPTER 4

THE LEGAL BATTLE BETWEEN TANGWENA PEOPLE AND NYAFARU DEVELOPMENT COMPANY FROM 2004-2016.

4.0 Introduction

After a strong resistance from the TADA at NF, the NDC director Didymus Mutasa by then secretary for administration in the ZANU PF party resorted to direct battle with the TADA in the courts over the control of the farm. This was an experiment by the Minister Mutasa taking his political muscles as a new method to fight against the Tangwena people over their land. The chapter analyzes the two court cases held over Nyafaru Farm as some of the court cases are confidential because they are still sensitive to be published. The chapter will then end up by reviewing how the Tangwena people won the case in 2016.

4.1 From Indirect to Direct Battle in the Court: The First Court Cases on the Public Violence

Matondi noted that, during the FTLRP other elites used indirect occupation methods of the farms forcefully grabbed from the white farmers, whereby the war veterans and ZANU PF youths were used for the benefit of those elites.¹ Didymus Mutasa in the first place followed the same path of indirect occupation of the NF, whereby he used the farm manager Pearson Kasu and the Tangwena collaborators for his personal gains at the end. However, he faced a strong resistance from the Tangwena people and failed to take control of the farm.

As reviewed in the chapter above, the indirect method by the minister created two rival groups within a community, the TADA composed of the Tangwena people who were against personal gains in the farm and the NDC composed of the Tangwena people who supported personal gains in the farm. Consequently, a political squabble was inevitable in the Tangwena community as each

group wanted to safe-guard its interests at the same area (NF). The NDC failed to defend the interests of their company director, of taking total control of the NF. It was because the TADA at Nyafaru Farm, as alluded by the late Tangwena's wife that, the real Tangwena sons and daughters were prepared to die for their land,² it strongly resisted the interests of the Minister Mutasa on their ancestral land.

The Minister followed the methods used by the colonial settlers to evict the Tangwena people from their land. They used their powers of being colonial masters in the country to suppress the Tangwena people on their own land. Therefore, Mr. Mutasa resorted to that method to use his Ministerial post in the ruling ZANU PF government to suppress the Tangwena people again. "Our former friend during the colonial era and two decades after independence, forgot that we as the sons and daughters of the late Rekai Tangwena we fear no one except our God, he took the Tangwena case to courts as a way to use his political stamina against us".³ The Tangwena participant indicated that they were not going to accept defeat because the Minister was one of the high authorities in the country.

The first court case reported by the Minister and his farm manager Pearson Kasu was held on the 27th of May 2004, when 22 TADA elderly members who were above 60 years of age were accused for public violence at NF. "The TADA elders master minded the public violence at the farm when they remove us from the farm compound by force, beating us, even destroyed our properties in the process and farm products like our grown-up wheat, fences and burnt our gum plantations and even our shop full of grocery. This led our farm director and manager sued the TADA for the justice to be practiced by the government at the farm."⁴ However, the TADA members countered the alleged case by reviewing that the public violence was not solely committed by them but both of the parties at NF. They argued that the land of contest was their land that they were given by

the Minister Mutasa on 08 January 2001 to build the community school. Therefore, the two rival groups appeared in the court for justice, though the TADA members called the case, a forged case by the NDC director.⁵

The case was entitled “State versus David Mukanya and 22 Others”, whereby the former represented the NDC and the later represented accused TADA members.⁶ Chekwa the Nyafaru Primary school teacher by then assumed that this first court case was a diplomatic way used by the Minister to cut the umbilical code between the elders who participated in the Tangwena struggles and the new generation of the Tangwenians especially the teachers and the community intellectuals. Minister thought that the elders were the ones who were leading the struggle and sharing with the young generations their experiences during the colonial era. By prosecuting the elders it was a way to terminate the participation of them in the struggle and thought he will be successful in his struggle.⁷

The state in the court failed to provide evidence against the accused and the state did not disapprove the alibi defense raised by the accused paragraph 3 of the defense outlined and further that the accused had a bona fide (genuine) belief that they had been given the land in question for the benefit of the community.⁸ The accused persons applied for their discharge in the court after the failure of the state to provide evidence. The state strongly opposed the application and insisted that the accused persons must be placed on their defense. It also argued that the accused persons’ demonstrations were unlawful and damages caused were extensive.⁹ The demonstrations and the damages that were referred to in this case were the violence cases aforementioned. From an interview from both parties it seems as if the public violence alleged to the TADA participated by both sides because it was a struggle between the two rival groups. The NDC members even

destroyed the foundation and walls of the secondary blocks that were built in the farm and they extended their eucalyptus plantation into the grazing lands and yards of the TADA members.

Again the state was told to present the evidence of the above accusations they were alleging to the TADA members, so that the application by the accused will be disapproved. Unfortunately, the evidence for the prosecution has been discredited in the cross examination and witnesses ended up raising contradictions among the state itself. According to the ruling document, their credibility was greatly doubtful for instance, Pearson Kasu who was supposed to be the chief witness denied some of the most obvious issues such as; he was not related and even known to the accused 23 persons. His brother Nagat Kasu (also his NDC colleague) confirmed he is related to all the accused 23 persons and he told the court his relation with each of them.¹⁰ From such a scenario the court found it difficult to believe that witness.

Chekwa pointed out that, the accused persons alleged that they committed public violence by the state and witnessed by Pearson Kasu, became so suspicious in the court because the accused persons were not arrested on the day when the disturbances took place. There was a great possibility that there were those who were not present when the disturbances took place and were only arrested because they attended on the 27th when the police finally arrested the accused persons.¹¹ Therefore, the court suspected the state for forging the case against the TADA members because the state failed to provide convincing evidence in each of their accusations.

To this end it was the court's finding that a defense of claim of right has been established. The accused rightfully believed that they had been given this piece of land. It came as no wonder that whatever damages caused on the farm, it was only on the disputed 300 acres where the villagers (accused) and the school authorities intended to build a school. Maoko noted that, the accused believed that the piece of land allocated to them cannot be taken as a wild one, especially taking

into account the letter written by Honorable Mutasa to the chief executive officer Nyanga Rural District Council (RDC) on 08 January 2001. The letter said that, he confirmed that the Cold Comfort Trust (a cooperative at Cold Comfort farm near Harare where he (Mutasa) was again the director) which controls NDC was willing to continue to assist the educational needs of the Tangwena people and he confirmed the acceptance of the sitting of the Nyafaru Secondary School on its property, the NF.¹²

This case in the ruling document was equated to one of the case happened long before in 1988 between the state and Mtizwa. The case involved members of the youth wing of the ruling party. There were a group of about 100 people who went to stop operations by the complainant in their communal grazing land with the belief that they had a right to protect their grazing area from depredation of squatters. On appeal it was held that it is not necessary for the accused to show that such belief was reasonable, although reasonableness or otherwise of the belief provides cogent evidence as to whether it was believed. It was finally held that it was eminently reasonable for the accused to believe they had a right to remove the structures that were erected in their grazing area.¹³ Therefore, like mentioned earlier on, the accused in the present case thought they had a legal right to remove the fence surrounding the area given to them by comrade Mutasa and also the crops grown in that piece of land.

Finally the state failed in this court case and the accused were discharged by the court. The accused lacked the requisite intention to commit the offence, it is also alleged that some of people were assaulted, but the manner in which they explained that they were assaulted made it quite unbelievable. The court argued that, having been assaulted by the accused persons they were supposed to have sustained serious injuries and they obviously were supposed to seek medical treatment and the police were supposed to have seen the injuries when they visited the scene. The

state admitted that the evidence had not proved who actually set the gum plantation on fire, but at the same time asking the court to draw inferences. In this case the inferences were only drawn from proved facts, but there were none especially given the fact that they were arrested well after the offence had been committed.

4.2 The Second Court Case on Land Rights

In response to the first move by the NDC director and his farm manager Pearson Kasu of bringing the Tangwena struggle to the courts led the Tangwena people also to take their own case to the court. The TADA leaders together with the School Development Committees (SDC) for Nyafaru Primary and Secondary schools took the case to court claiming their land rights on their ancestral land. The Tangwena people holding on their ancestral land right and the right given to them by the president after independence, they wanted freedom on their ancestral land which they gained after a long struggle. Muomba indicated that, the case was taken to the court so that the wrangles between the TADA and the NDC members will be resolved. The minister wanted to take the Tangwenian struggles during the colonial and armed struggle era over their ancestral land for granted.¹⁴

The applicants at this case were B. Maoko, Nyafaru Secondary School (NSS) and Nyafaru School Development Committee (NSDC) and the respondents were Pearson Kasu, NDC and Comrade D. Mutasa. In this case the TADA members were claiming the NF territory to be allocated for the school in extension of the 300 acres they were given by the minister in 2001. Maoko questioned that, how can educational facilities be accommodated on 300 acres of land? Therefore the schools needs enough ground which included some of the lands in the farm.¹⁵ From this point of view, the TADA members were declaring the NDC vital lands to be designated school area as an indirect way of evicting the company from their ancestral land. This was because the only solution for

TADA to achieve the goal of freedom on the Tangwena land was through evicting the foreigner from the land and ensures that the community took control of the land.

In the court, the NDC director and his manager Kasu defended themselves as the directors of the NF from the colonial era and they provided the title deeds left by William Hanmer during the armed struggle. Nyagondore SDC chairperson for NSS noted that, although the NDC provided the papers for evidence of occupying the farm legally, the case did not change because the Whiteman robbed the African land from its owners and privatized it for the personal benefit at the expense of the Africans. From that situation it [was] null and void to produce the papers from the colonial regime as a land right in now Zimbabwe, just because the land was taken back to its real owners.¹⁶ The Tangwena people at this period they were arguing with the fact that they have ancestral land right that will never be taken from them except digging of their ancestral graves and the second land right given to them as a remuneration of their participation in the fighting against the colonial rule by president Mugabe using Mutasa the respondent in the court.

The court in this case did not produce inferences that satisfied the TADA members because the documents that were produced by the company seemed to have convinced the court. The case was then postponed as some researches were to be taken on the documents produced by the NDC members. The TADA lawyer Toto took the case to the high court. The TADA members in some cases were able to pick-up nepotism in the court because they were aware that they were in struggle with the minister who has some powers that were to be used in the courts. According to Nyagondore, “we did not forget that our enemy was benefiting from the indigenous policy and also he was a well-known director of the NDC for a long time. We fastened all sides in the court so that the enemy was not going to escape our traps”.¹⁷ However, even though the TADA members were aware of the advantages of their enemies their way was so tough to achieve what they were

eagerly looking for. Apart from the challenges they faced in the courts they insisted in their struggle for the control of NF.

Thereafter, a number of court hearings over the land were held some in Mutare and others were held at the High Court in Harare. The Tangwena people insisted on their struggle at the courts, like the struggles of Rekai Tangwena during colonial era, because their sovereignty on their ancestral land was the urgent matter to them. All of the courts attended during that period failed to resolve the land question over the NF. Maoko postulated that, the land issue in the courts were postponed so that they could be resumed from 2008 and concluded in 2015 following the expulsion of the Didymus Mutasa from ZANU PF party and government. There were some hot issues from both sides that led the judges in all these courts failing to come up with proper judgments of the Tangwena case. For the court to rule in favour of the NDC it was not easy taking into consideration the ratio of the members between the two parties. The NDC composed of three percent while the TADA consist of the ninety seven percent. The interests of the NDC were openly inconsiderate even in the courts and at the same time judges were preserving the interest of the minister on the farm.¹⁸ Therefore, the case was pending until Didymus Mutasa was removed from the office by the government.

4.3 The “Rekai Kudzingwa Declaration”: The Tangwenians Road to Independence on their Land.

Perseverance to a greater extent has positive results in every situation. The Tangwena people after thirteen years in struggle with the NDC director Didymus Mutasa and farm manager Pearson Kasu, finally found their way out of the struggle with the NDC, taking their ancestral land in 2014. The year marked the expulsion of the former Vice President Joice T. Mujuru and her allies including Didymus Mutasa from the ZANU PF party and government on allegations that they were plotting

to topple President Mugabe. “As the Tangwena people, the year shall be celebrated as the day that marked independence on our ancestral land after a long thirteen year struggle against the neo-colonizers”.¹⁹ Mutasa as minister before expulsion was using his ministerial post to suppress the Tangwena people on their land, Nyafaru Farm.

The court cases were supposed to have been concluded earlier because the arguments by the NDC were clearly inconsiderate in the struggle while those of the TADA were for the community benefit, but the fact that Mutasa was the culprit led the case to extend until 2015. Ultimately the NDC director lost his political stamina that sustained him in the political struggle against the TADA. Therefore, it was for the Tangwena people to utilize the opportunity to take control over the NF.

The case of expulsion of former Vice President J.T. Mujuru and his allies led the ZANU PF elites to take that as an advantage to normalize the relationship of the government and the Tangwena people because the relations were made sour by the former minister Mutasa. In 2013 elections ZANU PF faced a dismal loss of votes to the opposition party of Movement of the Democratic Change (MDC-T) led by Tsvangirai.²⁰ The Tangwena people became the targeted audience by the ZANU PF politicians so that they will gain back their former support from the Tangwena people before the opposition party became strong in the community. Mandiitawepi Chimene, the Manicaland Provincial Affairs Minister just after the expulsion of Mrs Mujuru from the party, she visited the Tangwena land on the 10th of July 2015 to assess the situation on the ground. The ruling government used diplomatic way to gain back the support of the Tangwena people. After the visit, Mandiitawepi Chimene promised the Tangwena people that their political struggle over the NF has come to an end because the culprit’s tail has been cut short and the Tangwena people supported ZANU PF due to that factor. According to Nyagondore, the Tangwena people were assigned by

Mandiitawepi Chimene to come up with their main aims they were suggesting to the government to help them with.²¹

The Tangwena people during that period they were not much concerned with the country politics rather with their struggle with NDC director until they gained the title deeds of their land. To them this event motivated them and just after the visit in response to their assignment, the meeting on the 14 July 2015 was held at the Farm. There were five aims they drafted as a community to use the land they fought for, for the past thirteen years. The aims were as follows; that the hitherto expropriated land be used as a learning center for the Tangwena people's children to address the vagaries of colonial disruptions, to this end, the community has resolved that the land should not be pieced out to family landholdings but be reserved in its entire primarily for the expansion of education institutions from the current existing primary and secondary schools to tertiary and recreational levels. Secondly, the portion of the restituted land was to be set aside for the establishment of growth point services for the institutions and the surrounding community. Thirdly, that sometimes productive activities that fully exploit the high agronomic potential of the area be undertaken on the restituted land to sustain the developments of education and other services in line with government's Zimbabwe Agenda for Sustainable Socio- Economic Transformation (ZIMASSET) and lastly, the Tangwena community to put in place appropriate institutions to attain and sustain this vision in collaboration with appropriate national institutions and other development partners.²²

The Tangwena people from the finalization of the case after expulsion of Mutasa, they found their freedom within the ZANU PF party from the NDC. At the same time the ZANU PF party found its plan of gaining back their support from the Tangwena having been successful in helping the Tangwena people to gain back their lost freedom over their ancestral land. "In view of this

significance towards the attainment of what we fought for under the late Chief Tangwena (the integrity and security of our ancestral land rights), we have resolved that this conclusion be made formally referred to as the “Rekai Kudzingwa Declaration”²³ The Tangwena people from then they eagerly waited to hear from response of Mandiitawepi Chimene a government agent who let them free.

Finally on the 07th September 2016, the Tangwena people gained their land independence from the political struggle with the NDC over the control of NF. Minister of Manicaland Provincial Affairs Mandiitawepi Chimene officially handed over the NF land to the Tangwena people after fourteen years of struggle with the former minister Didymus Mutasa. However, according to Muomba, the official handover of the land was done as a half backed cake because tittle deeds of the land promised on the day to be given to the Tangwena people.²⁴ Thus the Tangwena people realized that they were being used for political ends by the ruling party.

4.4 Conclusion

All in all, the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm ended in 2016 with the Tangwena people gaining their land independence. The farm activities were put to an end and led to the downfall of Nyafaru Development Company. The farmland was then converted to educational land for the community. The farm compound was renovated to a teacher’s cottage, some of the fields were turned to school playing grounds and another party was left for school developments like, the proposed boarding buildings. Therefore, the Tangwena people successfully achieved their goal of removing the egg (Nyafaru Farm) of colonialism on their ancestral land that was trying to hatch new oppressors over their land.

END NOTES

1. P, B, Matondi, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, Zed Books Ltd, New York, 2012, pp. 23-4.
2. D, S, Moore, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place and Power in Zimbabwe*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2005, p. 311.
3. Interview with Mr. K. Hazangwe, the TADA elder who participated in the Tangwena struggles, 12th of February 2017.
4. Interview with Mr. R. Mutape, the NDC secretary general, 13th February 2017.
5. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
6. Interview with Mr. C. Chekwa, the TADA member and former Nyafaru Primary School teacher, 14th February 2017.
7. *Ibid.*
8. Court document CRB NO 635-57/05, 27 May 2004, p.1.
9. *Ibid.*
10. *Ibid.*
11. Interview with Mr. C. Chekwa, 14th February 2017.
12. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
13. Court document CRB NO 635-57/05, 27 May 2004, p.2.
14. Interview with Mr G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.
15. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
16. Interview with Mr. N. Nyagondore, the Nyafaru Secondary School Development Committee chairperson, 10th February 2017.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Interview with Mr B. Maoko, 1st of February 2017.
19. Interview with Mr. C. Chekwa, 14th February 2017.
20. *Ibid.*
21. Interview with Mr. N. Nyagondore, 10th February 2017.
22. Letter, "The Tangwena People's Restitutions Subsequent to Visit by Lands Officer", to Provincial Lands Officer, Manicaland Province, 14 July 2015.
23. *Ibid.*
24. Interview with Mr G. Muomba, 7th of February 2017.

CONCLUSION

The political struggles around Nyafaru in general and Nyafaru Farm in particular have origins traced from the colonial era. The parallel land rights between the Tangwena people and the colonial government led to the origin of the political struggles around Nyafaru and later on at Nyafaru farm. The Tangwena people claimed that they had an ancestral land right over the Tangwena land, while the white farmer Hanmer also claimed that he had the legal land right of the same portion of the Tangwena land. This precipitated the political struggles between the two rivalry groups whereby the latter with the powers of being a colonialist attempted to evict the former from their ancestral land. Then from contest between Tangwena people and William Hanmer, the seeds of political struggles have been sown in the Tangwena community.

The Tangwena people in trying to defend their land right they strongly resisted the evictions from their land. Even though they were brutally treated by the colonial government through, demolition of their homes continuously, prosecuted because of Chief Reikai Tangwena, abduction of the community children and threatened by the police dogs the Tangwena people chose to live in the bushes and curves like animals. The Tangwena people joined the war to fight for their land which was taken from them by white farmer Hanmer. Though they joined the armed struggle that involved the whole country population, to them independence of 1980 was not national independence but their own independence.

The evidence of the perception among the Tangwena people can be witnessed by the status quo just after independence between the Tangwena people and the new government of ZANU. The government came-up with the resettlement pattern countrywide including linear villages. Surprisingly, the Tangwena strongly resisted the policy on their ancestral land as they argued that they have the right to do whatever they deemed necessary on their ancestral land they fought for a

longtime. Therefore, the issue of ancestral lands right and that they were the one tribe that resisted colonial rule through and through led the Tangwena people tirelessly to fight against any means oppression over their land.

The political struggles were redirected from being the Tangwena community struggle to be Nyafaru Farm political struggle by Nyafaru Development Company in the post-colonial era. The company after attracting the Tangwena people by its objectives that were clearly supported them and its entire contribution to the Tangwena in the struggle, the directors later turned against the Tangwena people. As a result, this led to the antagonism between the two parties and the wage of conflict of eviction. Memorizing the colonial period struggles, the Tangwena people realized that their ancestral land right was under threat. The influence of the land reform programme of 2000 sparked the struggle between the Tangwena people against the company. Thus, the Nyafaru Development Company became the backbone of the political struggles at Nyafaru Farm.

The Tangwena people evicted the Nyafaru Development Company that was led by Mutasa the then ZANU PF minister from the farm and took control of the farm. This marked the violent political struggle at Nyafaru Farm that started in 2003 to 2006 and then continued as the legal battle to 2016 when the Tangwena people gained their land independence. The political struggle ended by the ouster of former Minister Didymus Mutasa (NDC Director) from ZANU PF and government with his colleagues on the allegations that they were plotting to oust President R. G. Mugabe from power. This led him to lose the powers he was using during the struggle and being de-campaigned by the ZANU PF elites on this case of the Tangwena people.

Therefore, the Nyafaru Farm became the site of political struggles through the Nyafaru Development Company that took control of the farm from the white farmer, with the aim of helping the Tangwena people on their struggle to fight against the colonial rule over their ancestral land.

The company later turned its objectives to privatize the farm for personal gains that led the Tangwena people to realize that the existence of the farm on their land will always attract oppression from the individuals who will be interested on the farm. Then, the removal of the farm and the company was the last option for the Tangwena people. They then fought the company until 07th September 2016 when the official handover of their land was held at Nyafaru Secondary School premises.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Oral Interviews

An interview with Chekwa, C. the TADA member and former Nyafaru Primary School teacher, interviewed on the 14th February 2017.

An interview with Hazangwe, K. the TADA elder who participated in the Tangwena struggles, interviewed on the 12th of February 2017.

An interview with Mabvudza, J. the adviser in the NDC, interviewed on the 5th of February 2017.

An interview with Mabvudza, L. the woman who participated in marched of the Tangwena women naked to Nyanga, interviewed on the 18th of February 2017.

An interview with Mabvudza, M. the former worker at Nyafaru Farm from the 1950s to 1995 and one of the founders of TADA, interviewed on the 20th of October 2017.

An interview with Mabvudza, S. the woman who participated in marched of the Tangwena women naked to Nyanga, interviewed on the 12th of January 2017.

An interview with Maoko, B. the Nyafaru Secondary School Headmaster, interviewed on the 1st of February 2017.

An interview with Mukanya, S. the cooker at the base of TADA party, interviewed on the 5th of February 2017.

An interview with Muomba, G. the Nyafaru Primary School and one of the founder members of TADA interviewed on the 7th of February 2017.

An interview with Mutape, K. the TADA member, interviewed on the 1st of February 2017.

An interview with Mutsiwawo, N. the man who worked at Nyafaru Farm from 1975 to 2004, interviewed on the 20th February 2017.

An interview with Mutwapo, N. the man who participated in the Tangwena struggle with the colonial regime, interviewed on the 18th of February 2017.

An interview with Nyagondore, N. the Nyafaru Secondary School Development Committee chairperson, interviewed on the 10th February 2017.

An interview with Nyamupangedengu, P. one of the TADA heroines in the struggle, interviewed on the 10th of February 2017.

An interview with Pabwe, P. the Nyafaru village heard who supported the TADA, interviewed on the 21st of October 2016.

An interview with Tangwena, J. Rekai's Sister who participated in the Tangwena's political struggles, interviewed on 14th of August 2016.

An interview with Tserayi, J. one of the TADA heroines in the struggle, interviewed on the 6th of February 2017.

Archival Sources

Brook, G, C, “No Good Reason has been Given for Moving Tangwena and his People”, *Rhodesia Herald*, 14 July 1969.

N. n, *Rhodesia Herald*, 18 August 1969.

Court document CRB NO 635-57/05, 27 May 2004.

Newspaper and Periodicals

Chakamwe Chakamwe, “Remembering the Heroic Fight of Chief Tangwena”, *The Patriot*, 30 October 2014.

Books and Articles

Austin, R, *Racism and Apartheid in Southern Africa*, the Unesco Press, Paris, 1975.

Chitsike, F, A Critical Analyses of the Land Reform Programme in Zimbabwe, 2nd Fig Regional Marrakech, Morocco, 2005.

Fredrickse, J, *None but Ourselves*, Zimbabwe Publishing House, Harare, 1982.

Gilchrist, R, D, “Rhodesia’s Place in the Native Problem”, *Journal of the African Society*, vol 32 (126-129), 1993.

Hove, M and Gwiza, A, “The Fast Track Land Reform Programme and Food Insecurity: A Case of Zimbabwe from 1992 to the Present”, *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, vol 2(8), 2012.

Kramer, E, “A Clash of Economies: Early Centralization Efforts in Colonial Zimbabwe, 1929-1935”, *Afriacan e-Journal Project*, Michigan State University.

Magaisa, A, T, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History’s, Multiple Victims*, 2010.

Mandondo, A, “Situating Zimbabwe’s Natural Resources Governance System in History”, in Govo, N, Dzimiri, N, P and Molapo, R, R, “The Politics of Land IN Zimbabwe’s Communal and Resettlement Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe”, *J Soc Sci*, vol 43(1), 2015.

Matondi, P, B, *Zimbabwe’s Fast Track Land Reform*, Zed Books Ltd, New York, 2012.

Mlambo, A and Raftopolas, B, “Becoming Zimbabwe”, in Govo, N, Dzimiri, N, P and Molapo, R, R, “The Politics of Land IN zimbabwe’s Communal and Resettlement

Areas: A Case Study of Gutu District, Zimbabwe”, *J Soc Sci*, vol 43(1), 2015.

Moore, D, S, *Suffering for Territory, Race, Place, and Power in Zimbabwe*, Duke University Press, Durham & London 2005.

Mutondi, P, B, *Zimbabwe's Fast Track Land Reform*, Zed Books Ltd, New York, 2012.

Ncube, G, T, “Crisis of Communal Leadership: Post-Colonial Local Government Reform and Administrative Conflict with Traditional Authorities in the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe, 1980-2008”, *African Journal of History and Culture*, vol 3 (6), 2011.

Nyao-Shava, V, Z and Barnard, S, L, *The Trajectory of Land Reform in Zimbabwe: Post- independence Era 1980-2000*.

Pulse, D, *Reconstruction*, American Friends Service, Philadelphia, 1983.

Ramphel, R, Quoted in A, T, Magaisa, *The Land Question and Transitional Justice in Zimbabwe: Law, Force and History's Multiple Victims*, 2010.

Others

Tangwena, T, in a documentary by Dambudzo Marechera titled *The House of Hunger*, 1992.

Letter, “The Tangwena People’s Restitutions Subsequent to Visit by Lands Officer”, to Provincial Lands Officer, Manicaland Province, 14 July 2015.