

Land Ownership and Range Resources Management in Zimbabwe: A Historical Review

*Chivandi, E.¹; Fushai, F.¹ and Masaka, J.²

*Corresponding Author

¹Department of Livestock and Wildlife Management

²Department of Land and Water Resources Management

Faculty of Natural Resources Management and Agriculture

Midlands State University

P. Bag 9055, Gweru, Zimbabwe.

E-mail: emchivandi@yahoo.co.uk

Abstracts

Land ownership and range resources management and utilisation in Zimbabwe spans over three distinct historical times. In pre-colonial Zimbabwe, chiefs together with their aides and subordinates were custodians of land and its encampment resources. Low livestock and human populations then, coupled with a cultural common sense of purpose within communities created a framework for a kind of "common property resource management" that led to sustainable range resource utilisation. The colonial era through the Land Apportionment Act of 1930, Native Land Husbandry Act of 1951 and the Land Tenure Act of 1969 saw the emergence of Tribal Trust Lands located in fragile environs of agro-ecological zones IV to V that became home to black Zimbabweans who had been dispossessed of resource-rich lands of agro-ecological zones I to III by the settler whites. Sustainable range resource utilisation initiatives such as the construction of mechanical conservation works, demarcation of arable from grazing land and grazing schemes in the Tribal Trust Lands failed partly due to resistance by the indigenous communities and the increases in both human and livestock populations that led to fragmentation of arable plots and subsequent encroachment into grazing lands. Independence brought with it rural development programmes and legislative changes aimed at stemming range resource degradation as well as bringing equity in land ownership among different races in Zimbabwe. Having "purportedly" failed to access enough land for resettlement via the "willing-buyer willing-seller" concept as stated during the Lancaster House Conference of 1979, the Government of Zimbabwe embarked on the Land Reform Programme that degenerated in the Fast Track Land Reform Programme whereby white-owned commercial farms were occupied without any prior logistical and infrastructural arrangements for the incoming settlers. The Fast Land Reform Programme has somewhat managed to 'avail prime pieces of land' to hitherto disadvantaged black Zimbabweans. However the programme presents both threats and opportunities to sustainable range resources utilisation in rural Zimbabwe. A dire need exists for Government to create awareness, educate, enforce and police, through its line ministries, all resettled Zimbabweans to utilise land and its resources in a sustainable manner.

Key Words: Land Ownership, Range Resources, Sustainable Resource Utilisation

Introduction

Zimbabwe, a country in the Southern African sub-region, is located between

latitudes 15.8⁰ S and 22.4⁰ S and longitudes 25.2⁰ E and 32.7⁰ E and extends for 390 700 km² (Vincent and Thomas, 1960; Anderson et al., 1993). The country has five agro-ecological zones; I through to V. Agro-ecological zones I, II, III, IV and V extend for 7 000km², 58 600km², 72

900km², 147 800km² and 104 400km² respectively translating into 1.8 %, 15 %, 18.7 %, 37.8 % and 26.7% of the total land area of Zimbabwe for agro-ecological zones I through to V respectively (Palmer, 1977; Anderson et al., 1993). Rainfall totals are highest in agro-ecological zone I averaging 1 000 mm per annum and decline to less than 400 mm per annum in agro-ecological zone V. Agro-ecological zones IV and V are fragile and very sensitive to utilisation. Land use planning recommends that the agro-ecological zones IV and V be put to extensive beef ranching, mixed extensive beef and wildlife production and or alternatively be used as wildlife sanctuaries in the form of National Parks and Conservancies.

The advent of the European settler occupation of Zimbabwe in September 1890 saw the genesis of the dispossession of blacks of their land (Lawton, 2001; Utete, 2003). One of the key colonial land enactments included the Land Apportionment Act (LAA) of 1930 that came about as a result of the Morris-Carter Commission (MCC) of 1925 (Lebert, 2003). The MCC sought to set out the framework upon which to found and have Rhodesia emerge as a self-sustaining white colony. The LAA separated land along racial lines both in terms of quality and quantity. Race groups were not allowed to acquire land in areas designated to other races. The second piece of legislation was the Native Land Husbandry Act (NLHA) of 1951 (Lebert, 2003; Utete, 2003). Central to the NLHA was the enforcement of the construction of mechanical conservation works (contour ridges) and limitation of livestock numbers, particularly cattle, in Tribal Trust Lands (TTLs). The Land Tenure Act (LTA) of 1969 saw the strengthening of the provisions of the LAA. Under the LTA, land was divided

in half with 44.9 million acres being allocated to each race (white and black). This meant marked increase in congestion in TTLs with accompanying overgrazing as more land once planned as grazing was encroached for food crop production. Independence in 1980 also saw the promulgation of various pieces of legislation. They included the enactment of the Land Acquisition Act of 1985, amendment of the Land Acquisition Act in 1992 (Section 10 of Chapter 20 of the Land Acquisition Act of 1985) followed by the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (Number 16) Act of 2000 and the amendment to the Land Acquisition Act in 2000 (Palmer, 1990; Moyo, 2001 and Lebert 2003). The promulgation and amendment of various acts sought to deracialise land ownership and establishment of equity among races.

The Zimbabwe 2002 national census results indicate that Zimbabwe has population of 13.5 million (Central Statistical Office, 2003) people of which over seventy percent of them (black Zimbabweans) are concentrated in the ecologically sensitive agro-ecological zones IV to V. Prior to 2000, land ownership was skewed in favour of white Zimbabweans to the disadvantage of the majority black Zimbabweans. The high human and livestock population density in regions IV to V put pressure on the range resources. The pressure on the range resources in the marginal areas manifested and continues to manifest itself as mosaic of problems associated with degrading rangelands exemplified by a reduction in cattle productivity, soil erosion and reduced soil fertility and siltation of rivers and dams (Fushai and Chivandi, 2004a and Fushai and Chivandi, 2004b).

This review paper traces legislative enactments, their impact on land ownership and range resources utilisation and conservation in Zimbabwe through different historical times. It is also the aim of the paper to highlight threats and opportunities availed to sustainable range resources utilisation in Zimbabwe brought about by the change in the land ownership structure as a result of the Land Reform Programme (LRP).

Land Ownership and Range Resources Management In Zimbabwe

Based on the history of the peoples of Zimbabwe; the land ownership structure and range resources management in Zimbabwe can be split into three distinct and unique phases, that is: pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial eras.

Pre-colonial Land Ownership and Range Resources Management

The pre-colonial era (pre-1890) human population of the country was estimated at $\pm 500\ 000$ (Vincent and Thomas, 1960; Anderson *et al.*, 1993). Livestock numbers were then low such that there was no problem of overgrazing and associated problems. Food crop production was based on shifting cultivation. The low human and livestock populations then made it possible to have enough time for regeneration of the vegetation without any threat to range resources. In addition to the low human and livestock population density then, the indigenous populace was concentrated in agro-ecological zones I to III that are less sensitive to utilisation (Vincent and Thomas, 1960).

Institutionally, land ownership, utilisation and protection of range resources was vested in the hands of the traditional leadership in the form of chiefs, their aides and the community at large.

Furthermore, people then had a unitary system of worship and viewed land and its resources as an inheritance given to them by their ancestors to safe-keep for posterity. Beliefs and social values were under the auspices of the traditional leadership. Some kind of convergence of purpose in the system of worship, resource allocation and utilisation existed. The common sense of purpose created a framework of '*common property resource management*' at community level via observance and respect of values such as: sacredness of community designated forest areas, sacredness of community designated rivers and water fountains and sacredness of certain tree species within a forest area. The shared beliefs and values as enshrined in their indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) and their subsequent judicious observance by all community members resulted in a non-exploitative range resource utilisation.

Colonial Era Land Ownership and Range Resources Management

The white settler community invaded the country in 1890 (Lebert 2003; Utete, 2003). The invasion led to the competition for land and its resources. The competition for control and ownership of land led to the Shona and Ndebele uprisings from 1896 to 1897 (Lebert, 2003). The defeat of the indigenous communities meant that their bid to retain and maintain a claim on the land and its resources was shattered. Immediately after the quelling of the indigenous people's uprising the colonial institution began to systematically alienate the indigenous people from their land.

The MCC of 1925 set the framework for the creation of a self-sustainable white Rhodesian colony (Lebert, 2003). The commission was set up following a referendum in which the settlers elected

for self-governance. The MCC proposed land holding patterns that set the settler economy on sound footing. It (MCC) culminated in the LAA of 1930. The LAA separated land along racial lines; both in terms of quality and quantity. Race groups were not allowed to acquire land in areas designated to other races. In terms of the LAA, 50.8 % of the land was reserved for white settlers, with bulk of it on the arable central highlands (Muchando, 1998, Lebert, 2003). The majority black Zimbabweans received only 30 % of the land that was designated as African Reserves Areas (ARAs). This was divided into TTLs. The bulk of the land designated ARAs was on the plateau sloping into the Zambezi Valley and in other mountainous escarpment regions of natural regions IV to V. Thus the majority population was condemned to marginal areas characterized by low rainfall and fragile sandy soils such as the Kalahari/Gusu sands of Gokwe, Lupane, Tsholotsho and Hwange (CARD, 1987). The remaining 20 % of the land was either owned by companies or by the colonial government as "Crown Land" and or was reserved as conservation areas.

The LAA led to the evolvment of three types of rural communities that depended directly for survival on land and its resources: Tribal Trust Lands (TTLs), African Purchase Areas (APAs) and Large-scale Commercial Farming Areas (LSCFAs). The TTLs (now Communal Areas), under the jurisdiction of Native Commissioners (NCs) were strictly for the indigenous population while the APAs acted as buffer zones between white and black rural settlements (Cheater, 1990). The LSCFAs were the strict preserve of the white settler community most of whom were given the farms for free as tokens for having represented the British Monarchy's

interests at various levels on the international arena. Thus the LAA of 1930, the NLHA of 1951 and the LTA of 1969 completely disinherited the indigenous communities of their land and its resources such that the sense of ownership was completely destroyed (Cheater, 1990; Schmidt, 1992).

Range Resources Management In TTLs

The NCs in charge of each TTL were tasked with the implementation of government policy on range resources utilisation. With the aid of the Department of Internal Affairs and the Natural Resources Board and legislative backing of the NLHA of 1951, NCs effected villagisation of settlements (after completion of the resource inventory of the whole country), demarcated arable and grazing lands in each of the TTLs, enforced digging up of mechanical conservation works (contour ridges) to minimise erosion, demarcated all water chains and vleis areas (the latter were utilised for dry season grazing only) and fixed the livestock units/numbers each community was supposed to carry (Lawton, 2001; Lebert, 2003). All 'excess stock' was cheaply bought off for stocking intensive conservation areas (ICAs) of the settler whites. These measures were taken in vain attempt to sustainably utilise range resources against a backdrop of indigenous people's seething discontent with the land loss they had suffered. Anderson *et al.* (1993) states that there was very little planned agricultural development in the TTLs until Alvord, then Director of African Agriculture, initiated a programme of Rural Development. Alvord introduced the concept of centralisation, a simple approach to land classification whereby arable land was consolidated and demarcated from surrounding grazing

land “on the pre-condition of a request by and the active commitment of the local people”, in other words a ‘participatory approach’ well ahead of its time. The implementation package included planned land use that included demarcation of grazing areas from arable lands, village consolidation, improved water supplies, woodlots and orchards, improved housing, schools, roads, soil conservation works and agricultural extension. This led to the creation of a cadre of Master Farmers (Anderson *et al.*, 1993). During the Alvord initiated programme, about 45 000 km² were centralised (Reid, 1980). A period of relatively successful communal area agricultural improvement was from 1960s to 1973 when communities in TTLs constructed mechanical conservation works, followed the cyclic dry and wet season grazing regimes and established some grazing schemes prior to the intensification of the liberation struggle (Reid, 1980). Geza and Reid (1983) stated that grazing schemes establishment and management resulted in marked increase in livestock production. Over 1000 grazing schemes were established before their disruption by the escalation of the liberation struggle (Geza and Reid, 1983, Fushai and Chivandi, 2004a; Fushai and Chivandi, 2004b). Froude (1974) states that Masvingo province communal areas (CAs) were the focus of much of the veld management (grazing schemes) schemes such that by 1973 32 % of Bikita District CAs was covered by grazing schemes. However Fushai and Chivandi (2004a) and Fushai and Chivandi (2004b) indicated that the Grazing Scheme initiative did not yield much in terms of livestock productivity and ecological sustainability as evidenced by poor livestock reproductive and productive performance and continued range resource degradation in TTLs.

In 1968 a statutory body, the Tribal Trust Land Development Corporation (TILCOR), [now the Agricultural and Rural Development Authority (ARDA)] was created. It was mandated with the responsibility of developing CAs (Anderson *et al.*, 1993). TILCOR’s development initiatives centred on estate-scale irrigation that led to establishment of projects such as the Sanyati, Tsholotsho and Muzarabani. Very few people in TTLs benefited from the intensification and subsequent pressure relief on the range resources brought about by the estate-scale irrigation projects. On the majority the state benefited from the controlled utilisation of the range resources in state lands. The strict monitoring and applied research carried out in these state lands resulted in a sustainable system of resource utilisation.

In the TTLs both human and livestock populations grew. Population growth occurred despite the efforts to effect sustainable range resources utilisation in the communal areas. Human population growth led to the fragmentation of the already small cropping lands into smaller units. Eventually the continued need for cropping land led to the encroachment into grazing lands once planned as unfit for cultivation (Cheater 1990; Muchando, 1998; Fushai and Chivandi, 2004b). The incessant pressure on the land and its resources resulted in the deterioration of the range condition and a concomitant degradation. The problem was compounded by the land tenure system in the TTLs where no individual owned land in his or her individual capacity hence there was no impetus to undertake any range resource conservation initiatives.

Range Resources Management In The APAs
At the inception of APAs, [later called Small Scale Commercial Farming Areas

(SSCFAs)], no proper planning was done as land holdings were later found to be too small leading to pressure on the range resources (Agritex, 1987). In an attempt to maintain sustainable range resource utilisation properties were merged. The mergers were made possible through relegation of perceived non-performers in the APAs to TTLs. This repossession of APAs land was mainly witnessed in the Chemagora SSCFAs of Gokwe (Agritex, 1987). In addition to this, more SSCFAs were created, for example, Lancashire and Wiltshire SCCFAs and such latter schemes were made slightly larger than ones in the original scheme. In the APAs range resource utilisation was effected on a more sustainable manner partly due to the tenure system that enshrined a sense of ownership to the individual farmers. Furthermore the extension worker to farmer ratio in the APAs was lower than in the TTLs, hence the former had better awareness created in them of the need to sustainably utilise and conserve range resources.

Range Resource Management In The LSCFAs

The LSCFAs were managed as Intensive Conservation Areas (ICAs). The key traits of the LSCFAs included a very low human population, a resource-rich eco-environment that was and is still less fragile compared to areas demarcated as TTLs and APAs. A separate extension department, Department of Conservation and Extension (Conex) was created to assist LSCFAs farmers in the execution of non-exploitative farming practices with sound, scientific and holistic resource management being practiced (Fushai and Chivandi, 2004a and Fushai and Chivandi, 2004b). Farmers in the LSCFAs had title (ownership) to the land that created a sense of belonging. This

multiplicity of favourable attributes in the LSCFAs led to the evolvement of a sustainable range resource utilisation farming system.

Parks, Conservancies and State Lands

The Parks and Wild life Act of 1975 (Government Printer, 1982) gave birth to the establishment of the then Parks and Wild Life Board, now, the National Parks and Wildlife Authority of Zimbabwe (NPWAZ). The Act mandated the Board to provide for the establishment of National Parks, Botanical Reserves and Gardens, Game Conservancies/Sanctuaries, Safari Areas and Recreational Parks; to make for the preservation, propagation, conservation and control of the wild life, fish, and plants of Zimbabwe and the protection of her natural scenery (Government Printer, 1982). The Board was purposed with the maintenance of ecological stability of wildlife and plant communities for the enjoyment, education and inspiration of the public. Conservancies afforded special protection to all animals or particular species of animals in the sanctuary for the national good. Safari areas were tasked with the protection of the natural habitat and wildlife such that facilities and opportunities are afforded to the public for camping, hunting, fishing, photography, viewing animals and bird watching. Conservancies and National Parks were established in agro-ecological zones IV and V adjacent to most of the TTLs. The minority white population benefited from the parks and conservancies at the expense of majority black Zimbabweans. The latter had to content with problem animals in the parks and conservancies brought close to their areas. This scenario led to the problem of poaching of both wildlife and wood by members of communities adjacent to such sanctuaries. The poaching

came about as a way of retaliating crop and human life destruction by problem animals and the indigenous communities' failure to benefit both materially and financially from the parks and conservancy areas. In addition to the establishment of Wildlife Board, some land was put aside as 'State Land' for example the Gwayi, Gwampa and Mtao forests.

Land Ownership in Independent Zimbabwe: The First Two Decades

Independence in 1980 brought with it a new impetus to improve range resources utilisation and conservation in CAs. The key target was to improve the socio-economic status of the communities and to bring under control range resource degradation. The period 1980 to 1992 saw several communal area developmental programmes being implemented by Government through many initiatives. Key initiatives included Rural Resettlement, Rural Reforestation, Communal Area Grazing Schemes, Small-scale Dairy Development, Smallholder Irrigation Projects and the evolution of Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (Campfire). Campfire is a Zimbabwean rural (communal area) development initiative that practices and promotes natural resource utilisation, including wildlife as an economic and sustainable land-use option, for people living in CAs. The programme evolves on the premise of returning the management of natural resources to the local inhabitants (Peterson, 1992). The key target of each the initiatives was, among other things, to reduce pressure on range resources, rehabilitate degraded range areas and or intensify production per unit area thus easing pressure on available resources for the betterment of the rural population through sustainable resource utilisation.

Institutional and Legislative Changes

Institutionally, changes were inevitable. The TTLs became officially known as CAs in 1982. District Administrators (DAs), Ward Development Committees (WADCOs) and Village Development Committees (VIDCOs) came into being. The DAs through WADCOs and VIDCOs became responsible for the welfare of communities and range resources in their districts. Government merged the departments of Conex, Agriculture and Rural Development (DERUDE) to create the Department of Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (Agritex). Agritex, the extension department, was mandated to concentrate its work in the smallholder agricultural sector with a concomitant increase in awareness by the communities of appropriate and sustainable range resource utilisation techniques. The extension department provided an interface between research and the CA farmers. Interventions and or technologies developed by Research Stations were tested on-farm with feedback on technology efficacy and appropriateness to Research Stations made possible.

On attainment of independence the Government of Zimbabwe (GoZ) enacted many pieces of legislation viz land and water since these are primary requirements for agricultural production. The legislative changes were made mainly after the lapse of the LHC crafted constitution (Moyo, 2001). They included the enactment of the Land Acquisition Act of 1985, amendment of the Land Acquisition Act in 1992 (Section 10 of Chapter 20 of the Land Acquisition Act of 1985) followed by the Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (Number 16) Act of 2000 and the amendment to the Land Acquisition Act in 2000 (Moyo, 2001 and Lebert 2003). The 1992 amendment to the

Land Acquisition Act introduced a designation provision that enabled addition of compulsory acquisition to the 'willing-seller' framework. The Constitution of Zimbabwe Amendment (Number 16) Act of 2000 was so crafted that it absolved the GoZ from any obligation to pay compensation for land itself. Additionally it set out the criteria for valuation of improvements on farm. Secondly the amendment sought to streamline the dual route of compulsory acquisition by eliminating the designation route (that dragged out acquisition) and retaining the direct acquisition route that had in itself more clearly defined compensation procedures (Moyo, 2001). The prime thrust of the various Land and Water enactments post independence was to create equity in accessing agricultural land among different races as well as to ensure fair access to agricultural (irrigation) water to hitherto disadvantaged black Zimbabweans.

The Rural Resettlement Programme: 1980 - 1992

Between 1980 and 1992 the rural resettlement area opened up amounted to a mere 6% of the country (Agritex, 1995). Seventy percent (70%) of the 6 % fell in agro-ecological zones I – III. According to the document entitled '**Zimbabwe's Land Reform**' prepared by the Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement (MoLARR) of the GoZ by 1997 the GoZ had acquired 3 498 444 Ha of land (8.97% of the country) and settled 71 000 families (MoLARR, 2001). In addition to the moral need to avail land to the landless majority, the other key tenet of the first phase of the Rural Resettlement Programme was to decongest CAs and thus relieve pressure exerted on range resources and rehabilitate degraded areas in the CAs. Resettlement during the period under

review was based on the premise of the 'willing-buyer-willing-seller' concept as was agreed upon during the LHC before elections that brought majority rule in the country. The GoZ accused those who had land of holding onto their land by charging unrealistically high prices such that government failed to buy enough land to meet the demand. However it is true that to some extent red tape retarded progress of the initial resettlement programme. Furthermore, besides the poor management of funds from the donor community meant for resettlement purposes, the Labour Party of the Britain (the former colonial master) once in power reneged on the clause of the LHC that stipulated that the British government was to fund the resettlement programme. As a result the initial resettlement programme brought very little relief on over-exploitation and subsequent degradation of range resources in CAs since the target decongestion was not achieved.

In the Conservancies and State Lands, the colonial status quo was maintained during the first one and half decades of independence. Poaching of resources in these protected areas continued since communities were not reaping any benefits from them. The poaching however cannot be wholly ascribed to local communities since there were allegations that security personnel meant to protect the resources were also found wanting. Additionally, cross border poaching was rampant particularly from the Zambian side with a number of Zambians being apprehended by the Parks security personnel. However, the situation in the National Parks was changed as a result of the amendment of the Parks and Wildlife Act (1975) in 1982 (Government Printer, 1982). Through the help of innovative

local conservationists and researchers, the National Parks and Wildlife Authority of Zimbabwe (NPWAZ) (formerly Wildlife Board) initiated and sustained a new community based conservation-driven (wildlife) industry where the traditional rights of local communities to sustainably utilise wildlife outside state protected areas was restored. The initiative saw the genesis of a Community Based Natural Resources Management Programme (CBNRMP).

Current Situation

Perceived failure of the initial Rural Resettlement Programme (RRP) to avail enough land to decongest CAs areas triggered dramatic developments in land ownership and range resource utilisation and conservation in Zimbabwe. Central to the developments was the enunciation of the Land Reform Programme (LRP) that drove its strength from the amended Land Acquisition Act of 1985. The LRP degenerated into the Fast Track Land Reform Programme (FTLRP) whereby landless blacks led by the War Veterans occupied commercial farms with a promise to rationalise and normalise the situation later by the line ministries of the GoZ. Apart from the need to relieve pressure on the range resources in the CAs via decongestion, the LRP was and is centred on the premise of creating a de-racialized farming system. The overall objectives of the LRP included redressing the inequities in the land resource allocations and providing a more efficient and rational structure. It sought to ensure greater security of tenure to land users, promote investment in land through capital outlays and infrastructure and promote environmentally sustainable utilisation of land while at the same time retaining a core of efficient large-scale commercial agricultural producers and transfer not

less than 60 % of the land from the commercial farming sector to the rest of the population (MoLARR, 2001).

The Land Reform Programme: A Critique

There are two schools of thought with regards to the impact of the almost complete LRP. The GoZ and some sections of the civil society believe that the LRP has set the stage for an Agricultural Revolution in the country. However academics (technocrats), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and sceptics in the civil society and industry perceive the LRP as having precipitated an ecological and economic disaster for the country. In its present form the programme does avail policy makers with several opportunities to craft and implement policies and programmes that can safeguard, enhance and in future maintain sustainable range resources in the communal and resettlement areas of Zimbabwe.

A number of threats are apparent on range resources as people are moved from CAs to resettlement areas. People moved into wildlife-rich districts have been tempted to poach animals. This consumptive use of wildlife is an unsustainable way of range resources utilisation. This has raised a lot of concern from districts that have functional Campfire programmes in place. In addition, there is uncontrolled cutting down of trees and uncontrolled use of fire to clear farming land in the new areas. These activities are pre-disposing soils to erosion. Furthermore, there is improper land utilisation. In many instances land fit for grazing is opened up for cropping with disastrous effects on range resource ecology. The LRP has broken the buffer zones of the SSCFAs and has thus brought many indigenous people to

neighbour the white 'commercial' farmers. This closeness has tended to create increased acrimony between the races with each side busying itself with trying to pull down the other racial grouping to the detriment of range resource utilisation and conservation.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The current LRP has to go beyond the establishment of equity in land ownership in Zimbabwe. As of now equity has not been achieved since the Utete-led Commission instituted by the presidency concluded that there was multiple land ownership among top leaders in government (Utete, 2003). The commission has thus recommended for a Rationalisation Programme. Land and the resources therein have to be viewed as potential business units that have to be maintained in production. Now is the opportune time for Government to put into place legislation that avails and enforces sustainable and appropriate land use options as influenced by the resource endowment of the different agro-ecological zones where people are being settled. In wildlife-rich districts it has to be Government policy that the new settlers pursue alternative land-use options along the lines of Campfire and or undertake mixed extensive cattle/wildlife production and eco-tourism (Fushai and Chivandi, 2004a; Fushai and Chivandi, 2004b). Such tailor-made land-use options, for example, the combination of wildlife production with non-consumptive (and controlled consumptive) tourism have a tremendous multiplier effect on many downstream industries that benefit the economy (Price Waterhouse, 1993). Already the NPWAZ has drafted a *'Wildlife-Based Land Reform'* policy document. The policy document framework underpins the recognition that

wildlife is a viable land-use option that can facilitate attainment of equity and that it is feasible (GoZ, 2002). Wildlife confers on Zimbabwe a unique comparative advantage with potential to sustain a viable domestic and foreign tourism industry. To be able to unlock and sustain the potential of the range-resource based eco-tourism industry in the newly resettled wildlife rich districts, the Government has to pump in resources into awareness creation, training, extension and planning. Promotion of harmony among the different racial groupings that utilise range resources by the government can help facilitate the faster transfer of technology from the resource-endowed white farmers to the upcoming farmers settled under the LRP. Programmes that intensify production have to be pursued vigorously. Dam construction has to be a top priority in all areas. With enough harnessed water, all year round cropping is possible meaning more crops can be produced from smaller areas as a result of the intensification that availability of irrigation water brings. The resultant intensification allows the release of more land to grazing and wildlife production thus indirectly acting as a safety valve in sustainable range resource utilisation.

Sustainable range resource utilisation is not a dream if Government is committed and sets its priorities right. Passing of enabling legislation, judicious execution and enforcement of the legislation, planning and execution of appropriate land use options as dictated by the resource endowment of the agro-ecological zone is critical. In addition to the aforesaid, training of the farming stakeholders through a well-supported extension and research department that is demand driven will yield sustainable range resources utilisation in the country.

References

- Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (Agritex) 1987. Performance of Farmers During the Inception Phase of the African Purchase Areas. Department of Agricultural Technical and Extension Services, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Agricultural, Technical and Extension Services (Agritex) 1995. Land Fragmentation Report: Agritex Input into the Land Tenure Commission. Agritex, Harare, Zimbabwe
- ANDERSON, I.P.; BRUIN, P.J.; MOYO, M. AND NYAMWANZA, B. 1993. Physical Resource Inventory of the Communal Areas of Zimbabwe – An Overview. NRI Bulletin 60, Chatham, UK: Natural Resources Institute.
- Coordinated Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) 1987. Regional Rural Development, Its Principles and Application in the CARD Programme in Zimbabwe, Masvingo. Germany Technical Cooperation (GTZ).
- Central Statistical Office, 2003. The 2002 Zimbabwe Population Census: Preliminary Results, CSO, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- CHEATER, A. 1990. The Ideology of 'Communal' Land Tenure in Zimbabwe: 'Mythogenesis Enacted?' *Africa* 60 (2).
- FROUDE, M. 1974. Veld Management in the Victoria Province Tribal Areas. *Rhodesia Agricultural Journal*, 71, (2): 29 – 33.
- FUSHAI, F. AND CHIVANDI, E. 2004a. Sustainable Range Resource Management in the Semi-arid Communal Areas of Zimbabwe: New Opportunities in Sustainable Management. *Southern Africa Journal of Agriculture and Science*, (In press).
- FUSHAI, F. AND CHIVANDI, E. 2004b. Sustainable Range Resource Management in the Semi-arid Communal Areas of Zimbabwe: An Analysis of Some Critical Constraints. *Southern Africa Journal of Agriculture and Science*, (In press).
- GEZA, S AND REID, M.G. 1983. Environmental Conservation In Communal Lands With Special Reference To Grazing Lands. *Zimbabwe Science News*, 17, (9/10): 148 – 151.
- Government Printer, 1982. Parks and Wildlife Act (1975) As Amended at the 1st of January 1982. Government of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- LEBERT, T. 2003. Backgrounder – Land and Agrarian Reform In Zimbabwe. National Land Committee, Johannesburg, South Africa.
- Ministry of Lands and Rural Resettlement (MoLARR) 2001. Zimbabwe Land Reform Programme. Department of Information and Publicity, Government of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- MOYO, 2001. The Interaction of Market and Compulsory Land Acquisition Processes With Social Action in Zimbabwe's Land Reform. Paper presented at the SARIPS of the SAPES Trust Annul Colloquium on Regional Integration, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- MUCHANDO, P.S. 1998. Land Reform and Democracy in Zimbabwe. APM East and Southern Africa. Cascavel, Brasil.

- PALMER, R. 1977. Land and Racial Domination in Rhodesia. Government Printers, Salisbury, Rhodesia.
- PETERSON, J. 1992. CAMPFIRE: A Zimbabwean Approach to Sustainable Development and Community Empowerment Through Wildlife Utilisation. Centre for Applied Social Sciences (CASS), University of Zimbabwe, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- Price Waterhouse, 1993. The Lowveld Conservancies: New Opportunities for Productive and Sustainable Land Use. Save Valley, Bubiana and Chiredzi River Conservancies – A Draft Report.
- REID, M.G. 1980. Tribal Agriculture in Relation to Rural Development – A Historical Note. Zimbabwe Rhodesia Science News, 14 No 1: 4 – 6.
- SCHMIDT, E. 1992. Peasants, Traders and Wives: Shona Women in the History of Zimbabwe, 1870 – 1939. Postmother, N.H.: Heinemann.
- UTETE, C. 2003. Government of Zimbabwe Commission of Inquiry Into The Fast Track Land Reform Programme. Government Printers, Harare, Zimbabwe.
- VINCENT, V. AND THOMAS, R.G. 1960. An Agricultural Survey of Southern Rhodesia (Part 1) - Agro-Ecological Survey. Government Printers, Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia.