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Executive Summary

At a cursory glance, Matobo district is typical of any rural area in Zimbabwe. Perhaps that was the perception held by many until the Maleme land dispute hit news headlines. In essence, Matobo may be perceived as an epicentre of historical, religious, political and socio-economic processes and upheavals notably over land rights contestations both pre- and post- Independence. The asymmetries in the district have largely escaped public attention; as focus has been on the majestic Matobo hills and its shrines as well as the famous Matobo National Park. Poverty and deprivation associated with land hunger amongst many in Matobo has not attracted the same attention unfortunately.

It is against this backdrop that the research on access to land in particular and resources governance in general was carried out. The research sought to identify some roots to conflicts induced by land issues with a view to addressing these problems. Questionnaire interviews were administered to 109 households randomly selected from Wards 16, 17 and 25. Six Focus Group Discussions were conducted with selected participants from the three Wards. Key-informant-interviews complemented the two methods and additional information was drawn from secondary sources.

The research revealed deepening levels of poverty in Matobo communities. Of the 109 households reached out 27 of them had no cattle or any domestic animals pointing out to difficulties in tilling the land and hence food insecurity. Also, it revealed inequalities by gender
and age in access to land. Very few women owned homes or had land in their names. Another challenge noted was access to safe water as about 50% of households in the research areas were drawing water from dams, rivers and open wells.

One recurrent theme from questionnaire interviews, focus group discussions and key-informants-interviews was the conflict between communities and Matobo National Parks. While the root causes of the conflict are historical the contemporary policies and relations with National Parks official are not making matters any better. Wildlife management strategies do not factor community participation. Apparently, communities resent the National Parks for encroaching on ancestral lands and also that it does not benefit them. Conflict seems to be simmering and could reach boiling point at any time should conditions remain the same.

With the aforementioned, the study proposed some recommendations to strengthen advocacy points for Habakkuk Trust’s conflict resolution program. One of the central issues that would need to be addressed at least by the Zimbabwe Land Commission should be equitable access to land especially for women and youths. There is need to improve access to safe water. A participatory and inclusive wildlife management strategy could go a long way in enhancing sustainability and mutual benefits to communities and parks and conservancies. Lastly, it is important for Habakkuk Trust to engage in capacity-building and awareness-raising in communities on public processes, legislation and policies on land access and use. Informed citizens can effectively hold duty-bearers to account. Addressing some of these issues would complement the conflict-resolution programs.
CHAPTER ONE
Introduction, Background & Context

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Matobo district of Matabeleland South, Zimbabwe can be perceived as the epicentre of historical, religious, political and socio-economic processes and upheavals that have characterized both pre- and post-independence history of the country. The district is home to the highest concentration of prehistoric rock art, Matobo Hills National Park (a UNESCO World Heritage Site 2003), King Mzilikazi Grave, Cecil John Rhodes Grave and a number of Njelele shrines most prominently Shalimani, Dula and Khozi. Notably, land rights contestations, typically entangled with religious connotations on the one hand and on the other racial and political, have played out in this district perhaps like nowhere else. The recent Maleme Saga that attracted national and international news headlines was but one of the eruptions from accumulated frustrations, fears and sense of dispossession by an impoverished community that felt its livelihood threatened.

The Maleme issue exposed the limitations of perceiving the land question in Zimbabwe as that of ‘changing racial composition of access’ as a means ‘to reverse past injustices’ (Sam Moyo). It further highlighted the black elite interests as opposed to masses’ interests in access to land and resources and the often denied ethnic factor in resources exploitation. Also, the incident confirms the assumption that ‘uneven access to land and resource rights’ (Saruchera, 2004) often leads to conflict. Needless to emphasize that the ‘militant and state-led approach’ to land reform in Zimbabwe not only precipitated antagonism and conflicting narratives within the nation but also divided regional and international opinion. Not only did the land issue lead to souring
diplomatic relations with United Kingdom (see Miles Tendi) but it internationalized the Zimbabwe crises by 2000. While the pro land expropriation narrative extolled social and economic justice for the formerly disposed majority, those in opposition emphasized the governance, democracy and human rights deficits of the Government of Zimbabwe as the cause. Rarely was there an opportunity to explore the impact of the ill-defined tenure rights and local resources governance on rural livelihoods and the management of resultant conflicts over land access and use.

This study therefore focuses primarily on citizen access to resources, land in particular and sources of conflict in Matobo with a view to providing conflict resolution strategies in far as access to land is concerned. It is imperative to assess the legislative history and framework in order to reveal the legislative gaps. The impact of land reform on communities in Matobo is of necessity evaluated to assess its impact on land ownership and land use.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

Since the research aimed to gather evidence on conflict induced by access to land in Matobo in order to facilitate local level advocacy work by Habakkuk Trust, the following objectives informed the study:

I. To provide evidence that would facilitate informed engagement on conflict around access to land, especially concerning the Maleme Farm.

II. To identify gaps in the laws and policies governing access to land and land use.

III. To propose recommendations on best practice in land use and land redistribution [for possible advocacy for the enabling legislation to establish the Zimbabwe Land Commission].
1.3 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- How have historical and politico-economic context of land problems manifested in Matobo?
- What is the land distribution picture like in Matobo?
- Which are the land tenure systems in Matobo and how have they impact on livelihoods or induced conflicts?
- How have the various pieces of legislation and policies impacted on land ownership and use in Matobo district?
- What lessons could be drawn from the Maleme land dispute on land ownership, land use and land conflict and resolution?
- Who are the key stakeholders in the land question in Matobo?

1.4 MALEME LAND DISPUTE

The Maleme land dispute that pitted a white farmer and black beneficiary of land reform who was a serving intelligence officer made headline news. The supposed takeover of the farm was not news worth since thousands of farms had gone under similar circumstances. What made news and perhaps history was the community resistance to the takeover.

Matobo district became a centre of focus nationally and even beyond over the land dispute. Typical of a conflict, many factors and players contributed to what became the Maleme Saga. While the local community self-mobilized and resisted a Government directive - even threatening unspecified actions, there was sympathy and solidarity from many quarters. It took local chiefs and the intervention of Vice President Mphoko as well as the reversal of the farm takeover to restore calm. The controversy around Maleme takeover took various dimensions, with overt tribal and regionalism sentiments.

The level of community mobilization and the volatile situation that built up over the Maleme land dispute coupled with solidarity from civil society in general exposed the fragility of Fast Track Land Reform and the high risk of land conflict. While it might be still too
early to draw lessons from the Maleme experience, it nevertheless reminded the nation of its vulnerability and proneness to violence over access to land and resource governance issues.

1.5 HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF THE LAND QUESTION

Grievances over access to land by the dispossessed Africans was known and even exploited by nationalists as a mobilizing tool. However, the liberation movement did not clearly articulate the ‘land question’ then or perhaps did not comprehend the complexity of the matter legally, economically and politically. Notwithstanding, it was determined in its objectives to expropriate alienated land for the benefit of the hitherto marginalized peasantry, and to develop the land and production through socialist forms of organization. Since independence however these objectives have more cautiously stated and slowly or ‘pragmatically’ implemented, resulting in a much more complex configuration of issues, realities and determinations of the ‘land question’ which require careful consideration in order to fully comprehend the position of the State on the one hand and that of the peasantry on the other hand (Sam Moyo in Mandaza, 1986).

Notably, at Independence in 1980, whites who constituted 3% of the population controlled 51% of the country’s farming land (44% of Zimbabwe’s total land area), with about 75% of prime agricultural land under the Large Scale Commercial Farming (LSCF) sector (Weiner et al., 1985) and hence inaccessible to the black majority. Farm sizes in the Large Scale Commercial Farming Sector ranged between 500 and 2000 hectares, with most of them located in the better agro-ecological regions I, II and III. The Communal Areas(CAs), which were home to about 4.3 million blacks which constituted 72% of the rural population, had access to only 42% of the land, three quarters of which was in the poor agro-ecological regions IV and V. Poverty was concentrated in the CAs, with Government estimating that more than half of the households had few or no cattle to use as draught power (TNDP 1982).
1.5.1 Political Economy of Commercial Farming

On the other hand the settler state developed a machinery to provide systematic technical, financial, marketing and infrastructural support to the large scale white farmers, who over the decades were to achieve advanced levels of productivity and the major contributions to the GDP and export earnings. As a result of this dualistic production system, a sharp historical polarization in the conception of the land use capabilities of white farmers on the one hand, in comparison to the peasantry on the other, became part of the folklore of Rhodesia (Moyo, 1986).

Perhaps it is against this background that one can appreciate the attachment to big farms first by white farmers and the multiple farm ownerships by the new black elite. It is against such background that land became everything that matters in Zimbabwe including slogans like ‘land is the economy’. This is in spite of the fact that agriculture contributed only 18% of the country’s GDP.

1.5.2 Fast Track Land Reform Programme – Background and Context

By mid-1984 the government had acquired approximately 2.5 million of land at a total cost of Z$52 million and, most of the land acquisition took place in the 1981/82 and 1982/83 seasons (Sam Moyo in Mandaza, 1986). In the 1990s on the whole there was curiously less urgency attached to grappling with the land question. This was perplexing in view of the earlier impetus together with the expiry of the restrictive clauses of the Lancaster House Constitution in 1990. Fewer than 25 000 new settler households received land between 1990 and 1997. However by 1997 the total number of resettled households now amounted to 71 000 on 3.6 million hectares of land. This was a far cry from the original target of 162 000 households (Sachikonye in Raftopolous and Savage, 2004). The demographic conditions influenced by population increase made land hunger more acute than
at other time since independence. Rumblings of discontent over delayed land resettlement grew louder and louder in most rural areas.

1.5.3 Economic Decline As A Factor
The economic structural adjustment programme (ESAP) which was implemented between 1990 and 1995 failed to revive economic growth with the net result of job layoffs in most industries. Unemployment grew in conditions of deepening poverty both in the urban and rural areas. Some analysts saw a link between the deteriorating conditions of livelihood and the subsequent pressure for land occupations in 2000 (Kanyenze, 2004).

1.5.4 Rejection of February 2000 Draft Constitution
Among other things this meant a rejection of the clause which would have allowed the compulsory acquisition of farms by government without compensation for the land itself. That frustrated the hopes of many groups, most notably war veterans. During the tenure of the Constitutional Commission, about ten war veterans were recruited to participate in the drafting process. They had two pressing issues they wanted inserted into the Constitution i.e. they wanted their pensions and access to be made Constitutional issues on order to protect them against any future government that might not be sympathetic to their cause. Section 57 was later (undemocratically) amended to include a clause that exempted the government from compensating farmers for acquired land, except for improvements on it. However, the draft went on to be defeated by a ‘No’ vote in a national referendum. Clearly the rejection of the Draft Constitution was an unacceptable embarrassment to both ZANU PF and the war veterans. That appears to have incited the war veterans to lead farm occupations and play a key role in mobilizing communities to join them (Marongwe in Hammar, Raftopolous and Jensen, 2003).

1.6 CONTEXT OF CONFLICT IN MATOBO
It is imperative for this study to unpack the conflict over land in Matobo through a theoretical understanding of the nature of conflicts and hence their resolution. This is important since conflict resolution is aimed at as part of addressing land disputes in the district. Actually, conflict could be conceived of a form of social interaction or a struggle over claims over scarce resources, in terms of power and status, in which the aims of the opponents might be to neutralize, injure or eliminate rivals (Coser, 1956; Widstrand, 1980). Conflicts occur in various types and forms e.g. conflicts can be classified into violent or non-violent conflicts, direct or indirect conflicts. Conventional wisdom has tended to focus on two major reasons to explain the occurrence of conflicts in society, namely the scarcity of resources induced by increasing human population numbers, and ethnicity. Hatred between ethnic groups is not a natural phenomenon but a product of different processes that cut across politics, economics, history and even psychology (Keane, 1996). In analyzing conflicts therefore it is important to rely on simplistic explanations such as that of population and ethnicity. What is often assumed to be population induced scarcity turns out to be socially constructed scarcity, completely different phenomenon. It is important therefore to clearly ascertain whether the conflicts over land in Matobo are actually so or mere perceptions.

1.7 CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND RESOURCES GOVERNANCE

The colonial land regime was characterized by a denial of the majority Africans in resources governance. Racial land policies had resulted in skewed socio-economic development where the minority whites were super rich and contrasted with the abject poverty and deprivation by the majority of Africans. Policies and legislation after Independence was meant to bridge the socio-economic gap and de-racialize land ownership. That entailed increased citizen participation in resources governance.
Poverty reduction strategies that do not promote citizen participation in resources governance are unlikely to achieve their goals. Agricultural land is an essential resource which dispossessed communities need access in order to under positive socio-economic transformation. Therefore, the land reform needs to be contextualized in terms of enhancing citizen participation in resources governance and from the poverty reduction angle.

1.8 CONCLUSION

This chapter outlined the historical and legislative context of the land question in Matobo in particular and in Zimbabwe in general. It gave a paradigm through which access to resources including land could be understood. It is the background that forms the basis through which the study was designed and executed. The subsequent chapters focus on research methods, presentation of data and analysis, research findings and implications respectively.
CHAPTER TWO
Research Methods

2.1 INTRODUCTION
Like any research, the survey of land issues in Matobo was subject to a number of intervening factors some of which were within the influence of the researchers and some not. The research approaches and modalities pursued including possible omissions in the research process should be appreciated against the background under which the study was carried out. It should be noted that Habakkuk Trust has had a presence for a number of years in most wards in Matobo district. Therefore, most respondents to the research and local authorities were familiar with the work of the organization. Conversely, Habakkuk Trust has interfaced with Matobo communities and leadership and in the process gathering valuable information on the state of affairs in the district on community livelihood, development initiatives and even conflicts associated with land use and ownership patterns.
This Chapter therefore outlines the research methods applied and the whole research process from desk study, research instruments, training of research assistants to data collection and ethical issues. These are presented in simple narrative meant to capture as much as was possible the actual experiences of the research process.

2.2 DESK STUDY
Since the study had to unpack the sources of land conflict in Matobo with a view to providing conflict resolution strategies in far as access to land was concerned. It was imperative to do thorough background study and review of literature on land in Zimbabwe from colonial dispossession through the various pieces of legislation and colonial policies to post independence land reforms, especially the Fast Track Land Reform and its aftermath.
It was necessary to establish through desk study that Matobo district in Matabeleland South province of Zimbabwe was typical of most provinces in as far as land use, land redistribution and land tenure systems in the country are concerned. Therefore, the findings of this research could be easily generalized and applied elsewhere in Zimbabwe. Of course, there were local nuances that were revealed in literature and confirmed by field research.

Evidence from secondary sources help create a picture through which land-induced conflicts could be appreciated in Matobo district and even beyond. An analysis of legislation and policies on land up to date and the growing corpus of literature on the land question in Zimbabwe proved useful in the study and facilitated both in the collection of primary data and in making recommendations on best practices that could be adopted in future and minimize conflict over land access and use in Matobo and in Zimbabwe in general.

2.3 RESEARCH APPROACHES
The study employed both quantitative and qualitative approaches, bearing in mind their often divergent procedures to social phenomena. Actually by applying both approaches, in way strengthened the research as evidence was tested from different angles for better results. The quantitative – especially the survey questionnaire was found appropriate in collecting information from households on land ownership, access to water and sizes of families and related information. Qualitative approaches were applied through focus group discussions, key informant interviews and from secondary data sources to develop insight into the problems in selected wards of Matobo district. Since the study seeks to address a particular problem, which is, finding ways of addressing conflict over land use, the research is therefore an applied one.

Furthermore, this is an explanatory research that builds on exploratory and descriptive works that have been done on issues of land and conflict in Zimbabwe in general and in Matobo in particular. It explains how the various factors – from the historical, political and
legislative and policy issues have interfaced with growing population and deepening poverty – to create an unstable environment prone to violent land disputes.

2.3.1 A Case Study Approach
By virtue of focussing on Matobo district the work constitutes a case study. Cross-sectional factors are brought together to explain how the land question plays out in Matobo and the resultant conflicts. Case studies are useful in providing information on a particular issue or topic under focus but their main limitations are on generalizations. Hence this study used as well a historical-comparative narrative to bring comparative cases to the Matobo issue.

2.3.2 The Survey Questionnaire
The survey questionnaire was the instrument used mainly to gather evidence from the selected communities in Matobo. Actually 40 interviews were done in Ward 16, while 42 interviews were done in Ward 17 and in Ward 25 they were 27 people interviewed from different households. The survey questionnaire was felt to be appropriate for the wide reach in a relatively short period of three days by six interviewers.
Apart from the advantage of targeting a relatively large number of respondents, the survey also samples many respondents who answer the same question. That gives information which could easily be quantified and explained statistically. For example, some of the questions posed in the study include the following:

Tool One

Q (2): Do you own the home you stay in?
Q (3): Do your land rights include (a) use rights (b) transfer rights (c) none of these
Q (11): What water sources do you have?
    Borehole, piped water, dam, river, well, other-specify?
From questions as given above, one could easily quantify how many people own homes and whether they have use or transfer rights to the land they occupy. Similarly, it was relatively easy to ascertain whether the majority of communities had access to piped water or river water or borehole water.

Another justification for the choice of the survey questionnaire was that information needed included people’s opinions and characteristics. By their nature, surveys are good in eliciting from many respondents about their beliefs, opinions, characteristics, and past or present behaviour. In the study, we needed to know, for example the sizes of households and how long households have occupied the area. On asking respondents whether they had hunting and logging rights which they do not have legally, the intention was to solicit for their opinions and beliefs relating to those rights as communities. Similarly as question (13) shows, it sought the respondents’ opinion on community development needs.

**Tool One**

**Q (3): What other help do you think your community needs?**

While the use of the survey questionnaire had its advantages as noted above, it nevertheless had its drawbacks. Since mainly the closed or fixed response questions were posed there was no room for individual variation or creativity or expression of a personal experience. Closed questionnaires make the assumption that respondents are the same when in reality they are not. By giving options to respondents, ideas that the respondent would not otherwise have had are generated hence influencing the response. Also, through this type of data collection one cannot tell between a respondent who has no opinion or knowledge of a certain subject. Another limitation is that respondents ‘are forced to give simplistic responses to complex issues’ which they could have addressed differently in a an open
discussion. Lastly, was the issue of financial cost as well as physical effort on the part of interviewers. The wards are relatively big and it meant driving distances within the same ward while researchers had to walk distances as well from one household to the next. Apart from physical exhaustion on the part of interviewers, it meant that work went far beyond their normal day as in some days one team returned to Bulawayo as late as 8pm.

2.3.3 The Focus Group Discussions
Although the initial thinking was 3 Focus Group Discussions [FGDs] of 10 participants each per ward from the three selected wards, in practice two FGDs were done per ward with varying numbers of participants. The logic behind the FGDs was to complement the atomistic data collected through questionnaires by allowing for open but guided discussions. Being a selected group had the anticipated advantage of verifying information within the group which could be difficult in a questionnaire.

Valuable information was obtained through the FGDs as interviewees discussed issues. Some of the information obtained had not been anticipated by the researchers as it was not known to them previously and not captured in literature. One of the issues well captured through FGDs was the relations between the Matobo National Park staff and community members. Sources of acrimony and disputes over land and resources seemed to come out clearly in FGDs, especially the ones with more elderly people who have institutional memory. Apart from the Matobo National Parks issue, FGDs revealed a subtle but hot issue over loss of grazing land previously designated for communities in Ward 16 and 17 which the Rural District Council had apparently repossessed and rented it out. Lastly, the FGDs helped elaborate on the Maleme Land dispute, at least from communities’ perspectives.
Although only two instead of three FGDs were carried out per ward in the three research wards, information obtained was sufficient for the study. However, unanticipated hurdles hampered the preparations for FGDs. Initially, it had been planned that each of the six research assistants would hold a FGD. That assumption proved impractical. In reality it was not possible for the same interviewer to direct the FGD at the same time jotting notes from the discussions. It was therefore resolved in the field that one conducts the FGD while another concentrated on note taking. The lack of audio-recording equipment or even video recording showed to be a disadvantage at that moment. Well, researchers had to do with what was available – pen and paper.

Actually one pair of research assistants seemed to have speedily honed skills in managing the FGDs and note-taking that it was decided that the pair do all the FGDs. While that decision had the advantage of ensuring a systematic conduct of FGDs as well as consistency in the management of time; it nevertheless had its drawbacks too. It put excessive load on one pair of research assistants who not only conducted FGDs but administered survey questionnaires as well. Organizing participants for FGDs was not as smooth as initially thought though of course the services of local councillors came in handy. Therefore, it is important to note the roles of Councillors Ms Hlongwane, Ms Nyamukuta and Ms Hlatshwayo in organizing selected participants for FGDs. Actually, all the three councillors happen to be women a direct contrast to a situation where males dominate at parliamentary level as far as the provinces is concerned.

Managing time was also a challenge for FGDs as it was not easy to predict when one activity was going to end and another begin. In some cases, participants waited for hours before the research team arrived to conduct FGDs. The reverse is also true, as in some instances, the research team would wait hours while community members were engaged in community meetings that took nothing less
than two hours. A case in point was in ward 25 at Mthwakazi Shopping Centre. Due to a constrained research budget, there was neither informant fee nor refreshments for FGD participants who were obviously hungry after long waits coupled with distances travelled from their respective homes to the meeting points.

2.3.4 Key Informants Interviews
Selected key informants tended to be mainly office-bearers, namely the three councillors from the three respective wards [Nyamukuta, Hlongwane and Hlatshwayo] selected as research areas, the headwoman [umlisa] of the area, the local chief Mr Masuku, a commercial farmer, the Chief Executive Officer of Matobo Mr E. Sibanda. The lead researcher conducted the key-informant-interviews which were differently structured to suit the different information elicited from the different key informants, except that of the three councillors.

The key-informant-interviews sought to gather information on both policy and administrative issues as well as particular concerns as were noted especially from FGDs. Apart from fact finding they were meant to assess local authorities’ awareness of and preparedness to redress conflict-inducing situations in the district. As noted in the presentation of data, in chapter 3, more grievances were presented by duty bearers who normally should have been addressing those issues. That actually underlined the gravity of land related problems in the district.

As would be expected of office-bearers it was not easy to make arrangements or appointments for interviewing some key informants. Some were even inaccessible even on mobile phones. It meant driving to their homes without prior appointments and risking finding them either busy or unwilling or even away. Fortunately, for those that this risk was taken were most understanding and graciously granted the interview at short notice. However, some key-informants who could
not be left out were either busy or not available during the research period such that arrangements had to be made almost two months after. At least all those targeted as key-informants and selected for interview consented even if it proved difficult to actually conduct some interviews.

### 2.4 RESEARCH TOOLS

The lead researcher designed the Community Data Questionnaire (Tool One) and A Guide to Focus Group Discussions (Tool Two) which were subjected to a standardization process with the Habakkuk Trust team while the Key-Informant-Interview questions were not standardized. The working hypothesis, supposedly drawn from the previous Maleme land dispute, was that ill-defined land rights following the rushed fast-track-land reform created situations prone to conflict over access to land and land use and ownership.

As discussed below, the research tools were simulated during the researcher training sessions and some amendments made. The first five interviews each were meant to serve as piloting the research while the first FGD was used also as pilot. While there were not changes for tool one the changes in Tool Two as previously mentioned was that instead of one interviewer leading the discussion and taking notes simultaneously it was decided that a pair be allocated a single FGD. A number of considerations were made in the design of research instruments. Top on priority was to conduct the research without exposing both researchers and respondents to harm. With the Maleme conflict still relatively recent and the interested parties involved, including the dreaded Central Intelligence Organization (CIO) and militant war veterans, it would have been grossly irresponsible and unwise to directly engage discussions on land conflict in the area. However, the same opinions and facts could still be obtained through open discussions and interviews on access to land and other natural resources like water, grazing and hunting and logging rights as examples. In any event, Habakkuk Trust aimed to
use the findings to inform its advocacy and lobby for appropriate legislation and setting of the Zimbabwe Land Commission which could address permanently some problems facing the Matobo communities.

Another consideration was creating an instrument that would take as minimal time of the respondents as was possible. Tool one was therefore standardized and questions reduced from 18 to 14. Also apart from four questions in Tool One all were closed questions which meant less time for the respondents and for the interviewer as optional answers were given. That was also meant to facilitate ease of quantification of collected data and easy tabulation. It was estimated that only 5 minutes had to be spent on the actual interview while of course double that time would have been spent on self-introductions and explaining the research project and seeking consent.

Additional administrative information needed was the date of the interview, name of interviewer, ward and area, age of respondent, gender of respondent, marital status of respondent and optionally occupation. The respondents did not need to give their names as that was not necessary and also to protect their privacy. The open ended questions needed short answers, for example Tool One Q(1): How many are you in your household? As is shown in the presentation of data in Chapter 3, some interviewers forgot to put the dates and even to fill in their names. Of course, that did not affect quality of data but demonstrates sloppiness.

Writing survey questionnaires is normally demanding and these were not an exception. Yet another crucial consideration was the language issue. Questions were crafted and tested in English yet they were going to be used in Ndebele. Therefore, for both Tool One and Tool Two, questions were in English and Ndebele. Considering the bilingual nature of Zimbabwean society and the prevalence of code-switching it was thought to be useful to be flexible in language use, especially in interviewing and discussing with young people.
Similarly, for the Guide to Focus Group Discussions the names of participants were not taken but their ages and gender. Unlike in the survey questionnaire, questions for FGDs were open-ended and interviewers had liberty to probe and fashion the discussions in ways she thought appropriate and relevant. Five guiding questions were given but they needed not be followed rigidly as the FGDs were meant to allow for as much talking on issues as was possible.

First it was important to establish the participants’ familiarity with the provisions of the Constitution of Zimbabwe, especially Chapter 16 agricultural on land. The question just needed to test level of awareness of land rights and laws governing land but whether one was ignorant of such provisions it did not curtail full participation in the subsequent questions. For example, the other four questions did generate discussions that potentially yielded information on the state of affairs as far as access to land and natural resources was concerned.

**Tool Two:**

- **Q(2)** How can people have access to farming and grazing land in Matobo?
- **Q(3)** Outside of farming what other sources of livelihood do you as the people of Matobo have?
- **Q(4)** As the people of Matobo what are your sources of water and how do you use this resource as a community?
- **Q(5)** Are there any CAMPFIRE projects in Matobo and how are you as the people benefiting from the natural resources in your area?

Although initially the interviewer had to jot notes from the FGDs this was eventually changed such that another research assistant did note-taking while the one concentrating on guiding the discussions. For
Tool One information was entered mainly by ticking the relevant responses or noting down in shorthand responses to the few open-ended questions. The sampling was purposive as choice of wards was predetermined before the research plan. The households approached were selected at random. However, on FGDs it was prearranged to have both sexes of participants and varying ages.

2.5 TRAINING OF RESEARCH ASSISTANTS
A day was dedicated to the training and orientation sessions for research assistants who were to go out to the field. It was important to refresh the research assistants with basic research skills and most importantly cultivate teamwork and team spirit. Also, it was crucial for the lead researcher to assess oral communication and writing skills of the research team and their appreciation of the aims and objectives of the research as well familiarize them with research instruments and research process.

The topics covered in the orientation sessions included:

(i) The historical context of the land question in Zimbabwe,
(ii) Land Tenure Systems in Zimbabwe,
(iii) Chapter 16 of the Constitution of Zimbabwe,
(iv) Research Methods and Ethics,
(v) Research Instruments [Tool one and Tool Two]
(vi) Trial run of research instruments and demonstration

It was felt that it was important for research assistants to have familiarity with the subject to be researched on and hence the history of land question and tenure systems in Zimbabwe. Chapter 16 not only spells out the current legal framework on agricultural land but provides for the yet to be established Zimbabwe Land Commission whose mandate is to bring justice and fairness in land access and utilization.
Research assistants needed to appreciate each question and what it sought to solicit from respondents. Most often research assistants who merely administer questionnaires without full understanding of their purpose are unlikely to pick subtle nuances from respondents. Also, full understanding helps the interviewer to probe further for more information. Besides, in an interview situation or FGDs the researcher has to be in full control of her situation and comfortable with instruments at her disposal rather than be enslaved by them. Discussing the research tools was meant to familiarize and internalize the questions.

Ethics are very crucial in research and most often organizations send researchers to community with very little regard to professional ethical conduct. A research is as good as the principles under which it was carried out. Ethical issues could not be left to chance, especially for the protection of communities that have suffered dispossession and poverty. Research assistants were drilled on entering the site of research and managing the research process with minimum disruption to the targeted community. Simulations were done for both Tool One and Tool Two. Tips were given on how to identify and deal with gatekeepers and spoilers in the field. For example, in a FGDs it could be one or two people dominating the discussions while others rarely say a word. It was important for researchers to navigate such processes and control the dominating personalities without embarrassing them.

2.6 DATA COLLECTION
Field work was conducted for three days from Thursday 17th December 2015 to Saturday 19th December 2015. As previously noted, the three wards targeted were 16, 17 and 25. The villages and areas covered include the following;

Shumbeshave, Natisa, Dewe, Silozwane, Silozwi, Shazhabukwa, Tombo, Lushumbe, Mthwakazi Area, Tshonaphansi, Manzana, Ziyadinga, Emncwazini, Mgadla, Halale, Njelele, Dema, Singwidzi and Gwandavale.
Habakkuk Trust had made prior arrangements with duty bearers especially respective local councillors who mobilized for FGDs. Since two cars were available for the field work, it allowed for the research team to divide into two sub-teams each taking some villages within a given ward. Prior arrangement was also made for interviews by the lead researcher with key-informants. Survey questionnaires meant that interviewers moved from one household to the next and in each household interviewing only one adult member. Filled questionnaires were collated at the end of each day and safely secured at Habakkuk Trust offices while information from FGDs was compiled at the end of the three day field research period. Similarly, notes from key-informants-interviews were compiled at the end of the field work, at least for those covered during the set period. The material shall remain the source of primary evidence for future researchers on related topics.

2.7 ETHICAL ISSUES
A research project like the one in Matobo had potential for a number of ethical dilemmas that needed careful consideration when planning the purpose of the study, designing research and actually conducting the research. In a rural and largely impoverished community the ignorance of their rights on the part of villagers could entice irresponsible behaviour by researchers. Secondly, the risks of exposing respondents to physical or psychological harm after providing information that some excitable partisan officials could deem prejudicial to Government interests. More-so, after the embarrassment by authorities when community activism over Maleme Farm led to reversal of land acquisition and award to a security official, the situation on the ground could have still been unsafe for open discussions. Besides, there were always risks that the research project could have been stopped for one reason or another, as has happened elsewhere with civic society organized meetings. However, none of the anticipated mishaps were experienced during or after the field work.
Since the purpose of the study was to help address conflict within Matobo community over land issues, the research process had to be faithful to its mandate of genuinely seeking solutions to community problems. The research had to be sensitive and balanced the pursuit of knowledge on the one hand and on the other observing the rights, privacy and dignity of community members who were subject of the research. A promise made to all participants was that the report from the research would be availed by Habakkuk Trust to the public including to the Matobo communities.

2.8 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Matobo is a relatively big district and the selected areas for the research are adjacent to each other and all share boundaries with the Matobo National Parks. It would be beneficial to establish conditions in a different part of the district. Future research could explore such a possibility and to test the findings of this work in different wards in the district. Another limitation derives from the timing of the study. It was a period of severe hunger in Matobo district as rains had been poor in that season and many families were already going without food or having one meal a day. That state of affairs would most likely produce certain biases from respondents since they were faced by unusual starvation and lack of water. Lastly, the issue of land conflicts or even land issues are sensitive and lead to polarization in Zimbabwe in general, more-so in Matobo with the Maleme Saga still fresh in peoples’ memories. Researching on a still ongoing land tenure issues and unresolved land conflicts is not easy at all as conditions could suddenly change with new policy pronouncements or new legislation. It is therefore possible and even expected that some opinions and views expressed in this report could have been overtaken by events as the land question remains fuzzy and with lots of grey areas.

2.9 CONCLUSION

In this Chapter, the details of the research process were given; from research method to research tools, training of researchers, collecting
data and ethical issues involved in the research. Such an appreciation of the process by the reader would facilitate comprehension of the context of the research as well as a better understanding of subsequent research findings. The following Chapter 3 presents and interprets evidence from both primary and secondary sources.
CHAPTER THREE
Data Presentation & Analysis

3.1 INTRODUCTION
In this chapter, primary data from the field is presented followed by its analysis. The analysis however draws from both primary and secondary evidence drawn from desk study. The evidence presented is meant to help illuminate a picture of land and resource access and distribution in the selected research areas of Matobo. Some of the data presented relates to household density, home ownership, title to land, ownership of domestic animals, and access to water, wildlife and forests among others.

3.2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON MATOBO
The information below could best be appreciated against facts on Matobo district in general. Matobo is in region 4 and 5 which are the dry parts of the country general. The district is the third populous in Matabeleland South province. According to ZIMSTAT figures from the 2012 Census the total population of Matobo is 93940 while that of the province stood at 683893 giving a household density of 4.4.
Table 1: Distribution of Population by District, Matabeleland South Province, Zimbabwe 2012 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beitbridge Rural</td>
<td>80083</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulilima</td>
<td>90561</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangwe</td>
<td>66218</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwada Rural</td>
<td>115778</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insiza</td>
<td>100333</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matobo</td>
<td>93940</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umzingwane</td>
<td>62990</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwada</td>
<td>20227</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beitbridge</td>
<td>42137</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumtree</td>
<td>11626</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>683893</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the majority of residents are rural consisting of 88%. Although about XX have access to safe water mainly from boreholes about 79% use firewood as source of energy. About 13% of the population between 3-24 have never been to school, while 32% of the same age bracket dropped out. NB Matobo ranks third after Insiza and Gwanda rural in population density in the province.
Table 2: Percent Distribution of the Population Age 3-24 who never attended school in Matobo by Sex, Zimbabwe 2012 Census (Source:ZIMSTAT Census 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>18278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>15627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>48207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 DATA FROM QUESTIONNAIRES

3.3.1 Household density – number of people per household
According to the 2012 Census figures from ZIMSTAT the average number of people per household in Matobo is 4.4 and the district ranks third in the province in terms of population after Gwanda and Insiza. From the 109 household used as sample for this research the average number of people per household was 6. That is in spite of the fact that there were single person households and some with two or three people.

The household density helps one to infer on pressure on resources like access to water, access to firewood and most significantly access to arable land as the communities survive basically on subsistence farming. The information may be useful in appreciating factors like access to basic education, employment rates, poverty levels and even ownership of domestic animals.

3.3.2 Home Ownership – title to land
The majority of men interviewed owned the homes whereas the majority of women interviewed did not own the homes. Actually, 91 households out of 109 were registered in a male person against only 15 registered in females and none registered on both while a paltry 3 were categorized as not applicable.
Figure A: Showing Title to Land by Gender

Out of 109 homes 83.4% were owned by men, 13.8% by women and 2.8% could not be ascertained.

In the three research wards 16, 17 and 25 all land is communally held. Which means that home owners have both use rights and transfer rights. However in the responses 72 said they had use rights while 27 said they had use and transfer rights with 23 claiming they had neither use nor transfer rights. From the targeted households therefore men dominate the access to land ratio while women and youth still remain underrepresented in access to land in communal and resettlement areas.

3.3.3 Ownership of domestic animals

Domestic animals, especially cattle and to an extent donkeys play important roles in household. Apart from domestic animals still being a measure of wealth or lack of it, these animals provide drought power, manure for the fields, milk and meat, as well as security for health, bereavement and settling debts and family obligations. In addition to giving a picture of the state of economic status within households, the number of domestic animals, especially cattle and
goats have a direct bearing on grazing land and access to water sources. Normally, land disputes in the communal areas are couched in the language of either shortage of grazing, encroaching in certain grazing areas or similar issues.

Table 3: Number of households owning domestic animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cattle</th>
<th>goats</th>
<th>sheep</th>
<th>Donkeys</th>
<th>pigs</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61 households</td>
<td>43 households</td>
<td>4 households</td>
<td>30 households</td>
<td>1 household</td>
<td>27 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What is noteworthy is that of the 109 households up to 27 of them had neither cattle, nor goats, nor sheep, nor donkeys, nor pigs. Life becomes hard for those families without domestic animals as we have already shown the utility of these animals in rural life. That lack of animals could be an indicator to food insecurity in the area. Actually that only 61 households had cattle is itself not telling a good story about livelihood in Matobo and food security.

3.3.4 Access to water
Matobo district is relatively a dry area and access to water is as important as access to land itself.

Table 4: Number of households with access to different sources of water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borehole</th>
<th>Piped</th>
<th>River</th>
<th>Dam</th>
<th>Open wells</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 households</td>
<td>2 households</td>
<td>20 households</td>
<td>13 households</td>
<td>47 households</td>
<td>6 households</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fifty-two households out of 109 which is 47.7% have access to protected sources of water in the form of boreholes. An additional 1.8% or two households have piped water. The other sources of water are wells, rivers, dams and wetlands. A number of households indicated more sources of water, however, it was not clear why a family with access to a borehole would also fetch water from a well or a river. Perhaps it could be proximity of the non-safe water source or it could be water for non-consumption but washing and other uses. But with only 47.7% with access to boreholes and 1.8% piped water it only leaves one to guess that the water from rivers, dams, wells and wetlands was for human consumption. Actually in addition to drawing water from other sources 43.1% also drew water from open wells.

Access to water for both human consumption, domestic animals and other uses have a bearing on gender in rural communities. It is normally women who fetch water and suffer the consequences of inadequate water. Women are the main caregivers to communities riddled by HIV/AIDS and various cancerous diseases making access to safe water even more acute.

### 3.3.5 Hunting Rights

All those interviewed were unanimous in that communities had no hunting rights in their areas. Acknowledging that communities had no hunting rights and that they were not hunting could be a vast difference in meaning. Even in regions where agriculture and pastoral like are seemingly good, villagers supplement their food supply from hunting. Matobo communities engage in some gathering of wild fruits, honey, *amacimbi* (mopani caterpillars), fishing and activities like curving, basketry and it looks unusual that they would not engage in hunting.

Actually, the district through the Matobo National Park boasts of plenty wildlife and birds. The Park established in 1953 occupies a total
area of 44 500 hectares and attained the UNESCO World Heritage Status in June 2003. While this is a national attraction and destination of tourists both locally and internationally, communities around the Park feel otherwise. There was a pervasive feeling that wild animals were getting priority of human beings since locals alleged that they were not benefitting at all from the presence of the Park on their ancestral lands.

3.3.6 Logging Rights
Unlike hunting, at least most respondents said they were allowed to fetch firewood and cut trees, especially dry ones. Only 20 out of 109 said they had no right to logging. With firewood as the main source of energy it is unimaginable how these families cook their food and warm themselves if they cannot cut down trees. Human settlements have had negative impact on forests generally and Matobo could not be an exception. Deforestation leads to poor soils and less grass and siltation of water sources. With time these conditions become sources of conflict over land and access to resources like grazing area and access to water.

3.4 Data from Focus Group Discussions
Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) provided complementary information to data gathered through questionnaires. Although FGDs were guided by open ended questions, focus was on sources of livelihood, access to land and land use as well as general resources access and distribution.

3.4.1 Sources of livelihood
It would seem people engage in a variety of activities to earn a living. Apart from subsistence farming which barely meets household needs, many people engage in bee-keeping, basketry, curios, pottery, brick moulding, vegetables, small projects, and selling mangoes and guavas. Some also make marula jam. Most of these activities are however seasonal.
Some villages were engaged in the lucrative poultry project from Ebenezer. The advantage with the poultry project was that it needed neither plenty of land which was becoming scarce nor was it depended on the vicissitudes of weather like agriculture. Besides, a ready market was guaranteed. There was predictability of income through the project and participants could make future plans and perhaps even secure small loans as production was approximating commercial scale.
It is against this background that land dispute initially between the white farm owner and the new black owner sucked in the community as livelihoods were perceived to be threatened. Hence, conflicts over land especially in Matobo are intricately tied to livelihoods. Actually from FGDs some participants confirmed that the Maleme dispute ‘was not about race but the impact the farm has on livelihoods and education of our children’. Actually, some women participants in the FGD would not mention Mr Cunningham by name but would merely say ‘umntanethu’ (our son), hence demonstrating how close they associated with the Cunningham family and their livelihoods that depended on the contested farm.

3.4.2 Access to land and land use
Discussions around access to farming and grazing land tended to be emotive in most FGDs. The guiding question was:

**Tool Two, Q(2): How can people have access to farming and grazing land in Matobo?**

In response the participants poured out their group feelings over issues of farming land, grazing land and access issues.

For example, FGDs held in Ward 16 at Natisa it was noted that there was no space even to allocate new families who were local children needing to start their own homes. Participants argued that their ward of around 140 square kilometres had more than 195 homesteads which to them amounted to overcrowding. Whereas the FGDs held in Ward 17 at Dewe observed that there was no more space considering that a huge percentage of the district was covered by mountains while another sizeable chunk had been appropriated by the Matobo National Park. One participant even chided the District lands Committee for what he claimed was inefficiency and ignorance ‘for
recommending the Big Cave area for agricultural purposes when it was 90% rocky area?

From the FGDs held at Silozwi Business Centre in Ward 16 an even daring revelation came out. Participants claimed that due to inadequate grazing space they were compelled by circumstances to sneak cattle into the Matobo National Park area. However, culprits had to pay fines to release cattle caught inside the Park. The fines seem to cause lots of resentments as participants claimed that the Matobo National Park was responsible for their crowding as it extended its boundary and encroached on communal lands. Participants felt that the Parks boundary should be readjusted back to what they believe was the original demarcation.

In ward 16 the burning issue was the Three-Tier system farms that were in the 1980s allocated for communal grazing but that had since changed. Participants claimed that the land which was supposed to be for communal grazing had in fact been subdivided into plots rented out to people from outside the district. Participants claimed that they had followed up the issue with the Rural District Council and local legislator but to no avail. They alleged that RDC officials were beneficiaries of land that should have been community grazing pastures.

Interestingly, the RDC had a strong answer to the claims by affected communities. It seemed that villagers could not afford to pay requisite taxes for the use of the said land, hence the renting it out to paying tenants. While the RDC action was logical and reasonable as far as revenue collection was concerned it however did not address the simmering anger and mistrust from the concerned villagers.
3.4.3 **Resources Access and Distribution**

The question eliciting responses on resources access and distribution including land was put as follows:

Tool Two

Q(5) *Are there any CAMPFIRE projects in Matobo and how are you as the people benefiting from the natural resources in your area?*

Participants in FGDs from Ward 25 held at Mthwakazi Business Centre had no kind words when it came to benefits from natural resources. They claimed that as a community they hardly benefitted from resources they claimed there was neither CAMPFIRE nor Community Share Ownership Trusts. One of the resources in the locality was grass which was cut for thatching or harvested for stock feed. Some areas within Ward 25 like Tshonaphansi Village and Manzana Village have small scale gold miners.

From discussions from most of the FGDs it would seem that their wrath was directed at the Matobo National Parks. There were strong sentiments that the National Park was more of a nuisance than a benefit to the community. Participants seemed to be unaware of benefits from the Park to local communities. There was undoubted anger, mistrust and suspicion on the Matobo National Parks. Some even mentioned a rumour that as communities surrounding the National Park they were entitled also to a percentage of Cecil John Rhodes’ will. The rumour alleged that millions of dollars meant for local communities were allegedly pocketed or diverted by officials who anyway did not hail from the district.

It is undeniable that relation between National Parks staff and villagers was toxic. With high levels of unemployment, it is understandable when villagers resent the employment of people of Shona and Tonga origins whose home districts are not in the
province. The Parks employees are some of the very few people gainfully employed and salaried amidst largely impoverished communities, hence creating envy, competition and potential for social conflicts. It was even claimed that more often villagers disarmed and beat up Parks employees when they visit drinking places within communal lands.

3.5 DATA FROM KEY INFORMANTS

Key informants confirmed most of the issues raised in questionnaires and in FGDs. The challenges in the district were noted as access to water. Food insecurity had become a perennial problem but 2015 to 2016 agricultural seasons were likely to be bad. Concerns by villagers over the Matobo National Parks and soured relations were also confirmed by most of the key informants.

3.6 CONCLUSION

The presentation of research findings was done against the background of the prevailing socio-economic conditions in Matobo district in particular and in Matabeleland South province in general. The data presented confirms a picture of general poverty characterized by high unemployment, poor agricultural yields, schooling deficits and above all inequalities in access to land and other resources essential for communities’ livelihood. The presence of Matobo National Parks with its glamour and richness of both flora and fauna contrasts with the overcrowded, overgrazed and largely arid communal lands. Insensitivity to the inequalities and poverty and threats to livelihoods was largely responsible for the Maleme Saga. Of course, the Maleme land dispute was triggered by the bundling land redistribution policies and modalities.

The potential for more conflicts over land in Matobo remain huge. In our view, the various factors likely to trigger a large scale land conflict are slowly but surely converging. These factors are historical, political,
and economic basically while they may take a cultural, religious and even ethnic dimension.
CHAPTER FOUR
Research Findings, Implications & Recommendations

4.1 INTRODUCTION
In this Chapter that presents the findings and their implications, the essential element are recommendations. Since the penultimate chapter presented the data and its analysis, here, we summarize the research findings against the research objectives by highlighting the implications and proposed recommendations.

It is important to recap the motivation behind the research which was primarily on citizen access to resources, land in particular and sources of conflict in Matobo with a view to providing conflict resolution strategies in as far as access to land is concerned. Notably, this survey on Matobo land use was framed against the history of the land question in Zimbabwe – drawing from legislative to policy and administrative dictates that have largely influenced access to land by communities.

Notably, continued unequal access to and distribution of land and other resources in Matobo could be recipe for future conflicts. There are marked inequalities in access to land use and ownership along gender and age as one dimension. But there are inequalities also in access to wildlife, safe and clean water, access to forests and access to minerals underground. These are some of the inequalities that laws and policies post-independence were ostensibly meant to address. While racially skewed colonial land ownership has largely been addressed, many communities remain trapped in poverty due to unequal access to resources – key being land.
4.2 RESEARCH FINDINGS
A number of research findings were noted and the key ones were as follows:

4.2.1 Deepening Poverty
Matobo communities were experiencing deepening rural poverty and food insecurity that was exacerbated by perennial low and erratic rainfall. A combination of national economic decline, growing population in some wards of Matobo, the shrinking grazing space and poor harvests continued to undermine community livelihoods. The high incidence of school drop-outs, or those who never went to school or levels of unemployment and underemployment are some pointers to deepening poverty in Matobo.

4.2.2 Gender Inequality in Access to Land
While access to land is essential for survival in rural Matobo, it was learnt that access to land remained heavily skewed in favour of men. Although both men and women of necessity till the land for a living however women have less rights on land. Even for married women, land is registered in their husbands names only rather than on both. There was no notable difference in terms of access to land in both communal or resettlement areas.

4.2.3 Inequality in Access to Land due to Age
In addition to gender inequality in access to land there was also inequality due to age. Youths hardly own land. Female youths could therefore be doubly disadvantaged in terms of access to land first because of their sex and secondly due to their age.

4.2.4 Challenges to Water Access
Issues of resources access in Matobo seemed to manifest themselves mainly in challenges to access to water. Almost half the households have no access to safe and clean water as families draw water from dams, rivers, unprotected wells and wetlands. Pressure on land could
better be measured on water access issues. Access to land and access to water are twin problems in Matobo.

4.2.5 *Challenges to Wildlife Management*

The research also established that current wildlife management policies as practised at Matobo National Park were largely insensitive to community interests. Recurrent conflicts between National Parks staff and villagers are symptomatic of unsustainable conservation practices. While communities are deprived of grazing land, hunting, logging or harvesting grass these are in abundant supply within the boundaries of the National Park.

4.2.6 *Information and Knowledge Gaps*

Apart from deepening poverty among Matobo communities there seems to be dearth of knowledge and information on public process and even constitutional provisions. Poverty alleviation would be difficult where communities have serious information and knowledge gaps. Less informed citizens are malleable and prone to false persuasion.

4.3 **IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS**

4.3.1 *Prevalence of Poverty* in Matobo implies that a significant number of household cannot afford quality education, or access good health facilities. With poor education and poor health there is usually low productivity and hence a continued cycle of poverty. High levels of poverty and starvation make communities susceptible to political manipulation.

4.3.2 *Gender Inequality* in land ownership demonstrate that in spite of major land reforms a significant percentage especially women were still dispossessed and economically marginalized. That undermines efforts towards poverty reduction as it perpetuates uneven development, exclusion.
from economic activities and decision-making. It reflects a lip service to constitutional provisions that guarantee gender equity and gender equality.

4.3.3 *Inequality for Youths* in access to land and natural resources undermines future stability and economic growth as the younger generations are subjected to social decline, unemployment, diseases and crime. Idle youths could be a powder keg for violent conflicts in future.

4.3.4 *Water Problems* hinder many economic activities as most economic activities utilize water. The paucity of water in Matobo c, land conflicts most likely over access to water, future of district lies in improving water supply and management

4.3.5 *Wildlife Management* that excludes local communities like in Matobo National Parks is in the long run not sustainable and might be the likely cause of land conflicts in the Matobo. The National Park laws and policies are largely responsible for negative attitudes by community members on conservation and protection of wild life and ecology. Such State Lands remain alienated from the surrounding communities [see Rukuni] yet the Wildlife-Based Land Reform aimed to address such anomaly.

4.3.6 *Information gap* that is amongst communities creates mistrusts and suspicions against National Parks, RDC, councillors, legislators and other duty-bearers. Without adequate information on public processes communities cannot effectively mobilize and advocate for improved services delivery or even to demand accountability. With the observed information gaps, communities may not contribute effectively to the Zimbabwe Land Commission Bill.
4.4 PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

4.4.1 Poverty reduction strategies should inform land tenure systems
Any policies and legislation on land and its use should ensure enhance poverty reduction, especially in rural communities. The yet to be established Zimbabwe Land Commission provides an opportunity for ensuring that land rationalization addresses equity issues and poverty reduction.

4.4.2 There should be equitable access to land by gender and age
Through enabling legislation and the Zimbabwe Land Commission there could be opportunities to redress inequalities in access to land. For example, it could be made compulsory for married people to jointly register property. Inequalities in land use and land rights are a recipe for future conflicts.

4.4.3 Improve access to safe water and management
Poverty reduction, improved health and food security could be guaranteed to communities with access to water which is safe and properly managed. Conflict resolution on land matters may not be resolved without addressing simultaneously water issues.

4.4.4 There should be change of mindset and approaches to wildlife management that is sensitive to community interests, inclusive and sustainable. Matobo National Parks should not continue as if it was independent of the surrounding areas.

4.4.5 Capacity-building and awareness-raising on public processes.
To address knowledge gaps, there should be intensive capacity-building and raising of community awareness on pieces of legislation or by-laws or policies relating to resources governance. Empowered citizens can hold duty-bearers accountable.

4.5 CONCLUSION
The research demonstrated the huge potential that Matobo district possesses. It similarly revealed the levels of poverty and deprivation by the majority in the Matobo communities. Since resources are finite and the population keeps growing, evident challenges like access to water was already a cause of concern. A picture was created of an area whose carrying capacity was steadily dwindling. Existing laws and policies seem inadequate to address the pressing community challenges. Matobo communities are restive from accumulated frustrations, fears, mistrust and sense of deprivation.

Resources governance need to be addressed and ways of increasing community participation in decision making and from benefits from natural resources including access to land. Unequal access to land needs urgent attention. The simmering anger against the Matobo National Park cannot be ignored without dire consequences. There is already conflict which has just not yet turned violent. In advocating for the implementation of Zimbabwe Land Commission, it would imperative for Habakkuk Trust to address the sources of conflict. It is better and progressive to be proactive and prevent violent conflict than to attempt peace building after the conflict. Intervention to dissipate hostilities and create a tranquil environment needs to be done expeditiously. With its experience in working with communities in the district and further armed with research findings, Habakkuk Trust is therefore better placed to be catalyst for proactive conflict resolution and peace building in Matobo.
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Appendix A: HABAKKUK TRUST MATOBO DISTRICT LAND SURVEY

Date: .........................................................

Name of Researcher..............................................................

Tool One: Community Data Gathering Questionnaire

Ward...............................................................

Area..................................................................

Age.................................................................

Gender.............................................................................

Marital Status..........................................................

Community Role/Occupation............................................

1. How many are you in your household? [Libangaki ngekhaya lonke?]

2. Do you own the home you stay in? YES / NO [Nguwe na umninimuzi? YEBO/HATSHI]

3. Do your land rights include (a) use rights (b) transfer rights (c) none of these.

   [Umninimuzi ulamandla (a) okusebenzisa indawo le (b) ukuyipha kumbe ukuyithengisela omunye. (c) akalawo lawo amalungelo

4. Is this land right documented in the name of (A) a man (B) a woman (C) Both (D) Not Applicable

   [Umuzi lo ubhaliswe ngegama (A) likababa (B) likamama (C) amagama omabili (D) Akukho lokhu]
5. Is your land right a collective land right? YES. No it is individual right? [Indawo le ngakazulu walapha kumbe ngeyomuntu munye? YEBO. HATSHI ngeyomuntu munye]
6. How long have you been staying in this area? [Ulesikhathi esingakanani uhlala kule indawo?]
7. Do you have these domestic animals; goats, sheep, pigs, cattle, donkeys, horses? [Lifuyeni; imbuzi, izimvu, ingulube, inkomo, amadonki, amabhiza?]
8. (a) Do you do crop farming? [Liyalima amasimu?] (b) Do you do horticulture? [Liyalima izilimo zengadi?] (c) Do you have hunting rights? [Liyavunyelwa ukuzingela?] (d) Do you have logging rights? [Lilemvumo yokugamula egangeni?]
9. Are there mining activities in your area? [kuyenjiwa endaweni le kumbe ukutsheketsha?]
10. How can one access farming land in your area? [Umuntu angathola njani indawo yokulima lapha?]
12. Which NGO organizations have worked in your area in the last 5 years? [Yiziphi inhlanganiso amaNGO ezisebenze lapha esingathi iminyaka emihlanu edluleyo?]
13. What other help do you think your community needs? [Ncedo bani obona ludingeka esigabeni senu?]
14. How do you think this help could be obtained? [Kambe lungatholakala njani loloncedo?]
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APPENDIX B: Data from Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Households Covered is 109</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Interviewees =109 [61 Male; 48 Female , 30% being Youths]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number per household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Ownership by Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of land title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households with Domestic Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households Accessing Water Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households with Hunting Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households with Logging Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>